

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF PHILOLOGY

Iona Maškevič

English Studies (Literature, Linguistics, Culture)

**Realizations of modality and evidentiality in argumentative newspaper
discourse: an English-Polish contrastive study**

MA thesis

Academic supervisor –Assoc. Prof. Dr. Anna Ruskan

Vilnius, 2022

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my profound gratitude to my academic supervisor and dear professor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Anna Ruskan for her professional advice and constructive comments which immensely contributed to the process of writing this thesis. It would not be possible to achieve such knowledge and understanding of modality and evidentiality, especially in a way that could be employed to my mother tongue, without her help. I am extremely grateful for the opportunity to work with such an excellent person, who is understanding, considered, and supportive. The thesis allowed me to not only better understand journalistic discourse of English language, but view Polish from a different perspective.

I am also genuinely grateful to my faculty professors, especially Jolanta Šinkūnienė and Birutė Ryvitytė, who encouraged, provided much needed guidance and support, as well as their expertise in times of need.

Lastly, I give my heartfelt thanks to my family, friends and colleagues, who supported and encouraged me throughout all these years.

Abstract

This thesis deals with the realizations of modality and evidentiality in English and Polish argumentative newspaper discourse. It examines the way modality and evidentiality markers are used in English and Polish opinion columns of both liberal and conservative views. The study exploits quantitative and qualitative methods of research. The purpose of the thesis is to investigate and reveal possible similarities and differences in the use of modality and evidentiality markers in English and Polish argumentative newspaper discourse. The analysis has shown that the most frequent types of modality in both languages are epistemic and dynamic. Modal verbs are most frequently used to express modality in English, while modal adverbs tend to more frequently convey modal meaning in Polish. Modal adverbs are the primary means of expressing epistemic modality in both languages. There are fewer evidential markers compared to the modality markers in both English and Polish newspapers. The findings also show that modality and evidentiality markers are more frequent in opinion columns in the conservative newspapers in both languages, rather than in those with liberal political views.

Key words: modality, evidentiality, epistemic, deontic, dynamic, newspaper discourse, journalistic discourse, comparative study, English, Polish

Contents

Acknowledgements	2
Abstract.....	3
Introduction.....	5
1. Defining the category of modality	7
1.1. Types of modality	7
1.2. Modal markers in English	9
1.3. Modal markers in Polish	10
2. Defining the category of evidentiality.....	12
2.1. Types of evidentiality and evidential markers in English.....	12
2.2. Evidential markers in Polish.....	15
3. Data and methodology.....	17
4. Realizations of modality and evidentiality in English opinion columns.....	19
4.1. Distribution of modal and evidential markers in <i>The Guardian</i> and <i>The Telegraph</i>	19
4.2. Modal verbs	19
4.3. Modal adverbs	24
4.4. Evidential markers	26
5. Realizations of modality and evidentiality in Polish opinion columns.....	30
5.1. Distribution of modal and evidential markers in <i>Gazeta Wyborcza</i> and <i>Rzeczpospolita</i>	30
5.2. Modal verbs	30
5.3. Modal adverbs	33
5.4. Evidential markers	35
Conclusions.....	37
Data sources	39
References.....	40
Summary.....	42
Appendix 1.....	44
Appendix 2.....	55

Introduction

The notion of modality, according to Facchinetti (2009) is a never-ending issue as modality has been an interest for linguists for many years. The term *modality* might refer to many notions in linguistics. It is known that the function of modality is broad in a sense that it can express possibility and necessity, the speaker's or writer's stance or attitudes, as well as, according to Zhongyi (2015) reflect the ideology, commitment and authority of the speaker, especially in political discourse. Modality is the expression of the speaker's opinion closely related to subjectivity. Traditionally, linguists acknowledge three types of modality: epistemic, deontic and dynamic. Deontic and dynamic modality are more complex, while linguists tend to agree on the definition and role of epistemic modality. Therefore, studies of modality often focus on epistemic modality.

Evidentiality, on the other hand, is a relatively new category within linguistic analysis. It is connected with the category of epistemic stance and epistemic modality as well. Aikhenvald (2004:3) states that evidentiality "is a linguistic category whose primary meaning is source of information [...] To be considered as an evidential, a morpheme has to have 'source of information' as its core meaning; that is, the unmarked, or default interpretation", in other words, evidentiality helps to establish the speaker's or writer's justifications for their judgements.

Realizations of modality and evidentiality have been investigated from various perspectives. For instance, topic of modality has been discussed from the perspective of semantics, pragmatics and many others (Leech 2003, Palmer 1979, 2001). Expressions of modality and evidentiality have also been discussed as markers of stance in previous research (Biber et al 1999, Biber 2006, Marín-Arrese 2011, 2015). Most common markers used to express modality and evidentiality are modal auxiliaries, modal adverbs, verbs of cognitive attitude, *etc.* Expressions of modality and evidentiality have been investigated cross-linguistically: for example comparison of English and Lithuanian modal verbs by Šolienė (2016), realizations of epistemic possibility in English and Lithuanian by Usonienė and Šolienė (2012), as well as studies on evidentiality in English and Polish by Gujarek (2010), research on modals adverbs in English and Polish by Rozumko (2019), epistemic modality markers in English and Polish, investigated by Warchał and Łyda (2009), or even Hansen and Karlik's (2005) study on modality in Slavonic languages. There are quite a few studies concerning this area in political discourse, namely a cognitive-functional study of modality and evidentiality in political discourse by Zhongyi (2015), Marín-Arrese's (2011) study of epistemic stance and subjectivity in political discourse.

The expression of modality and evidentiality may vary depending on the type of discourse, *i.e.* political discourse, journalistic discourse, academic discourse. The field of modality and evidentiality was broadly discussed previously in general as well as in terms of political and journalistic discourses. It was also studied cross-linguistically, however, to my knowledge, there is no comparative research

done on expressions of modality and evidentiality in English and Polish journalistic discourse, namely in the genre of opinion columns.

English is considered to be *lingua franca*, while Polish is a native language to sixty million people around the world, as well as a second or third language to many people. I believe it is important and valuable to study and compare these two languages because it could benefit English and Polish speakers, especially in the field of journalism, which is still the main source of acquiring information about the events around the world.

The question is how markers of modality and evidentiality shape English and Polish argumentative newspaper discourse depending on the political leaning of the paper (conservative vs liberal) and whether there are any differences or similarities in expressing modality and evidentiality in English and Polish newspaper discourse. Therefore, the purpose of the present study is to investigate and reveal possible similarities and differences in the use of modality and evidentiality markers in English and Polish argumentative newspaper discourse.

To reach the aim of this thesis the objectives are as follows:

1. To identify and categorize markers of modality and evidentiality in the compiled English and Polish corpora of argumentative newspaper discourse;
2. To look for similarities and differences in the distribution of modal and evidential markers in the corpora
3. To compare the use of markers of modality and evidentiality in the argumentative newspaper discourse representing conservative and liberal views

This thesis consists of Introduction, Theoretical Part where the notions of modality and evidentiality will be discussed, Methodology, where data and methods for the analysis will be stated, Empirical Part, where the collected data will be analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively, and Conclusions.

1. Defining the category of modality

Modality can be described in different ways. It is most often defined as the expression of the speaker's attitude, subjectivity and opinion. Modality commonly expresses the degree of commitment or obligation of the speaker or writer, as well as reflects the level of authority (see Palmer 2001; Huddleston, Pullum 2002; Simon-Vandenberg, Aijmer 2007; Salkie 2009; Marín-Aresse 2011, 2015). Modal markers express a variety of meanings arranged on a scale from possibility to necessity.

In this section the notion of modality will be discussed more broadly based on the theoretical premises describing types of modality as well as markers of modality

1.1.Types of modality

Modality is a complex category that has received numerous interpretations and considerations in the literature. According to Collins (2009:11), modality is a variety of semantic notions, which includes possibility, necessity, permission, obligation and ability. Huddleston and Pullum (2002:173) explain that necessity and possibility are fundamental concepts of modal meaning, which involves the speaker's position or judgement that the situation is possibly true or that it possibly or necessarily needs realization. Similarly to Huddleston and Pullum (2002), Salkie (2009) reiterates that possibility and necessity are central and more traditional aspects of modality.

Modality is a complex issue as many scholars have not reached a consensus in terms of the types of modality. In some studies, researchers use the distinction between epistemic modality and root modality (cf. Collins 2009:21). Epistemic modality is "concerned with the speaker's attitude towards the factuality of the situation", in other words, the speaker's judgement of whether the proposition is likely to be true (Collins 2009: 21), whereas root modality is "more basic", from which epistemic modality derives, as supported by diachronic evidence (ibid.). However, it is not easy to provide a straightforward definition of root modality (ibid.). The distinction between epistemic modality and root modality can be found in Palmer's (2001) classification of 'Propositional modality' and 'Event Modality'. Epistemic modality and evidentiality "are concerned with the speaker's attitude to the truth-value or factual status of the proposition" and are considered as instances of 'Propositional modality', whereas 'Event modality' includes deontic and dynamic types of modality referring "to events that are not actualized", that is the events that have a potential to happen but have not happened yet" (Palmer 2001: 8). Root modality is what Palmer (2001) calls 'Event modality' (Collins 2009: 22).

Deontic modality is the most common and most important type of root modality (Palmer 2001; Collins 2009). Palmer (2001) indicates the following features of deontic modality: firstly, deontic

modality is “dependent on some kind of authority” (*i.e.* the speaker), for example: *You may leave now*; secondly, the speaker has the ability to guarantee that the action will occur, e.g. *John will do it for you*; and lastly, deontic modality might be interpreted as the circumstance that makes it possible for the action to happen, rather than the ability itself (*ibid.*), e.g. *You shall have it tomorrow*. The second type of modality, which Palmer (2001) includes to ‘Event modality’ is dynamic, which relates to ability and/or willingness. Collins (2009: 23), in agreement with Palmer, mentions that dynamic modality “includes ability, volition and circumstantial meaning”, for example, ‘*John can speak French*’ (ability), ‘*You can get to the island by ferry*’ (circumstantial meaning), ‘*She will iron your clothes*’ (volition). The difference between deontic and dynamic modality is that with dynamic modality a person is able or willing to act, while with deontic modality the person is permitted or ordered to act (*ibid.*).

The type of modality that gained most agreement between linguists is epistemic modality, which is concerned with knowledge, as well as “the speaker’s attitude to the truth value or factual status of the proposition” (Palmer 2001:86; Collins 2009:21).

Discussing different types of modality, it is important to note that modality is a graded notion, which means that “modal expressions can often be located on a scale” (Salkie 2009:87). For instance, epistemic modals can be judged on a scale from low probability to high certainty. Huddleston and Pullum (2002:179) explain that modality can be gradable in terms of strong, medium and weak modality. Necessity, which belongs mainly to deontic modality, refers to strong commitment while possibility refers to a weak one.

The varied nature and complexity of modality lies in its connection with such categories as evaluation, subjectivity and stance. Thompson and Hunston (2000:5) refer to modality as a sub-category of evaluation by stating that the speaker’s or writer’s attitude may relate to certainty or obligation. Salkie (2009) argues that one of the criteria for modal meanings is their relation to subjectivity. According to Salkie (2009), epistemic modality is highly subjective, while deontic modals only sometimes are subjective, and dynamic modals are never subjective.

The connection between different types of modality and stance as well as the dimensions of subjectivity and intersubjectivity is presented in Marín-Arrese’s framework (2011) of epistemic and effective stance. Marín-Arrese (2011) argues that stance refers to the speaker or writer’s position, attitude and knowledge of the event or proposition. Effective stance holds the positioning of the speaker or writer’s with respect to realization of events, where the speaker/writer is determined to influence the course of events, while epistemic stance is the position of the writer or speaker with respect to knowledge of the events in the process of realization, aiming to estimate the likelihood of a proposition (Marín-Arrese 2011: 195).

Effective stance is related to meanings connected with deontic and dynamic types of modality, whereas epistemic stance expresses meanings related to epistemic modality and evidentiality. Effective

stance includes the subcategories of ‘deonticity’, ‘attitudinals’ and ‘directives’, and epistemic stance encompasses the subcategories of ‘epistemic modality’, ‘truth-factual validity’, and ‘evidentials (experiential, cognitive, communicative)’. ‘Deonticity’ refers to deontic modality, which enables circumstances or permits the speaker or writer to engage in the state of affairs (Marín-Arrese 2011:202). The sub-category of ‘attitudinals’ “comprises the use of matrix predicates designating speaker’s inclination and volition (I hope, We want, I’m not willing...), or intention (We resolved, I plan...) regarding the realization of the event”, in addition to “predicative adjectives (We are resolved to,...), relational constructions involving nominals and sentence adverbs” (ibid:204). The last sub-category of effective stance is the category of ‘directives’, which uses the Imperative mood in the expressions (ibid:205).

Epistemic stance is the position of the writer or speaker with respect to knowledge of the events in the process of realization. It includes the notion of ‘epistemic modality’, which encodes different types of certainty and likelihood of the realization of the proposition. Degrees of certainty are usually characterized by high level of certainty (e.g. *must, cannot, certainly*), medium level of certainty or probability (e.g. (*will, should, would, probably*)), and lastly low level of certainty/possibility (e.g. *may, could, perhaps*) (ibid:206). Next subcategory of epistemic stance is the ‘truth factual validity’, which uses personal or impersonal judgements about the likelihood of the event. The last sub-type of epistemic stance is the category of evidentials (experiential, cognitive, communicative). Evidential markers emphasize about the acquisition of the information for the proposition, e.g. direct personal sensory evidence, mental sensory (i.e. *I believe, I think, I know*), as well as self-reference (ibid.206-209).

As shown above, modality is a complex category encompassing various notions and categorized differently in the literature (see epistemic modality vs root modality; ‘Propositional modality’ vs ‘Event modality’; epistemic modality, deontic modality and dynamic modality). This paper will focus on a tripartite scheme of modality: epistemic, deontic, and dynamic. Evidentiality, despite being closely linked to epistemic modality, will be discussed more broadly in the next section.

1.2.Modal markers in English

The most common means of expressing deontic, dynamic and epistemic modality are modal auxiliaries. Most commonly used modal auxiliaries to express deontic modality are the verbs *may* and *might*, which function as ‘directives’, with the help of which a person tries to make another person do something (Palmer 2001: 71). Another modal auxiliary related to deontic modality is the verb *shall*, expressing a promise or a threat (ibid:72). Some deontic modals are used to “weaken the force of modality”, for example the modal verb *ought to* or *should*, which express deontic necessity or obligation, weakens the modal verb *must*, while *might* weakens the verb *may*, and *could* weakens *can* (ibid: 72).

Modal verbs that express ability and willingness in the domain of dynamic modality are *can* and *will* (*ibid*: 76). Epistemic modals can express certainty, probability, possibility, and likelihood. Modal auxiliaries *may* and *must* convey a possible or a reasonable conclusion, for example ‘*John may be in his office*’; ‘*John must be in his office*’ (Palmer, 2001:25), indicating the speaker’s confidence and certainty based on knowledge. *May* and *might* can also express possibility for the event, as well as speculation and deduction (*ibid*:71). Epistemic *will*, according to Collins (2009) express predictability and prediction, and the speaker’s confidence in the truthfulness of the proposition.

Despite the fact that modality can be expressed by modal auxiliaries in all three types of modality, only in the epistemic type it can also be expressed by modal adverbs or adverbials. Biber *et al.* (1999) name six major areas of meaning of epistemic stance adverbials: doubt and certainty (*i.e. no doubt, certainly, undoubtedly, probably, perhaps, maybe, arguably, decidedly, definitely, most likely, of course, I guess, I think*); actuality and reality (*i.e. in fact*), source of knowledge (*i.e. apparently, according to, as Wardel (1986) notes, etc.*); limitation (*i.e. in most cases, mainly, typically*); viewpoint or perspective (*i.e. in our view, from our perspective*); imprecision (*i.e. like, sort of, if you can call it that, about, kind of, roughly, so to speak*). Markers of imprecision can also be considered as hedges. Modal adverbs as well as verbs of cognitive attitude can be used as markers of epistemic modality. Nevertheless, as epistemic modality and evidentiality are two interrelated concepts, verbs of cognition will be discussed in the following section concerning evidentiality.

1.3.Modal markers in Polish

Polish grammatical system also expresses modality by using modal verbs, although, according to Warchał and Łyda (2009) modal verbs in Polish are not so well defined as a system as they are in English. There are fewer modal verbs in Polish than in English. There is only one verb that signals possibility (*móc*) and three verbs that indicate different types of necessity. For example, *musieć* expresses a strong level of necessity, similarly to English *must*, or *have to*. Verbs like *powinien* and *mieć*, similarly to English *shall*, *should*, *ought to*, denote a weaker level of obligation (*ibid*:224). Polish also has a few impersonal modals of possibility and necessity such as *można*, *trzeba*, *należy* and *wypada*, all of which are the equivalents of English *can*, *could*, *must*, *should*, *etc.* Modal verbs *wolno*, *niepodobno* and *niepotrzebować* are not fully considered as modal auxiliaries, although *wolno* is restricted to deontic modality, while *niepodobno* and *niepotrzebować* – dynamic modality (*ibid.*). The Polish verb *móc* may express the meaning of deontic *can* or epistemic *may*. The verb *musieć* may function as a deontic or epistemic modal verb, similar to the meaning of the English equivalent *must* (*ibid.*) Hansen and Karlin (2005) claim that “some modals have developed functions

beyond modality” which happened to the Polish verb *mieć* ‘should’, which “has adopted the evidential meaning ‘hear-say’” (p. 221). Warchał and Łyda (2009) provide also the list of modal adverbs, particles, “adjectival and participial constructions, predicatives, modal lexical verbs, nouns imparting various degrees of likelihood, and morphological/grammatical markers, such as a future tense and conditional forms”.

Modal adverbs in Polish are classified in a similar way as modal adverbs in English. Rozumko (2019:19) explains that modal adverbs are grouped according to the degree of certainty, their evidential (reportive and inferential) meaning as well as meanings of confirmation and expectation. Rozumko (2019) provides the following list of the modal adverbs:

- a) High confidence markers: *niechybnie, niewątpliwie, na pewno*;
- b) High confidence markers expressing expectations: *faktycznie, istotnie*;
- c) High confidence markers expressing confirmation: *faktycznie, oczywiście*;
- d) High confidence markers expressing expectations: *oczywiście, naturalnie*;
- e) Markers of a medium degree of certainty: *chyba, pewnie, zapewne*;
- f) Markers of conviction: *naturalnie, oczywiście*;
- g) Low confidence markers: *przypuszczalnie, chyba, może, być może*;
- h) Confirmatory markers: *rzeczywiście, istotnie*;
- i) Reportative markers: *podobno, rzemoko*;
- j) Inferential markers: *widocznie, najwyraźniej*
- k) Non-eliminating marks: *chyba, być może*
- l) Markers of hypothesis: *podobno, jakoby*;

According to Rozumko’s (2019) study, most of the modal adverbs express epistemic or evidential meaning (p.120). In both languages modal adverbs express the speaker’s degree of certainty or likelihood of the proposition, reported information, inference and expectations (*ibid.*).

2. Defining the category of evidentiality

The categories of modality and evidentiality are interrelated (see Palmer 2001), though some linguists, like Aikhenvald (2004), consider evidentiality to be a separate category from modality. Evidentiality has been an interest to linguists in the fields of semantics, discourse studies; it is defined as “a source of information” (Aikhenvald 2004), which indicates how the speaker or writer has gained knowledge for the proposition. As was previously mentioned, Palmer (2001:7) explains that epistemic and evidential systems both belong to the category of ‘Propositional modality’. The difference between the two systems is that epistemic modality expresses the speaker/writer judgement of a proposition, while evidential modality indicates the evidence the speaker/writer has to claim their judgement. The reason to believe that epistemic modality and evidentiality are both connected is that deduction appears in both systems. As an example, Palmer (2001) comments on the verb *must*, which conveys the speaker’s confidence about his/her statements because he or she has the background knowledge and evidence to make the claim. Although Palmer (2001:35) ascribed evidentiality to one of modality types, he provides the two categories that are purely evidential: Reported and Sensory. Reported and sensory evidentials are the most common means of presenting evidence for the statements, as the speaker/writer could have heard the information from other sources or he or she could have witnessed the act themselves. Evidentiality types will be discussed in greater detail in the next section.

Not all linguists agree that evidentiality and epistemic modality belong to the same category. Cornillie (2009) for instance, similarly to Aikhenvald (2004), believes that epistemic modality and evidentiality do have a close relationship but are hardly the same. He defines evidentiality as a “functional category that refers to the perceptual and/or epistemological basis for making a speech act” (Cornillie 2009: 45). Overall, Cornillie (2009:47) reasons that evidentiality refers to the process that leads to a proposition, while epistemic modality refers to evaluation of the likelihood of the proposition. Though Cornillie (2009) acknowledges Aikhenvald’s view that evidentiality is a separate category, he still challenges her argument that evidentiality is a purely grammatical category (i.e. expressed by grammatical means). Evidentiality is a universal category and can be expressed by a variety of grammatical and lexical devices, depending on a language.

With regard to previous research done, it is essential to have in mind that epistemic modality and evidentiality are interrelated. The two categories may not be identical, but the similarity is undeniable. Evidentiality has several types and, like epistemic modality, can be expressed by modal verbs, verbs of cognition, adverbials, verbs of perception as well as adjectives.

2.1.Types of evidentiality and evidential markers in English

Evidentiality generally represents two types, namely direct and indirect evidentiality or direct and indirect evidence. Direct evidence indicates that the action was witnessed by the speaker (*i.e. We have seen; We have witnessed, etc.*). Indirect evidence, on the other hand, implies that the action was not witnessed personally by the speaker, but that the knowledge was gained from other sources (*i.e. It is clear/obvious; it appears/seems, etc.*) (Cornillie 2009:45). Gujarek (2010: 34) adds that direct evidentiality concerns sensory perception, such as the ability to see, hear or be aware of something and mainly relates to visual evidence. There is no doubt that visual evidentiality includes the events that have been personally witnessed by the speaker or writer. In contrast, non-visual evidentiality covers other senses, like hearing, smell, feeling or even taste (*ibid:38*). Auditory evidentiality is a rare phenomenon across languages, therefore the meaning of this kind of sensory evidential can usually be inferred from context. Generally direct evidentiality illustrates the speaker's personal experience (*ibid:40-41*). In the English language, perception verbs are usually used to present sensory evidence (sight, hearing, touch, *etc.*) and indicate that the speaker has had a direct visual or auditory conception of the situation (*ibid.:55*)

Indirect evidentiality, on the contrary, includes the inferred and reported evidentiality, usually when the speaker did not witness the event personally, but learned the information about the action from another source after the event happened. Inferred evidentiality indicates that on the basis of logic or perceptual evidence the speaker concludes that the event happened, while with reported evidentiality it is known that the speaker gained the information about a certain situation from someone else (Gujarek, 2010:41). Inferred evidentiality is expressed by phrases such as *I have come to the conclusion, that means, seem, evidently, etc.*; reported evidentiality is expressed by hearsay markers such as *it is said, according to*, as well as the verbs *think, believe, etc.* that may report mental states of third parties. Inferred evidentiality can be deductive or assumptive. With deductive inference, the speaker has a visual or sensory evidence of the event, although the events have not been witnessed personally. As an opposition to deduction, assumptive evidentiality is based on reasoning, as the speaker or writer makes an assumption on the basis of his or her general knowledge (*ibid:44-45*) (see also Palmer 2001, Aikhenvald 2004). Reported evidentials, on the other hand, mostly have no author, because the speaker might have gained knowledge of the event from someone who was not even a direct witness. Gujarek (2010:51) highlights the difference between reported (or hearsay) and quotative evidentials, claiming that quotative evidentials “specifically indicate the author of the original statement”.

Marín-Aresse (2011) divides evidentials into Experiential, Cognitive and Communicative. The category of experiential evidentials includes markers that indicate the emphasis of “‘the perceptual aspect’ of the acquisition of the information indicating that the speaker has direct personal sensory access to the evidence, or that the evidence is perceptually available to her/himself and others, including the addressee/reader”, for example: *We have seen, We have witnessed, We have experienced* (Marín-Aresse, 2011:207). The Cognitive type of evidentials concerns the mentality of the speaker, as it involves the

predicates of mental state, such as *I believe, I think, We know*, which are also called verbs of cognition. Cognitive evidentials also involve non-verbal markers, such as *doubtless, without doubt*, as well as “rational and existential constructions involving nominals, for example: *My guess was, There was no doubt in my mind, My belief*, and so on (*ibid*:208). The third type of evidentials mentioned by Marín-Aresse are the communicative evidentials. It includes the aspect of self-reference (*i.e. I said*) where the speaker or writer communicates the knowledge of the event, also the proposition is validated by the means of engaging in a proposition as a public speaker (*ibid*:209).

Languages such as English and Polish have no grammaticalized markers of evidentiality, for that reason evidentiality is expressed by modal verbs, adverbs (*e.g. clearly, evidently, obviously, presumably, etc.*), adjectives (*e.g. clear, evident, obvious, etc.*) (Gujarek, 2010:29). Modal verbs were broadly discussed in the previous section on modality, therefore they will not be discussed any further. More attention will be given to verbs of cognition, as they are known to serve as both epistemic modality and evidentiality markers.

Verbs of cognitive attitude are known to be linked to epistemic modality and evidentiality. The most common verbs of cognition are *know, believe, and think*. Let us start by looking into the verb *know*. Cappelli (2007:156) considers the reason for using *know* in asserting the speaker’s certainty in a proposition. Her reasoning is that the speaker wishes to emphasize that he/she has the reasons to support truthfulness of the proposition. In that case, the hearer does not have any reasons to doubt the speaker, as the speaker has reliable evidence to support the statement. *I know* “in a qualificational sense can be considered a true marker of evidentiality” (*ibid*:157). This verb of cognition is considered to belong to epistemic and evidential domains as it “consistently lexicalizes the subject’s commitment to the truth of the proposition”, basically *know* is evidential because of its reliability despite being specified or not, and it is epistemic because it expresses highest possible degree of likelihood and certainty (*ibid*:166).

The second most commonly used verb of cognitive attitude is the verb *believe*, which is generally used to express a commitment to personal opinions in relation to the proposition (Cappelli, 2007:167). The difference between the previously discussed verb of cognition is that with using *believe*, the speaker expresses his/her opinion but is not certain and cannot guarantee the truth. *Believe* can serve both as an evidential marker because of the affective evidence, and as an epistemic marker for having a positive degree of likelihood and lower level of certainty.

The third most frequent verb of cognition discussed by Cappelli (2007) is *think*, which possesses the evaluative sense. *Think* is also a part of the epistemic domain, as it expresses a positive degree of likelihood and commitment to the statement, but at the same time leaves the possibility for the speaker of being wrong. According to Cappelli (2007:185) *think* is purely epistemic and can be interpreted as the speaker stating his/her personal opinion or simply ‘maybe’. Even though Cappelli (2007) claims that *think* is a purely epistemic verb, she also acknowledges that the speaker’s stance is based on some kind

of evidence. All in all, all of the main verbs of cognitive attitude express both evidentiality and epistemic modality.

2.2. Evidential markers in Polish

Similarly to English, Polish does not have any grammaticalized evidentiality markers. According to Gujarek (2010), evidentiality in Polish is marked by lexical items such as perception verbs, lexical verbs, parentheticals, particles, and adverbs. Different types of perception verbs can indicate different types of evidentiality. Polish perception verbs, similarly English verbs of perception, indicate different types of sensory evidence. This type of verbs can indicate both direct and indirect evidentiality (Gurajek 2010:75). Gujarek (2010) differentiates perception verbs between those that constitute dynamic and stative senses, claiming that dynamic perception verbs do not have any evidential meaning, while stative perception verbs “can be interpreted depending on the subject role (subject-perceiver versus subject-percept verbs) or types of complements” (ibid.76). In Polish, the subject functions as a perceiver in a proposition where someone has recognized an object with the help of one of the senses:

(1) *Widziałam psa z trzeba nogami.*

I saw a dog with three legs.

This is an example of direct sensory evidentiality (ibid:78). Different lexemes are used for different meanings, as in visual *widzieć* (see), auditory *słyszeć* (hear), and *czuć* (feel). There are also verbs that indicate the ability to see (*widzieć*), hear (*słyszeć*) and feel (*czuć*) and they are called predicative or defective verbs because of the unusual morphosyntactic behavior of occurring only in their base form (ibid.80):

(2) *Dzisiaj wyraźnie widzieć góry.*

You/One can see the mountains clearly today.

In Polish the interpretation of evidential meaning depends on the perception verb used in a sentence. Gurajek (2010:81) excludes dynamic verbs as they do not possess any evidential meaning. Direct evidentiality is expressed by stative perception verbs (‘subject-perceiver), as in (3), and deductive evidentiality is expressed by subject-percept verbs, as in (4). Predicative verbs can be quite ambiguous in their context; therefore, they can indicate both direct or inferred evidentiality, as in (4) and (5) (ibid.):

(3) *Widziałam psa z trzeba nogami.*

‘I **saw** a dog with three legs.’

(4) *Ania ładnie **wygląda** w tej sukience.*

‘Ania **looks** pretty in this dress.’

(5) ***Słyszeć** głośną muzykę.*

You/one can **hear** loud music.’

Perception verbs are not the only means of expressing evidentiality. There are several other lexical items that possess evidential meaning, *i.e.* lexical verbs or adverbs *e.g.* *widocznie* (*apparently*), *wyraźnie* (*evidently*), *pewnie* (*probably*), *może* (*maybe*), *podobno* (*reportedly*), *rzekomo* (*allegedly*) *etc.* In this research *pewnie* and *może* are considered to express epistemic modality, rather than evidentiality. Gujarek (2010:96) also explains that deductive evidentiality concerns the speaker’s inference based on sensory evidence:

(6) *Trawa jest mokra, **widocznie** w nocy padało.*

*The grass is wet, **apparently** it rained at the night*

With the help of the adverb *widocznie* (‘apparently’) the speaker infers that it was raining at night based on the evidence that the grass is wet (*ibid.*). It can be either visual sensory if the speaker saw the rain drops on the grass, or by the sense of touch if he or she stepped on the wet grass.

English and Polish evidentiality markers are similar to the extent that in both languages evidentiality is expressed by perception verbs, modal verbs, adverbs, and verbs of cognition.

3. Data and methodology

The research in this thesis is based on opinion columns collected from both English and Polish newspapers with conservative and liberal views. Modality and evidentiality concern the speaker's or writer's stance towards the truthfulness of the proposition, therefore, opinion columns serve as a great means to examine how modality and evidentiality markers contribute to express these notions. Two English newspapers *The Guardian*, having liberal political views, and *The Telegraph*, with conservative political views, as well as two Polish newspapers *Gazeta Wyborcza*, expressing liberal beliefs, and *Rzeczpospolita*, with conservative political views, were selected for this study. The self-compiled corpus contains around 100,000 words from each language (see Table 1).

Argumentative newspaper	Number of opinion columns	Number of words
<i>The Guardian</i>	52	50,431
<i>The Telegraph</i>	56	50,301
<i>Gazeta Wyborcza</i>	64	49,762
<i>Rzeczpospolita</i>	101	50,031

Table 1. Number of words and opinion columns in English and Polish opinion columns.

The opinion columns were collected from November 2021 until early 2022. English opinion columns were collected at the end of 2021, while Polish opinion columns were collected at the beginning of 2022 as there were some complications with obtaining the material. The topic of the opinion columns was not significant, although most of the opinion columns conveys the topics of politics, economics, gender and environmental issues. The purpose was to collect opinion columns with the equal number of male and female authors. However, it turned out to be problematic, as many of the opinion columns from the selected period of time were written by male authors. In *The Guardian* 28 opinion columns were written by male authors, 17 by female, and in 8 opinion columns the author was unknown. In *The Telegraph* 36 opinion columns were written by men, and 20 by women. *Gazeta Wyborcza* contained 41 opinion columns with male authors, and 25 with female authors, while *Rzeczpospolita* 85 opinion columns were written by men, 13 by women, and in one the author was unknown. The reason for a higher number of opinion columns in Polish is that the columns are much shorter than they are in English.

The collected data was analysed by carefully reading through every sentence and selecting appropriate markers of modality and evidentiality in both languages. The markers that were chosen consist of modal verbs, adverbs, some lexical verbs, as well as verbs of cognitive attitude. Modality markers were chosen and analysed based on Collins (2009), primarily modal verbs and semi-modal verbs. Semi-modals were excluded from the study, as this research would be too extensive, only modal verbs were analysed as markers of modality. Modal adverbs were chosen and analysed based on Biber et al's (1999) classification of stance adverbials, while evidentiality markers were selected and analysed

based on Marín-Aresse's (2011) classification of 'Experiential', 'Cognitive' and 'Communicative' evidentiality. These notions were discussed in the previous section.

Qualitative and quantitative methods were applied in this research to examine how modality and evidentiality markers are used in both languages, what types of modality and evidentiality markers are preferred in argumentative journalistic discourse, and what meaning and functions they possess. The quantitative findings include the counts of the normalized frequencies of modal and evidential markers per 10,000 words. The aim was to compare the distribution and use of these markers in papers representing different political orientation (conservative vs liberal).

4. Realizations of modality and evidentiality in English opinion columns

In this section markers of modality and evidentiality will be discussed. Primarily modal verbs, modal adverbs as well as evidential markers will be explored in the English conservative newspaper *The Telegraph* and *The Guardian* representing liberal political views.

4.1. Distribution of modal and evidential markers in *The Guardian* and *The Telegraph*

Modal verbs, compared to modal adverbs, are more frequently used to express modal meaning in the opinion columns in both *The Guardian* and *The Telegraph* (see Table 2). Evidentiality markers, on the other hand, are less frequently used in both newspapers. However, it should be noted that the number of modality and evidentiality markers is slightly higher in *The Telegraph* than in *The Guardian*, which suggests that *The Telegraph*, a newspaper with conservative political views, contributes to authorial opinion and stance to a greater extent than *The Guardian*, a newspaper with liberal political orientation. The stark difference lies in the higher frequencies of the markers of evidentiality. The opinion columns in *The Telegraph* contain twice as many evidential markers as the opinion columns in *The Guardian*. The conservative newspaper seems to provide more source of evidence to the statements made in the opinion columns, which positions them as being slightly more reliable and truthful.

	<i>The Guardian</i>		<i>The Telegraph</i>	
	Raw numbers	FR/10,000 words	Raw numbers	FR/10,000 words
Modal verbs	612	121.3	682	135.5
Modal adverbs	106	21.01	142	28.2
Evidentiality markers	85	16.9	132	26.2

Table 2. The frequencies of modality and evidentiality markers in the opinion columns in *The Guardian*

There is no denying that modal verbs are the most frequent means to express modal meaning, as modal auxiliaries have been imbedded into modal system of a language; see *i.e.* Palmer, 2001; Collins, 2009; Zhongyi, 2015; *etc.*

4.2. Modal verbs

As shown above, modal verbs are the most frequent means of expressing modal meaning in both *The Guardian* and *The Telegraph*. Out of the three types of modal meaning (epistemic, deontic, dynamic) that the modal verbs convey, the most frequent is epistemic meaning (see Table 3, Table 4). Opinion columns in general tend to express the writer's opinion on the matters discussed in the texts and epistemic modality, referring to the writer's stance, encoding different types of certainty and likelihood of the events, is the primary means to express the writer's position towards the knowledge of the events

he or she is writing about. Modal verbs expressing epistemic meaning are most frequent in *The Guardian* than in *The Telegraph*, which shows that the columnists in *The Guardian* are more committed to the claims and assessments that they make than the columnists in *The Telegraph*.

Modal verbs	Epistemic		Deontic		Dynamic	
	N	Percentage %	N	Percentage %	N	Percentage %
<i>Must</i>	13	2.1%	37	6%	2	0.3%
<i>Should</i>	8	1.3%	39	6.4%	0	0%
<i>May</i>	37	6%	0	0%	10	1.6%
<i>Can</i>	39	6.4%	4	0.7%	77	12.6%
<i>Might</i>	27	4.4%	1	0.2%	14	2.3%
<i>Could</i>	37	6%	3	0.5%	27	4.4%
<i>Will</i>	119	19.4%	0	0%	4	0.7%
<i>Shall</i>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<i>Would</i>	94	15.4%	0	0%	20	3.3%
Total	374	61.1%	84	13.7%	154	25.2%

Table 3. Distribution of the modal auxiliary verbs used in the opinion columns in *The Guardian*

Modal verbs	Epistemic		Deontic		Dynamic	
	N	Percentage %	N	Percentage %	N	Percentage %
<i>Must</i>	10	1.4%	29	4.3%	0	0%
<i>Should</i>	8	1.17%	69	10.2%	0	0%
<i>May</i>	28	4.1%	0	0%	9	1.3%
<i>Can</i>	24	3.5%	4	0.6.7%	97	14.2%
<i>Might</i>	30	4.4%	5	0.7%	16	2.3%
<i>Could</i>	16	2.3%	0	0%	55	8%
<i>Will</i>	110	16.1%	1	0.14%	9	1.3.7%
<i>Shall</i>	0	0%	1	0.14%	0	0%
<i>Would</i>	130	19%	0	0%	35	5.1%
Total	256	51.2%	105	15.4%	221	31.4%

Table 4. Distribution of the modal auxiliary verbs used in the opinion columns in *The Telegraph*

The second most frequent type of modal meaning expressed by the modal verbs in the opinion columns of *The Guardian* and *The Telegraph* is dynamic. Dynamic modality refers to the person's ability or willingness to act, which is greatly the topic of opinion columns in newspapers of certain political views. 154 out of 612 modal auxiliaries in the opinion columns in *The Guardian*, and 221 out of 682 in *The Telegraph* were used as a means of expressing dynamic ability, willingness, or volition. Quasi modal auxiliaries were not used in this study. Dynamic meaning is more prominent in *The Telegraph* than in *The Guardian*. The least frequent type of modal meaning is deontic. With deontic modality a person is permitted or ordered to act, which can be less relevant in the opinion columns. In *The Telegraph* deontic meaning is more prominent than in *The Guardian*.

Epistemic modals express certainty, probability and possibility, as well as likelihood. Epistemic *must*, for instance, conveys the speaker's confidence, also expresses logical certainty based on what is already known. *Should* used epistemically expresses a tentative assumption or assessment of the likelihood, as well as deduction from known facts. *May* and *might* express mainly a possibility for the proposition to be true. Epistemic *will* is used for predictability and prediction, conveying the speaker's

confidence that the proposition is true based on evidence and knowledge. Similarly to *will*, the modal auxiliary *would* expresses epistemic hypothetical possibility. In this research, epistemic modals most frequently express possibility, hypothesis or prediction.

In both *The Guardian* and *The Telegraph* the most frequent modal auxiliaries to express epistemic meaning are *will* and *would*, *can*, *may*, and *might*. Epistemic *will* and *would* are mostly concerned with predictability and prediction, which according to Collins (2009:127), portrays the speaker's confidence of the truthfulness of the proposition based on knowledge and evidence, which scales from high degree of certainty, as in (1) – (5):

- (1) *A teenage boy who is concerned about his behaviour **will** find few resources if he seeks help. [The Guardian]*
- (2) *Femicide and abuse **won't** end until misogyny is recognised for what it is and eliminated. [The Guardian]*
- (3) *Nothing less than a return to the sort of difference between the living standards of the rich and the poor which has not been seen for generations: an immediate future where only the well-off are likely to be able to heat their homes to the comfortable levels now taken for granted, and only the wealthy **will** be able to afford fresh meat. [The Telegraph]*
- (4) *And it **will** inevitably be deployed militarily and for the purposes of assassinations by drones. [The Telegraph]*

Epistemic *would* in most cases expressed the hypothesis, with features like “diffidence, tact, politeness and unassuredness” (Collins, 2009:143). In (5) and (6) *would* signals epistemic prediction or hypothesis in the events that would happen if some other factors were considered first.

- (5) *Zoe Billingham, former lead inspector on the police's response to domestic abuse at Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services, says that if this was organised crime, police **would** be using all the covert tactics at their disposal to arrest offenders. [The Guardian]*
- (6) *Under these scenarios, Paterson **would** probably have re-won his safe Conservative seat after some public humiliation, while Webbe, who has had the Labour whip withdrawn, **would** probably have lost. [The Telegraph]*
- (7) *Surely it **would** make more sense to elect farm animals, ideally sheep, which at the time of each Commons vote could be herded through the required lobby with minimal fuss. [The Telegraph]*
- (8) *Two steps **would** make a difference. [The Guardian]*

Example (6) shows that the modal *would* is softened even more by the adverb *probably*, indicating low level of certainty, which makes it seem like the speaker is not really sure whether this hypothesis would be true. Examples (7) and (8) express the hypothetical meaning, with low degree of certainty.

Epistemic *might* usually expresses a low degree of possibility as the speaker is not entirely sure whether the proposition is true, as in (10). Sometimes epistemic *might* not only expresses the speaker's lack of confidence in the possibility for action, but also is used as a polite suggestion as in (9):

(9) *So she **might** as well set the politics aside (...)* [The Guardian]

(10) *I suppose some terrorists **might** fire a rocket at the cabinet.* [The Guardian]

In (11) and (12) epistemic possibility is expressed by the modal verb *could*:

(11) *This **could** have been a very small footnote in the life of this parliament.* [The Guardian]

(12) *Passage of both bills will not only thrill Democratic voters but **could** spur further economic growth.* [The Guardian]

Although *should* and *must* most frequently convey deontic meaning, expressing necessity and obligation, in some cases they are used epistemically, as in (13) indicating assumption that Labour should feel happy with the upcoming events, and deduction in (14), (16) and (16):

(13) *With two byelections coming in Conservative seats, Labour **should** be happy.* [The Guardian]

(14) ***Shouldn't** that be enough to arouse some journalistic suspicion?* [The Telegraph]

(15) *He **must** be a happy man because he and his fellow modellers could hardly have been more wrong this year.* [The Telegraph]

(16) *He **must** have forgotten that he was invited to appeal against the commissioner's findings both in writing and in person, and did so* [The Guardian]

As already noted, the second most frequent type of modal meaning expressed by the verbs was dynamic. Collins (2009:22) suggests that possibility and necessity can also arise from volitional or circumstantial meaning that indicate a person's ability or willingness for action. The most common modal verbs that express dynamic meaning are mainly *can* and *could*. Modals such as *may*, *might*, *will* and *would* were less frequently used with dynamic meaning in both newspapers, for example:

(17) *Although economic policymakers expect this period to pass relatively quickly, there is little the White House **can** do to address the fastest price increases in a generation.* [The Guardian]

(18) *Yet, while the Conservatives **can** win by focusing on one side of this divide, Labour **cannot**.* [The Guardian]

In (17) and (18) the writer brings to attention the potentiality for action based on the capacities of subject he/she is referring to, like the White House ability to address a problem or the Conservatives ability to win. Example (19) presents the most basic case of dynamic ability, while in (20) it is up to the *external*

regulator whether to sack the MPs or not, so it is the case of the regulator's willingness for the action. In (21) *could* expresses the ability of voters to force a by-election.

(19) *Once a committee has itemised in detail what they **can** and **can't** do, the imperative is to comply with its rules rather than to fret about whether their behaviour is, in a broader sense, edifying. [The Telegraph]*

(20) *What is the alternative? Surely it's to establish a mighty external regulator that **can** sack MPs without so much as a by-your-leave, and to widen that regulator's remit so that, as well as malpractice, it **can** kick them out for being lazy, tiresome, rude or wrong. [The Telegraph]*

(21) *We proposed, as part of a package of decentralising measures, a recall mechanism, whereby local voters **could** force a by-election [The Telegraph]*

The modal auxiliaries *will* and *would* despite being mostly epistemic, can also express dynamic modality, e.g.:

(22) *He failed to appreciate why others **would** attach importance to standards in public life because he cares so little about them himself. [The Guardian]*

(23) *And Germany won't be preaching austerity anymore, and even if it does no one **will** be listening, and that will set the path for bigger government and more spending. [The Telegraph]*

In (22) the author refers to people who *attach importance to standards in public life* as it is the subject's will to do so, thus, in this case the use of dynamic *would* expresses volition, (23) on the other hand, presents a case of whether anyone would be willing to listen. In (24) the modal auxiliary expresses circumstantially derived need, as ducks have to live in water, it is their primary home:

(24) *Ducks **must** live in water but those breeding in our suburbs are in terrible danger as they travel to it. [The Guardian]*

The least frequent type of modality attested in the opinion columns of *The Guardian* and *The Telegraph* is deontic modality, which expresses the speaker's position to the realization of the events. In the self-compiled corpus, the most frequent modal verbs expressing deontic meaning are *should* and *must*, which indicate permission or obligation, as in the examples below:

(25) *The UK has a more lax approach to lobbying than many other parliamentary democracies; there is no question that tougher rules **should** be introduced, including a comprehensive register of all political lobbying and an agency to regulate the revolving door between ministerial and government office and lucrative private sector contracts. Parliamentarians **should** consider*

introducing a cap on their additional earnings and an advance approval system for any additional income they earn. [The Guardian]

(26) *New UK crime bill **must** make domestic abuse a top priority and include provision for preventing perpetrators (deontic necessity and obligation) [The Guardian]*

(27) *Occasional problems may arise when the doom imperatives contradict one another: at just the point when climate campaigners are demanding that we live in super-insulated, draft-proof homes, the NHS is telling us that we **must** open windows to disperse Covid particles. [The Telegraph]*

(28) *Some say CRT **should** be taught in schools. Others say that it is not being taught but that it **should** be. [The Telegraph]*

In (25) we can clearly see that the modal auxiliary *should* expresses deontic necessity and obligation. The writer considers appropriate and right that new rules should be introduced and the Parliamentarians have an obligation to consider a cap for their earning. (26) is also a case of deontic obligation, as the speaker states that it is necessary that domestic abuse has to be made a priority; *must* in (27) indicates that it is necessary to ventilate rooms during Covid; and *should* in (28) states clearly that people want CRT to be taught at schools.

There are very few cases when deontic modality is expressed by other modal verbs than *should* and *must*. In (29) the modal verb *can* serves to strengthen the necessity that leaders must not be passive in the current situation:

(29) *Years of delays mean that the timetable is incredibly tight. Leaders **cannot** afford to be passive. [The Guardian]*

4.3.Modal adverbs

Modal verbs are not the only means to express modality. Modal adverbs similarly express modal meaning, precisely epistemic, as all modal adverbs found in the opinion columns conveyed epistemic modality (see Table 5). A number of modal adverbs explored in this study is considered in Biber et al.'s (1999) classification of stance markers within the subcategory of epistemic stance adverbials expressing certainty and doubt (*i.e. no doubt, certainly, perhaps, etc.*), actuality and reality (*i.e. in fact*), source of knowledge (*i.e. apparently, according to*), viewpoint or perspective (*i.e. in our view, from our perspective*), and imprecision (*i.e. like, kind of, so to speak, roughly, sort of, etc.*). In the present analysis, adverbials expressing source of knowledge, as well as viewpoint or perspective, will be considered within the category of evidential markers. The functional categories of certainty and doubt as well as actuality and reality are applied to the modal adverbs consideration following Biber et al.'s (1999) classification

Modal adverbs	<i>The Guardian</i>		<i>The Telegraph</i>	
	Instances in the text	Percentage %	Instances in the text	Percentage %
Certainty	56	52.8%	81	57%
Doubt	14	13.2%	34	23.9%
Actuality and reality	5	4.7%	12	8.5%
Other	31	29.3%	15	10.6%
Total	106	100%	142	100%

Table 5. Distribution of the modal adverbs used in the opinion columns in *The Guardian* and *The Telegraph*

The distribution of the modal adverbs in the two papers is rather similar, though *The Telegraph* displays slightly more instances of these markers. Most frequently epistemic adverbials found in the opinion columns of *The Guardian* and *The Telegraph* express epistemic certainty, for example:

- (30) *So why have Conservative MPs and their government stood behind Paterson? One reason is **undoubtedly** sympathy.* [*The Guardian*]
- (31) *And yet in the Westminster world of double-dealing, this man apparently believes he is still fit for public office – emboldened, **no doubt**, by the fact that his party let him get away with it for so many years.* [*The Telegraph*]
- (32) *Narcissists are also, perhaps unsurprisingly, **more likely** to engage in online bullying; for those purporting to be in it for moral causes the ends justify the means.* [*The Guardian*]
- (33) *Such arguments are not, **of course**, part of everyday, mainstream discussion.* [*The Guardian*]

The epistemic stance markers like *no doubt*, *undoubtedly*, *more likely*, *of course* in the examples above express a high degree of certainty. In (30) and (31) *undoubtedly* and *no doubt* function as stance adverbs expressing a high level of certainty that there is no reason to doubt that the statement is true. Examples (32) and (33) also express a high level of certainty. *More likely* is used to speculate the outcome of the negotiations indicating that the writer is highly certain with this statement; *of course* expresses certainty that it is common knowledge that such arguments are not a part of everyday life.

Epistemic adverbials are also used to express doubt, *i.e.* low or medium degree of certainty as in (34) – (36) below. In (34) and (35) doubt is expressed by *perhaps*, indicating a low level of certainty of the writer as he/she is not certain about the Prime Minister's intention, or whether there was a discussion on a particular topic. *Probably* in (37) is used as a means of speculating about Trump playing a more prominent role, in which the author is not certain; *unlikely* in (36) indicates that the speaker is not certain and does not believe in the truth of the proposition.

- (34) *Perhaps this was the Prime Minister’s true intention when he was being apologetic about the UK being the origin of the Industrial Revolution this week, as part of his argument for us going further and faster in our efforts to tackle climate change than other countries. [The Telegraph]*
- (35) *Perhaps there was some such discussion and I missed it, given that I gave up and switched off - but somehow that seems unlikely given the tumultuous unanimity of the coverage I did see. [The Telegraph]*
- (36) *As well as being mindlessly obedient, sheep are capable of making all the appropriate noises during Prime Minister’s Questions, and are **unlikely** to seek additional earnings outside Parliament.*
- (37) *All this may change in 2022, when Trump will **probably** play a more prominent role and Democratic candidates can use him as a foil to attack Republicans. [The Guardian]*

The least frequent type of epistemic adverb is the subcategory of actuality and reality. *In fact* in (38) comments on the status of proposition, stating as a fact that the point of the project was to present a set of policies:

- (38) *It was quite clear that this was, **in fact**, the whole point of this organised project that was being called “news”: to present a very contentious set of policies which elected governments should have been required to justify, in a way that could not be challenged. [The Telegraph]*

4.4.Evidential markers

Following Marín-Aresse’s (2011) classification, evidentiality markers were divided into ‘Experiential’, ‘Cognitive’, and ‘Communicative’ (see Table 6)

Evidential markers	<i>The Guardian</i>		<i>The Telegraph</i>	
	Instances in the text	Percentage %	Instances in the text	Percentage %
Experiential	39	45.9%	75	56.8%
Cognitive	17	20%	26	19.7%
Communicative	29	34.1%	31	23.5%
Total	85	100%	132	100%

Table 6. Distribution of the evidentials used in the opinion columns in *The Guardian* and *The Telegraph*

In *The Telegraph* evidential markers are more prominent than in *The Guardian*. Experiential evidentials are the most frequent, 48 tokens out of 94 in *The Guardian* and 83 tokens out of 140 in *The Telegraph* were found to be expressing experiential evidentiality. Communicative evidentiality markers are second most frequent to appear in the opinion columns in both papers, while cognitive evidentiality appears to be the least frequent.

Experiential evidentials include such markers as *we have seen, it appears, clear, seem, obviously, clearly, etc.*, that indicate perception or reasoning based on inference as in (39) – (44):

- (39) *What **seemed** positively sinister, as opposed to just annoying, about this conception of what constitutes “news” was that its purveyors seemed comfortable (positively delighted, in fact) with their role as messengers of moral certainty. [The Telegraph]*
- (40) *Labour, it **seems**, needs a bolder, clearer, more ambitious vision to take to the electorate. [The Guardian]*
- (41) *It is **clear** that he simply wants revenge and impunity from the rule of law. [The Guardian]*
- (42) ***It is abundantly clear** that there is an acute shortage of housing in certain regions of the UK. [The Telegraph]*
- (43) *Iran is **clearly** open to a conversation. [The Telegraph]*
- (44) *It **appears** that the likes of Glenn Youngkin understand this very well indeed. [The Telegraph]*

The evidential markers found above express indirect inferential evidentiality, which, according to Marín-Aresse (2011:208) emphasizes the speaker’s inference based on observation or reasoning. Inferential markers are expressed mainly by lexical verbs, predicative adjectives or adverbs as in the examples above. In (39), (40) evidentiality is expressed by the lexical verb *seem*, which appears to be rather frequently used in the corpus; *appears* in (44) is another case of lexical verb being an evidential marker. As mentioned before, experiential evidentiality can be expressed by predicative adjectives as in (41), (42). The predicative adjective *clear* indicates that the information is truthful and clear to the receiver, therefore counts as evidence. Similarly to predicative adjectives, evidential adverbs, as in (43), present the evidence of the events as something that is known or obvious from the observant perspective.

The second most frequent markers of evidentiality are communicative evidentials, which portray self-reference, verbal agreements, cognitive processes of conclusion, as well as reports. Self-reference and verbal agreements, being markers of direct evidentiality, were not found neither in *The Guardian* nor in *The Telegraph*. Communicative evidentials, on the other hand, were expressed in both newspapers most frequently by verbs of communication or adverbials, as in the examples below:

- (45) *The fact that in defeat the Democrats have been reduced to this **suggests** that they may be failing to learn anything at all from the past week. [The Telegraph]*
- (46) ***According to** the Crime Survey for England and Wales in the year ending March 2020, there were an estimated 1.6 million female victims of domestic abuse, aged 16 to 59. [The Guardian]*

(47) *I doubt it! Cop26 looks like a ratings dud, and if it wasn't for Boris's gags and the countless moments of accidental levity (**according to** the local press, Joe Biden's motorcade was flashed by a "large, naked Scottish man" taking a picture with his phone), the summit would've passed unheard, like a tree falling in the Amazon. [The Telegraph]*

(48) *Still, as **John Maynard Keynes famously quipped**, in the long run we are all dead and if Trump is the path to Democratic success, so be it. [The Guardian]*

(49) *As **the Observer reports** today in the latest article in our End Femicide campaign, the epidemic of male violence against women and girls (VAWG) makes up 40% of police business, yet prevention – stopping perpetrators before they inflict psychological, physical, sexual, economic and digital damage (utilising social media) – is given a low priority [The Guardian]*

In (45) evidentiality is expressed by the verb **suggest**, which, according to Marín-Aresse (2011), denotes a cognitive conclusional process, in other words, if a speaker concludes it means that he or she is implying that the proposition is true. (46) – (49) are examples of adverbials and reporting clauses that indicate that the speaker refers to someone else to elaborate on the truthfulness of the proposition.

The least frequently used type of evidentiality in both *The Guardian* and *The Telegraph* is cognitive. Verbs of cognitive attitude were most frequently used to express cognitive evidentiality in both newspapers. As was previously mentioned, epistemic modality and evidentiality are interrelated, therefore some markers can express both epistemic modality and evidentiality. According to Palmer (2001:8) “epistemic modality and evidential modality are concerned with the speaker’s attitude to the truth-value or factual status of the proposition”. For example, verbs of cognitive attitude indicate both doubt and certainty and source of information, as in the examples below:

(50) *The tragic fate of my father was shared by millions of Indonesians whose lives were destroyed by the 1965 bloody military coup, which **I believe** was backed by the American, British and Australian governments. [The Guardian]*

(51) *I don't know if Johnson knows anything at all about classical history and the ancient world – he wears his learning so lightly, it's just impossible to tell – but **I think** you'd stop shy of hailing these particular brains trust as the third triumvirate. [The Guardian]*

(52) ***We know** now that the use of fear and moral inquisition attached to a doom narrative can compel people to give up their freedoms with very little resistance. [The Telegraph]*

Verbs of cognitive attitude indicate that the speaker expresses a different degree of certainty in the truth value of the proposition, similarly to epistemic modality. *I believe* is generally used to express commitment to personal opinion, as in (50) the writer is committed to the information that American, British and Australian governments backed the military coup but cannot guarantee that the statement is

true. In (51) *I think* is used as a means of evaluation with a degree of commitment where the author could be wrong. The writer states the opinion that if Johnson knew anything about classical history, he would “stop shy of hailing”. *We know* in (52) is used to assign a high degree of certainty in the truthfulness of the statement, making it possible for the reader to believe that statement is true and the writer has enough evidence to support this claim.

5. Realizations of modality and evidentiality in Polish opinion columns

This section will overview modality and evidentiality markers in opinion columns of the Polish newspapers *Gazeta Wyborcza* representing liberal political views, and *Rzeczpospolita* voicing conservative political views. Primarily modal verbs, adverbs and evidentials will be discussed.

5.1. Distribution of modal and evidential markers in *Gazeta Wyborcza* and *Rzeczpospolita*

Compared to both *The Guardian* and *The Telegraph*, there are fewer markers of modality and evidentiality in the Polish newspapers examined. The main difference is that modal verbs are not a popular means to express modality in Polish opinion columns as there are only 146 instances of modal verbs expressing modal meaning in *Gazeta Wyborcza* and 183 instances in *Rzeczpospolita* (see Table 7).

	<i>Gazeta Wyborcza</i>		<i>Rzeczpospolita</i>	
	Raw numbers	FR/10,000 words	Raw numbers	FR/10,000 words
Modal verbs	146	29.3	183	36.6
Modal adverbs	166	33.4	210	41.9
Evidentiality markers	42	8.4	49	9.8

Table 7. The frequencies of modality and evidentiality markers in the opinion columns in *Gazeta Wyborcza* and *Rzeczpospolita*

Modality is mostly expressed by modal adverbs and adverbials. All 166 adverbials found in *Gazeta Wyborcza* and 210 in *Rzeczpospolita* express epistemic meaning and belong to the category of stance adverbials (see Biber et al, 1999). Selected opinion columns are not rich in evidentials compared to both English newspapers. The second most frequent means to express modality are modal auxiliary verbs. In *Rzeczpospolita* slightly more modal verbs were found compared to *Gazeta Wyborcza*. Polish opinion columns from both newspapers express evidentiality less frequently than opinion columns in *The Guardian* and *The Telegraph*. There were only 42 instances of evidentiality markers found in *Gazeta Wyborcza* and 49 instances found in *Rzeczpospolita* all of which belong to the category of indirect evidence.

5.2. Modal verbs

As was mentioned above, modal verbs are one of the most frequent means to express modality in English. However, in Polish modal verbs are not as frequently used to express modality as in English. As illustrated by the data in Table 8 and Table 9, modal auxiliaries tend to express dynamic meaning more frequently than deontic or epistemic meanings in both *Gazeta Wyborcza* and *Rzeczpospolita*. The

second most frequent meaning of modality is deontic, while epistemic is the least frequently expressed modal meaning in the opinion columns in Polish argumentative newspaper discourse.

Modal verbs	Epistemic		Deontic		Dynamic	
	N	Percentage %	N	Percentage %	N	Percentage %
<i>Móc</i>	9	6.2%	0	0%	94	64.3%
<i>Musieć</i>	7	4.8%	27	18.5%	0	%
<i>Powinien</i>	0	0%	9	6.2%	0	%
Total	16	11%	36	24.7%	94	64.3%

Table 8. Distribution of the modal auxiliary verbs used in the opinion columns in *Gazeta Wyborcza*

Modal verbs	Epistemic		Deontic		Dynamic	
	N	Percentage %	N	Percentage %	N	Percentage %
<i>Móc</i>	22	12%	1	0.5%	92	50.3%
<i>Musieć</i>	0	0%	34	18.6%	0	0%
<i>Powinien</i>	11	6%	23	12.6%	0	0%
Total	33	18%	58	31.7%	92	50.3%

Table 9. Distribution of the modal auxiliary verbs used in the opinion columns in *Rzeczpospolita*

There are not as many modal verbs in Polish as there are in English, although some may have several meanings. The modal verb *móc*, for example, can express modal meaning similarly to English *can*, *may*, or *might*. Polish modals in the selected corpus mostly function as markers of dynamic modality, although, there are instances of epistemic and deontic meanings.

Although, as discussed in the previous section, the modal verb *móc* has mainly deontic meaning of *can* and epistemic meaning of *may*, the results of the study proved otherwise. The most frequent meaning of *móc* in the corpus is that of dynamic *can*, for example:

(53) *W obozie rządzącym można usłyszeć spekulacje, że weto może być elementem szerszego planu, który zakłada zwrot w polityce wewnętrznej i zagranicznej oraz nowy rząd na czas wojny.* [Gazeta Wyborcza]

‘There is speculation in the government camp that the veto **can** be a part of a broader plan that envisages a domestic and foreign policy reversal and a new government for wartime.’

(54) *Zaznaczam jeszcze raz: nie możemy mieć pewności, czy zawiodły dane wywiadowcze, czy to Putin nie słuchał sygnałów ostrzegawczych.* [Gazeta Wyborcza]

‘Let me reiterate that we **cannot be sure** whether the intelligence data failed or it was Putin who did not listen to warning signals’

(55) *Każdy może żyć, jak chce – katolik i ateista, heteroseksualista i homoseksualista, liberal i konserwatysta.* [Rzeczpospolita]

‘Everyone **can** live as he wants – Catholic and atheistic, heterosexual and homosexual, liberal and conservative.’

In the examples above *móc* functions dynamically expressing the ability for veto to be a part of a broader plan (53); the inability to be sure in (54), also the ability of people to live as they want in (55).

Deontic meaning in both *Gazeta Wyborcza* and *Rzeczpospolita* is mainly expressed by the modal verb *musieć*, which functions as deontic *must*, indicating a strong sense of obligation and necessity for the action to happen:

(56) *Rządy prawa nie są przestarzałą ideą, która **musi** ulec rządowi woli praktykowanym przez nowe autorytaryzmy.* [*Gazeta Wyborcza*]

‘The rule of law is not an outdated idea that **must** be subject to the rule of the will of the new authoritarianism.’

The modal auxiliary *powinien* functions as deontic *should*, expressing strong obligation and necessity as in examples below:

(57) *Przemysł **powinien** w coraz większym stopniu ulegać dekarbonizacji m.in. przez wykorzystanie technologii wodorowych.* [*Rzeczpospolita*]

‘Industry **should** be increasingly decarbonized, including the use of hydrogen technologies.’

(58) *Kraj, w którym władza udaje demokrację przed wspólnotą, niszcząc niezależne sądownictwo i media, nie **powinien** liczyć na naiwność i życzliwość wspólnoty.* [*Rzeczpospolita*]

‘A country where the government fakes democracy to the Community and destroys the independent judiciary and media **should** not count on the naivety and benevolence of the Community.’

(59) *Może wtedy, kiedy Łukaszenka pakował ludzi do więzienia, świat **powinien** bardziej zdecydowanie zareagować.* [*Gazeta Wyborcza*]

‘Maybe when Lukashenko put people in prison, the world **should** have reacted more decisively.’

The least frequently expressed modal meaning by modal auxiliaries in the opinion columns was epistemic. Although *móc* most frequently expressed dynamic modality, in some cases it can convey epistemic meaning of *may*, indicating a possibility that someone can pursue a different occupation as in (60), or the assumption of what the problem might be in (61). *Móc* can also function as epistemic *might* indicating that in the past something might have been done differently as in (64).

(60) *Natomiast **może** uprawiać inny zawód. Oczywiście najlepiej jest, gdy ktoś taki na zawsze zostaje wyrugowany zarówno z sądownictwa, jak i z polityki.* [*Rzeczpospolita*]

‘However, he **may** pursue a different occupation. Of course, it is best if the person concerned is permanently banished from the judiciary and politics.’

(61) *Problemem **może** być nachalne wymuszanie na niewierzących uznania jakiejś religii za wzór wiary i stylu życia.* [*Rzeczpospolita*]

‘One problem **may** be that unbelievers are forced to accept a religion as a model of their faith and way of life.’

(62) *Wcześniej **można było oczekiwać**, że Zelenski okaże się dużo ostrożniejszy [Gazeta Wyborcza]*

‘In the past we **might have expected** Zelenski to be much more careful’

There are also cases when *powinien* possesses the meaning of epistemic modality, indicating mainly the assumption or the actions, like in (65).

(63) *W tych trudnych czasach Zelenski **powinien** być wzorem dla nas wszystkich. [Rzeczpospolita]*

‘In these difficult times, Zelenski should be a role model for all of us.’

5.3. Modal adverbs

Modal auxiliaries are not a primary means of expressing modality in Polish. The research has shown that adverbs are the most frequent markers of expressing epistemic modality. Modal adverbs are more frequent in *Rzeczpospolita* than in *Gazeta Wyborcza* (see Table 10). There are twice as many adverbials expressing certainty in the conservative *Rzeczpospolita* compared to the liberal *Gazeta Wyborcza*. Adverbs expressing doubt, on the other hand, appeared to be more frequent in *Gazeta Wyborcza* rather than in *Rzeczpospolita*. Adverbials expressing actuality and reality are more frequent in *Gazeta Wyborcza*.

Modal adverbs	<i>Gazeta Wyborcza</i>		<i>Rzeczpospolita</i>	
	Instances in the text	Percentage %	Instances in the text	Percentage %
Certainty	64	38.6%	151	71.9%
Doubt	89	53.6%	54	25.7%
Actuality and reality	13	7.8%	5	2.4%
Total	166	100%	210	100%

Table 10. Distribution of the modal adverbs used in the opinion columns in *Gazeta Wyborcza* and *Rzeczpospolita*

Adverbs expressing doubt and certainty were used most frequently in both *Gazeta Wyborcza* and *Rzeczpospolita*. Adverbs in examples (64) – (67) express epistemic certainty in the truthfulness of the proposition. *Bez wątpienia* in (64) functions as a stance marker *no doubt*, as well as in (67) *niewątpliwie* expresses a high level of certainty similarly to *undoubtedly*. *Z pewnością* (*certainty*) in (65) and *oczywiście* (*of course*) in (66) also express a high level of certainty.

(64) ***Bez wątpienia** Unia Europejska oraz Stany Zjednoczone będą musiały stworzyć dla Ukrainy nowy Plan Marshalla. [Gazeta Wyborcza]*

‘There is **no doubt** that the European Union and the United States will have to develop a new Marshall Plan for Ukraine.’

(65) *Z pewnością daleko nam do kultury politycznej Brytyjczyków, konsekwencji Niemców w realizowaniu politycznych celów, skandynawskich wzorców uczciwości. [Gazeta Wyborcza]*

‘**Certainly**, we are far removed from the political culture of the British, the consistency of the Germans in pursuing political objectives, the Scandinavian patterns of integrity.’

(66) *Oczywiście najlepiej jest, gdy ktoś taki na zawsze zostaje wyrugowany zarówno z sądownictwa, jak i z polityki. [Rzeczpospolita]*

‘**Of course**, it is best if the person concerned is permanently banished from the judiciary and politics.’

(67) *Nie mogę jednak nie dostrzec, że brak podjęcia procedury w odpowiednim momencie, wbrew temu, co zdaje się sugerować pełnomocnik rodziny, a niewątpliwie sugeruje Federacja na rzecz Kobiet i Planowania Rodziny, niewiele ma wspólnego z ubiegłorocznym orzeczeniem Trybunału Konstytucyjnego. [Rzeczpospolita]*

‘However, I cannot overlook the fact that the failure to initiate proceedings at the right time, contrary to what the representative of the family seems to suspect, and what the Federation for Women and Family Planning **undoubtedly** suggest, has little to do with last year’s ruling by the Constitutional Court.’

Móc in Polish can also function as an adverb expressing doubt, like *być może* in (68) and (69) function as *perhaps* and *może* in (70) functions as *maybe*, all of which convey lack of certainty in the truthfulness of the statement, therefore, express doubt.

(68) *W części obozu PiS rozważany jest polityczny zwrot kopernikański: wyrzucenie Solidarnej Polski, współpraca z częścią opozycji, a być może nawet powołanie nowego rządu na czas wojny. [Gazeta Wyborcza]*

‘In one part of PiS camp, a Copernican political turn is being considered: the ousting of Solidarity Poland, cooperation with parts of the opposition, and **perhaps** even the formation of a new government during the war.’

(69) *Być może rozumowanie tu jest takie: trzeba się Bąkiewiczowi odwdziaczyć za to, że w czasach rządów PO organizował Marsz Niepodległości, który stał się największym chyba wówczas marszem antyrządowym. [Rzeczpospolita]*

‘**Perhaps** the reasoning is here: one has to thank Bąkiewicz for organizing the Independence March during the PO government, which became arguably the largest anti-government march.’

(70) *Zostaniesz zniszczony lub może nawet trafisz do więzienia.*

‘You are going to be destroyed or **maybe** even go to prison.’ [Rzeczpospolita]

5.4. Evidential markers

Similarly to the English opinion columns, evidentiality and epistemic modality correlate and some adverbials function both as epistemic modality and evidentiality markers. Evidentiality is expressed by adverbials, lexical verbs, also verbs of cognition. Similarly to the English opinion columns, evidentiality markers are less frequent than modality markers. Evidentials are slightly more frequent in *Rzeczpospolita* than in *Gazeta Wyborcza*. Experiential evidentiality is more frequent in both Polish argumentative newspaper opinion columns, while cognitive evidentiality is the least frequent (see Table 11).

Evidential markers	<i>Gazeta Wyborcza</i>		<i>Rzeczpospolita</i>	
	Instances in the text	Percentage %	Instances in the text	Percentage %
Experiential	21	50%	24	49%
Cognitive	9	21.4%	3	6.1%
Communicative	12	28.6%	22	44.9%
Total	42	100%	49	100%

Table 11. Distribution of the evidentials used in the opinion columns in *Gazeta Wyborcza* and *Rzeczpospolita*

Experiential evidentials are the most frequent in both English and Polish opinion columns, all of which express indirect evidence. *Jawnie* in (71) functions as the adverbs *evidently* or *clearly*, which indicates that the information is truthful and clear to the receiver and is perceived as evidence. In (72) we can see the use of lexical verb *wydawać się* functioning as experiential indirect evidential *seem*.

(71) *Każdy, kto przyczynił się wtedy do oddania władzy **jawnie** już wówczas niedemokratycznej partii rządzącej, jest współodpowiedzialny za dzisiejsze ofiary rządów PiS.* [*Gazeta Wyborcza*]

‘Everyone who contributed to the handover of power to the evidently at that time undemocratic ruling party is partly responsible for today’s victims of PiS rule.’

(72) *Ten scenariusz dzisiaj – podkreślam: dzisiaj – **wydaje się** mało realistyczny.* [*Gazeta Wyborcza*]

‘This scenario today – and I stress: today – **seems** unrealistic.’

The second most frequent type of evidentiality is communicative, which is expressed by adverbials of hearsay, as well as indication of the source of knowledge the writer refers to:

(73) *To też **podobno** ma powodować, że młodzi ludzie mniej chętnie oddają w wyborach swój głos na PiS.*

‘It is **reportedly** expected to make young people less willing to vote for the PiS in the elections.’

(74) *Ale według ministra edukacji dobór ekspertów nie budzi zastrzeżeń.*

‘However, **according to** the Minister of Education, the selection of experts is irrefutable’

The least frequent means to express evidential meaning are cognitive evidentials, most of which are expressed by verbs of cognitive attitude, as in (77). *Myślę* (*I think*) is used to express the writer’s evaluation of the situation and stating his or her opinion on the matter.

(75) *Myślę, że z Ukraincami jest podobnie. Ich bliskość jest bardzo silnie odczuwana.*

‘**I think** that it’s similar with Ukrainians. Their closeness is very strong.’

Overall, the opinion columns in the English newspapers tend to express modality largely with the help of modal auxiliary verbs, while modal adverbs proved to be the means of expressing modality, precisely epistemic meaning, in the Polish newspaper columns. Conservative newspapers in both languages proved to have more markers of modality and evidentiality than those representing liberal political views. Modal auxiliary verbs are not as common in Polish as they are in English. All of the three main modality types were found, although some modals express only one modal meaning. The dynamic type of modality was largely present with modal verbs, while epistemic modality and evidentiality is more of a domain for adverbs and lexical verbs. The results of the analysis show that in both English and Polish opinion columns epistemic and dynamic modal meanings dominate. Deontic modality played a secondary part. Modal auxiliary verbs are used to express epistemic, deontic, and dynamic meaning; however, adverbs express only epistemic meaning of modality.

Conslusions

Modality is the expression of the speaker's attitude, closely related to subjectivity. Traditionally, linguists acknowledge three types of modality: epistemic, deontic and dynamic. Most frequently used modal markers are modal auxiliary verbs and modal adverbs. Evidentiality is a linguistic category conveying the source of information and helps to establish the speaker's or writer's justifications for their judgements. Modality and evidentiality was broadly discussed in previous research in term of political and journalistic discourses, as well as cross-linguistically, however, to the best of my knowledge, no comparative research has been done in this field concerning English and Polish argumentative newspapers opinion columns. The purpose of this MA thesis is to investigate and reveal possible similarities and differences in the use of modality and evidentiality markers in English and Polish argumentative newspaper discourse. To achieve the aim of this thesis the following objectives were raised and realized.

Most common markers used to express modality and evidentiality are modal auxiliaries, modal adverbs, predicative adjectives, and verbs of cognitive attitude. Modal auxiliary verbs (*must, should, may, might, can, could, will, would, shall*) were categorized into epistemic, deontic and dynamic markers of modality; semi-modals were not discussed. Modal adverbs were categorized within functional groups of doubt and certainty (*i.e. no doubt, certainly, probably, perhaps, likely, of course, etc.*), actuality and reality (*i.e. in fact*), and other (*i.e. mainly, sort of, kind of, typically, etc.*). Adverbials indicating source of knowledge, as well as viewpoint and perspective were considered as evidentials in this thesis. Evidentiality was categorized based on Marín-Arrese's (2011) classification of evidentials into 'Experiential', 'Cognitive' and 'Communicative'. All of the evidentiality markers found in the corpus represent indirect evidentiality. The main markers to express evidentiality were adverbials (*e.g. obviously, clearly, evidently, etc.*), predicative adjectives (*e.g. clear.*), some lexical verbs (*e.g. seem, appear*), and verbs of cognitive attitude (*e.g. I believe, I think, I know, I reckon*).

The results show that the most common meaning of modality is epistemic and dynamic, indicating possibility, prediction/hypothesis, and ability for action; deontic modality proved to be the least common in both languages. Modal auxiliaries are the primary markers to express modality in English opinion columns, while in Polish, modality is largely expressed by modal adverbs. All of the modal verbs mentioned above were found in English opinion columns, however, in Polish opinion columns only *móc, musieć* and *powinien* served as markers of modality. Epistemic and dynamic meaning in opinion columns in both languages were the most frequent, expressing possibility, hypothesis and ability for action. Modal adverbs convey the epistemic meaning in both languages, most frequently expressing certainty and doubt. In both *The Guardian* and *The Telegraph*, as well as *Gazeta Wyborcza* and *Rzeczpospolita*, evidentiality is expressed by adverbials, predicative adjectives, verbs of cognition,

and some lexical verbs, although there are less evidential markers in the opinion columns in both languages than modality markers. Markers of modality and evidentiality are more frequent in *The Guardian* and *The Telegraph* than in *Gazeta Wyborcza* and *Rzeczpospolita*. The findings also show that the opinion columns in the newspapers of conservative political views in both languages contain more markers of modality and evidentiality than those of liberal political leanings. It reveals that the columnists in the conservative newspaper are more committed to the claims and assessments that they make, as well as, are dedicated to provide evidence to the claims they make, compared to the columnists in the liberal newspapers.

This comparative study might be important and valuable in the future as it could benefit journalists, as well as writers in the field of translation to have a better understanding of the expression of modality and evidentiality in these languages. This study contributes to the contrastive studies already conveyed in English – Spanish, English – Lithuanian *etc.* in the way that it proves and denies the hypothesis and theories raised previously. Modality and evidentiality are notions that express the speaker's position with regard to the truthfulness of the propositions. Opinion columns, being a part of journalistic discourse, tend to use modality and evidentiality as a means of speculation, deduction, inference, as well as providing information. Further research is necessary regarding speaker/writer stance and commitment to the validity of the information in the newspaper discourse. The contrastive study needs to be conveyed more extensively for the purpose of finding possible variation of culture and interaction in the journalistic discourse.

Data sources

The Guardian <https://www.theguardian.com/international>

The Telegraph <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/>

Gazeta Wyborcza <https://wyborcza.pl/0,0.html>

Rzeczpospolita <https://www.rp.pl/>

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad & Edward Finegan, eds. 1999. *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Biber, Douglas. 2006. Stance in spoken and written university registers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. 5 (2). 97-116
- Cornillie, Bert. 2009. Evidentiality and epistemic modality. On the close relationship between two different categories*. *Functions of Language*. 16 (1). University of Leuven. John Benjamins Publishing Company. 44- 62
- Cappelli, Gloria. 2007. "I know I reckon I know how Leonardo da Vinci must have felt ...". *Epistemicity, evidentiality and English verbs of cognitive attitude*. Pari: Pari Publishing
- Collins, Peter. 2009. *Modals and quasi-modals in English*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi
- Facchinetti, Roberta. 2009. *Subjectivity, (Non-)subjectivity and Intersubjectivity in English Modality*.
- Gujarek, Beata. 2010. *Evidentiality in English and Polish*. University of Edinburgh.
- Hansen, Björn, Karlík, Petr. 2005. How to measure a real convergence: a case study of contact-induced grammaticalization in the German-Hungarian-Slavonic contact area. *Modality in Slavonic Languages. New Perspectives*. München: Sagner. 219-237.
- Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leech, G. 2003. Modality on the move: The English modal auxiliaries 1961–1992. In R. Facchinetti, M. Krug and F. Palmer, (eds.), *Modality in Contemporary English*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. pp.223-240.
- Marín-Arrese, Juanna I. 2011. Effective vs. epistemic stance and subjectivity in political discourse. (In Hart, Christopher. 2011. *Critical Discourse Studies in Context and Cognition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 193-223.
- Marín-Arrese, Juana I. 2015. Epistemicity and stance: A cross-linguistic study of epistemic stance strategies in journalistic discourse in English and Spanish. *Discourse Studies* 17 (2), 210-225.
- Marie, Anne. Vandenberg, Simon. Aijmer, Karin. 2007. *The semantic field of modal certainty. A corpus-based study of English adverbs*. Topics in English Linguistics. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Palmer, F. R. 1979. *Modality and the English Modals*. London and New York: Longman.
- Palmer, F. R. 2001. *Mood and Modality*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, Geoff, Alba-Juez, Laura. 2014. Evaluation in Context. The many faces and phases of evaluation. 242. John Benjamins Publishing Company. 3-20.

- Thompson, Geoff, Hunston, Susan. 2000. *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. *Evaluation: An Introduction*. Oxford University Press. 1-26
- Rozumko, Agata. 2019. *Modal adverbs in English and Polish. A functional perspective*. Białystok.
- Salkie, Raphael. 2009. Degrees of modality. In R. Salkie, P. Busuttil & J. Auwera (Ed.), *Modality in English: Theory and Description*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton. 79-103
- Usonienė, Aurelija. Šolienė, Audronė. 2012. Corpus of strategies in realizations of epistemic possibility in English and Lithuanian. *International Journal of Corpus*. Vilnius University. 291-316.
- Quirk et al. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Pearson Longman.
- Zhongyi, Xu. 2015. *Modality and Evidentiality in Political Discourse: A Cognitive-functional Account*. Department of Linguistics and English Language. Lancaster University.
- Šolienė, Audronė. 2016. (Non)epistemic modality: English *must*, *have to* and *have got to* and their correspondences in Lithuanian. *Kalbotyra* 69. 223-245
- Warchał, Krystyna. Łyda, Andrzej. 2009. Epistemic modality markers in Polish-English and English-Polish consecutive interpreting: Modal values and categories. *W kręgu teorii: Studia językoznawcze dedykowane Profesorowi Kazimierzowi Polańskiemu in memoriam*. University of Silesia. 247-265.

Summary

Modalumo ir evidencialumo raiška argumentaciniame laikraščių diskurse: anglų-lenkų kontrastyvinis tyrimas

Šiame tyrime analizuojami modalumo ir evidencialumo žymekliai anglų ir lenkų argumentaciniame laikraščių diskurse. Šio tyrimo tikslas yra išsiaiškinti modalumo ir evidencialumo žymeklių vartojimo panašumus bei skirtumus liberalių ir konservatyvių politinių pažiūrų anglų ir lenkų laikraščių nuomonių rubrikose. Ankstesniuose tyrimuose modalumas ir evidencialumas buvo plačiai aptarti politinių bei žurnalistinių diskursų, taip pat tarpkalbinėje perspektyvoje, tačiau, mano žiniomis, kontrastyviniai tyrimai anglų ir lenkų argumentacinių laikraščių nuomonių skilčių srityje nebuvo atlikti.

Šiame darbe buvo nustatyta, kad modalumas išreiškia kalbėtojo požiūrį į teiginį. Apskritai skiriami trys pagrindiniai modalumo tipai: episteminis, deontinis ir dinaminis. Dažniausiai vartojami modaliniai žymekliai yra modaliniai veiksmažodžiai bei modaliniairieveksmiai. Evidencialumas yra pripažintas kaip lingvistinė kategorija, perteikianti informacijos šaltinį ir nurodanti, kaip kalbėtojas pagrindžia savo sprendimą. Evidencialumas buvo suskirstytas į ‚patirtinį‘, ‚pažintinį‘ ir ‚komunikacinį‘. Dažniausiai vartojami evidencialumo žymekliai yrarieveksmiai, leksiniai veiksmažodžiai, predikatiniai būdvardžiai bei mentaliniai veiksmažodžiai.

Analizė atskleidė, kad dažniausia modalumo reikšmė yra episteminė ir dinaminė, reiškianti galimybę, prognozę/hipotezę bei gebėjimą. Angliškose nuomonių skiltyse modalumas dažniausiai buvo išreikštas modalinių veiksmažodžių pagalba, tačiau lenkiškuose laikraščiuose modalinei reikšmei išreikšti dažniausiai buvo vartojami modaliniairieveksmiai. Abiejose kalbose modaliniairieveksmiai buvo vartojami episteminio modalumo raiškai. Tiek *The Guardian* ir *The Telegraph*, tiek *Gazeta Wyborcza* ir *Rzeczpospolita* evidencialumą išreiškiarieveksmiai, predikatiniai būdvardžiai, mentaliniai veiksmažodžiai, bei kai kurie leksiniai veiksmažodžiai, nors abiejose kalbose nuomonių skiltyse evidencialumo žymeklių yra mažiau nei modalumo žymeklių. Tyrimo rezultatai taip pat rodo, kad konservatyvių politinių pažiūrų laikraščių nuomonių skiltyse abiem kalbomis yra daugiau modalumo bei evidencialumo žymeklių negu liberalinių pažiūrų nuomonių skiltyse.

Šis lyginamasis tyrimas gali būti svarbus ir vertingas ateityje, nes gali padėti suprasti modalumo ir evidencialumo raišką šiose kalbose žurnalistams ir vertėjams. Žurnalistiniame diskurse modalumas ir evidencialumas yra paprastai naudojami kaip spekuliacijos, dedukcijos, išvadų bei informacijos pateikimo priemonės. Būtina yra atlikti tolesnius tyrimus, susijusius su kalbėtojo poziciją ir įsipareigojimu pagrįsti informaciją laikraščio diskurse. Kontrastinį tyrimą reikia atlikti plačiau, kad būtų galima nustatyti galimus kultūros ir sąveikos skirtumus žurnalistiniame diskurse.

Raktiniai žodžiai: modalumas, evidencialumas, episteminis, deontinis, dinaminis, žurnalistinis diskursas, lyginamasis tyrimas, anglų, lenkų

Appendix 1

Opinion columns and their authors:

The Guardian:

1. *It's Liz Truss's moment to do the right thing* by David Mitchell
2. *If Labour can't beat the Tories' polarising game, it should build bridges instead* by Robert Ford
3. *Social media fuels narcissists' worst desires, making reasoned debate near impossible* by Sonia Sodha
4. *Boris Johnson's contempt for integrity is at the rotten heart of the Paterson affair* by Andrew Rawnsley
5. *Want to change the world? Then you'd better give up on self-defeating pessimism* by Kenan Malik
6. *Satire really has left the building when we're asked to be kind to Ghislaine Maxwell* by Catherine Bennett
7. *The Observer view on tackling violence against women* by Observer editorial
8. *The Observer view on No 10's handling of the Owen Paterson affair* by Observer editorial
9. *It's not all about the culture war – Democrats helped shaft the working class* by Robert Reich
10. *My life and death hike through busy Melbourne to help a duck march her eight babies to water* by Debbie Lustig
11. *Writing a book about Scott Morrison: 'the fact he seemed boring wasn't an obstacle'* by Sean Kelly
12. *The Tories' big idea for staying in power? Endless conflict with the EU* by Nick Cohen
13. *The Station Eleven gang: has the pandemic given us a thirst for culture that's out of our comfort zone?* by Rebecca Nicholson
14. *How can we tame the tech giants now that they control society's infrastructure?* by John Naughton
15. *A student hall from hell hath no windows to distract from study and sleep* by Rowan Moore
16. *The Tories reveal yet again their belief that the rules are for little people, not for them* by David Lammy
17. *Josh Hawley is right that men aren't doing well – but it's because of toxic people like him* by Arwa Mahdawi

18. *Will Brazil seize the climate opportunities in the carbon-storing Amazon?* by Luís Fernando Guedes Pinto
19. *America's diplomatic approach with North Korea is flawed. It's time to change tack* by Lt Col Daniel L Davis (ret)
20. *Why does the media keep saying this election was a loss for Democrats? It wasn't* by Rebecca Solnit
21. *Fossil fuels made our families rich. Now we want this industry to end* by Aileen Getty and Rebecca Rockefeller Lambert
22. *Millions of Americans owe court fees or other 'carceral debt'. This must end* by Astra Taylor
23. *Mark Zuckerberg and the tech bros are still on top – but their grip is loosening* by Jane Martinson
24. *At Cop26, I've found I have more in common with protesters than politicians* by The civil servant
25. *The plan to tighten Australia's voter ID laws is just a clumsy uptake of US culture wars* by Jason Wilson
26. *The Guardian view on climate progress: now for the detail* by Editorial
27. *The Guardian view on Roman Britain: a constantly shifting picture* by Editorial
28. *The Paterson fiasco confirms the threat Boris Johnson poses to British democracy* by Jonathan Freedland
29. *Owen Paterson was just the fall guy. This week's chaos was all about Boris Johnson* by Marina Hyde
30. *A loophole is leaving the most vulnerable pupils in England at risk* by Amanda Spielman
31. *Reaching net zero by 2070 is possible – but it's what India does right now that matters* by Joydeep Gupta
32. *The real lesson of the election results? Democrats must go big and bold* by Andrew Gawthorpe
33. *If Americans can't have basic things like childcare, our democracy is a sham* by David Sirota and Andrew Perez
34. *What toxic men can learn from masculine women* by Finn Mackay
35. *Never mind aid, never mind loans: what poor nations are owed is reparations* by George Monbiot
36. *The Paterson debacle shows that Johnson no longer has advisers – he has courtiers* by Simon Jenkins
37. *The Guardian view on the Paterson case: enough is enough* by Editorial

38. *The Guardian view on Covid's second winter: act now or pay later* by Editorial
39. *This Conservative sleaze row will soon matter to voters too* by Polly Toynbee
40. *The British army has serious questions to answer about the alleged killing of Agnes Wanjiru* by Gaby Hinsliff
41. *Before my sister died, I promised her I'd hold Britain's benefits system to account* by Imogen Day
42. *Banks are still financing fossil fuels – while signing up to net zero pledges* by Mariana Mazzucato
43. *Democratic strategists are embracing 'populism'. But they've got it wrong* by Steve Phillips
44. *The Guardian view on Owen Paterson's reprieve: a constitutional heist* by Editorial
45. *Owen Paterson's escape shows that the sleaze era is back* by Martin Kettle
46. *Let's call out the Tories' behaviour for what it is: corruption* by Keir Starmer
47. *Boris Johnson has condemned Britain to replay Brexit on a loop* by Rafael Behr
48. *We need radical policies to reach net zero. Here's a fairer way to do them* by Polly Toynbee
49. *Glasgow is the real test of Boris Johnson's floundering 'global Britain'* by Mujtaba Rahman
50. *This fish spat with France is just another product of Johnson's broken Brexit* by Simon Jenkins
51. *Britain's prisons are becoming ever more like the failed US system* by Duncan Campbell
52. *Politicians talk about net zero – but not the sacrifices we must make to get there* by John Harris

The Telegraph

1. *Embracing wokeness is electoral Kryptonite for Biden's Democrats* by DOUGLAS MURRAY
2. *Doom-laden Cop26 reporting is more moralising than journalism* by JANET DALEY
3. *We do need a regulator for our MPs. Let's call it... 'the electorate'* by DANIEL HANNAN
4. *Germany is suddenly the eurozone's weakest link* by MATTHEW LYNN
5. *You can be as wrong as you like when you're a Covid pessimist.* by CHRISTOPHER SNOWDON
6. *America will need Margaret Thatcher's conviction to clean up the mess left by Joe Biden* by NIKKI HALEY

7. *It would take something big to distract us from the bad-news bonanza – so thank heavens for Christopher Walken.* by VICTORIA COREN MITCHELL
8. *Triggering Article 16 is hardly the ‘nuclear option’* by RUTH DUDLEY EDWARDS
9. *Antivirals will deal the final blow to Covid 19.* by MATTHEW LESH
10. *This is one of the most magnificent poems of the First World War* by SIMON HEFFER
11. *Doom-laden Cop26 reporting is more moralizing than journalism.* by JANET DALEY
12. *It shouldn't be up to Mark Zuckerberg to set the rules on facial recognition tech* by JULIET SAMUEL
13. *Suddenly, millennials are beginning to regret starting the woke wars* by MICHAEL DEACON
14. *Kathleen Stock's quiet dignity is humbling* by CAMILLA TOMINEY
15. *The West is living through a period of radical uncertainty and has no clue how to respond* by CHARLES MOORE
16. *Zombie Britain desperately needs a way out of this dangerous debt bubble* by JULIET SAMUEL
17. *Are you ready, Keir? The smart money's on an early general election* by CHRISTOPHER HOPE
18. *The disease of hypocrisy has become endemic* by CAMILLA TOMINEY
19. *The BBC should erect a statue of Lionel Blair, with an apology note attached* by DOMINIC CAVENDISH
20. *Want to stop MPs misbehaving? Fix the recall system* by MUTAZ AHMED
21. *The Scottish Greens are more obsessed with independence than climate change* by TOM HARRIS
22. *An anti-sleaze candidate would be meaningless gesture politics* by ELIOT WILSON
23. *We'll all pay for turning Big Oil into a pariah* by JEREMY WARNER
24. *The Tories are behaving like a tired government in its dying days* by FRASER NELSON
25. *Omnishambles complete as Tories beat a humiliating retreat from the Leadsom amendment* by MADELINE GRANT
26. *The woke confusion of John Lewis's unlit Christmas jumper* by JUDITH WOODS
27. *It's not just the liberties of NHS workers that deserve protection - but the public's too* by KATE ANDREWS
28. *Britain's grey seal population boom is a man-made miracle* by JEMIMA LEWIS
29. *Labour might have had the upper hand — were it not for the sentencing of Claudia Webbe* by TOM HARRIS

30. *Number 10 ineptitude made the Paterson saga far worse for everyone involved* by ELIOT WILSON
31. *No one is being honest about the effect of Net Zero on Britain's poorest families* by GAVIN RICE
32. *We can't afford to wait for Macron to solve the migrant crisis for us* by NIGEL FARAGE
33. *Glenn Youngkin offers Republicans a model for post-Trump success* by RAKIB EHSAN
34. *Facebook changing its behaviour is a lot harder than changing its name* by BELINDA PARMAR
35. *Feckless Biden's presidency is already a failure* by CON COUGHLIN
36. *There's no hypocrisy quite like EU hypocrisy* by TIBOR FISCHER
37. *Only our enemies profit from the nihilistic campaign to make us feel ashamed of our past* by ROBERT TOMBS
38. *Dash it, Jeeves! Britain's running out of butlers* by MICHAEL DEACON
39. *Skills shortages? Make Saturday jobs mandatory for teenagers* by JUDITH WOODS
40. *The National Trust must start appealing to the young – not patronising us* by ALICE LOXTON
41. *Once again care homes are bearing the brunt of the Government's Covid incompetence* by ANDREW HALDENBY
42. *I'm no fan of the Chinese Communist Party - but on the environment, they've got it right* by ROSS CLARK
43. *Trashing the Industrial Revolution won't bring China to the Cop26 table* by MUTAZ AHMED
44. *Priti Patel's abject failure to tackle illegal Channel migration can't be allowed to continue* by PATRICK O'FLYNN
45. *Owen Paterson's dystopian trial proved it's high time for parliamentary standards reform* by STEWART JACKSON
46. *We've embraced Victorian vices but not their virtues* by MADELINE GRANT
47. *Smart motorways are a symptom of the British state's addiction to failure* by PHILIP JOHNSTON
48. *I refuse to be lectured on climate change by the Keystone Cop26 brigade* by ALLISON PEARSON
49. *Owen Paterson has been treated fairly* by CHRIS BRYANT
50. *If Cop26 was one minute to midnight, why did so many delegates arrive on private jets?* by TIM STANLEY
51. *Want to fight back against wokery? Cancel a direct debit today* by ALLISON PEARSON

52. *Centuries on, Thomas Linacre still deserves Oxford's honour* by MARIE DAOUDA
53. *If British cancer care is to catch up with other countries, we need to invest more in radiotherapy* by PROFESSOR KAROL SIKORA
54. *The Old Vic's cancellation of Terry Gilliam is unprecedented insanity* by DOMINIC CAVENDISH
55. *France's de-escalation shows that sensible diplomacy can still prevail post-Brexit* by TOM HARRIS
56. *Opposition to coking coal exposes the folly of our climate debate* by ANDREW WILLSHIRE

Gazeta Wyborcza

1. *Świat się ocknął i zobaczył prawdziwe oblicze Putina* by Monika Olejnik
2. *Jaka obrona ojczyzny? Europeizacja jest lepsza od militarnej autarkii* by Antoni Podolski
3. *Dobra zmiana po "lex Czarnek". Część obozu władzy łagodzi kurs i chciałaby się dogadać z częścią opozycji* by Dominika Wielowieyska
4. *Ta wojna wszystko zmieniła. Nie minął tydzień, a żyjemy w innym świecie* by Jacek Żakowski
5. *Prawie cały świat protestuje, a mimo to Putin nie jest sam* by Dawid Warszawski
6. *Upadek mitu Putina, czyli porażka rosyjskiego wywiadu* by Piotr Niemczyk
7. *Polska solidarność: są uchodźcy lepsi i gorsi* by Rafał Zakrzewski
8. *Wyolbrzymiona groźba wojny nuklearnej. Siewcy atomowej paniki wspierają agresję Putina* by Miłosz Wiatrowski
9. *Sojusznicy Kremla w USA. Nowe oblicze Republikanów* by Dominik Stecuła
10. *Każde społeczeństwo produkuje małych i większych Putinów* by Magdalena Środa
11. *Nie bądźmy naiwni, nic się nie zmieniło: PiS to wciąż PiS* by Eliza Michalik
12. *Nie zapominajmy, kto jest agresorem w tej wojnie. Nie obwiniajmy zwykłych Rosjan* by Wiktoria Bielaszyn
13. *Bodnar i Żakowski apelują: Nie czekajmy na UE, już dziś przyznajmy obywatelom Ukrainy w Polsce równe prawa* by Adam Bodnar, Jacek Żakowski
14. *Dla Putina historia nigdy się nie skończyła* by Mateusz Mazzini
15. *W obliczu wojny potrzebny jest powrót konsensu elit. Przed laty nam się opłacił* by Maciej Kisilowski, Anna Wojciuk
16. *Dlaczego nam się udało, a Ukraińcom nie* by Witold Gadomski
17. *Panowie, skończcie z tą "winą Tuska", bo mamy wojnę* by Monika Olejnik

18. *Sejm popiera Ukrainę: uroczyste pustosłowie bez konkretów* by Jacek Żakowski
19. *Kraj Putina, czyli groteska i zbrodnia w jednym stoją domu* by Dawid Warszawski
20. *Wybór Dudy. Prezydent na politycznych rozstajach* by Rafał Zakrzewski
21. *Kłamliwa kampania Polskich Elektrowni narusza prawo konsumenckie* by Eliza Rutynowska
22. *Inwazja inwazją, a oni jak kłamali, tak kłamią. Obsesja PiS-u na punkcie Tuska* by Wojciech Czuchnowski
23. *Sankcje przeciw Rosji. Trzeba znaleźć ten czuły punkt* by Ernest Skalski
24. *Krótką typologia seksualnych drapieżców* by Magdalena Środa
25. *Aneksja Donbasu: Putin sam przyznał sobie nagrodę pocieszenia* by Roman Kuźniar
26. *Kłamstwa PiS i kłamstwa Putina w jednym stały domu* by Eliza Michalik
27. *Strzelać czy rozmawiać - dylemat Putina* by Janusz Onyszkiewicz
28. *Żeby uniknąć wojny, trzeba wstać i powiedzieć "nie"* by Katarzyna A. Przybyła
29. *Jeśli zdepczecie nasze nadzieje, staniecie się symbolem nieudacznictwa* by Marek Beylin
30. *Kto ma na rękach krew ofiar? Niech każdy spojrzy w lustro* by Maciej Kisilowski, Anna Wojciuk
31. *Kiedy energia stanieje? Raczej nieprędko* by Witold Gadomski
32. *Demokratyczna Polska musi dawać nadzieję pracownikom* by Adrian Zandberg
33. *Świat się śmieje, ludzie przecierają oczy ze zdumienia* by Monika Olejnik
34. *Europo, pobudka! Awanturnicza polityka Putina to dzwonek alarmowy* by Radosław Sikorski
35. *Jacek Kurski, Władek Putin i ich plan "Groza"* by Piotr Głuchowski
36. *Recydywa Mariusza Kamińskiego. Jego list o Pegasusie będzie materiałem dowodowym* by Paweł Wroński
37. *Duda się rozpycha i stawia Kaczyńskiemu* by Dominika Wielowieyska
38. *Tajemnicza wioska, gdzie się nie wyrzynają* by Dawid Warszawski
39. *Podczas klęski nie wprowadzili stanu klęski. A gdyby była wojna?* by Jacek Żakowski
40. *Nie ma mowy o przypadku. Również data użycia Pegasus nie jest przypadkowa - między marcem a majem 2019 r. Właśnie Kołodziejczak zorganizował pierwszy wielki protest rolników w centrum Warszawy.* by Krystyna Naszkowska
41. *Słowa dr Grzyb mogą być odczytywane jako akt przemocy* by Angelika Pitoń
42. *Krytykowanie postulatów ruchu trans nie jest transfobią. Magdalena Grzyb odpowiada Angelice Pitoń* by Magdalena Grzyb
43. *Posłowie Konfederacji udowodnili, że kieruje nimi to, przed czym ostrzega ofiara oświęcimskich tortur* by Tomasz Jakubowski

44. *W 2011 dostałem list od generała Jaruzelskiego. Oto jego treść* by Wojciech Maziarski
45. *Od przekleństw gorsze są nowomowa i pustosłowie* by Eliza Michalik
46. *Rocznica stanu wojennego. Mój antykomunizm słabnie* by Magdalena Środa
47. *Rocznica stanu wojennego. W wykonaniu PiS to podła gala hipokryzji* by Marek Beylin
48. *Order Orła Białego dla Jana Pietrzaka? Kim jest naprawdę ten "niezlomny antykomunista"* by Dominika Wielowieyska
49. *Premierowi kończą się króliki w kapeluszu, przygotujmy się na stagflację* by Witold Gadomski
50. *Kaczyński wypowiada wojnę. Niemcy wyciągają rękę* by Marek Beylin
51. *Kto świętuje z sympatykami Putina, niech się potem nie dziwi* by Jacek Żakowski
52. *PiS będzie kusił opozycję w sprawie KRS. Nie można dać się nabrać* by Michał Wilgocki
53. *Prezes włączył funkcję "przetrwanie". Ale w odwodzie ma plan "Błaszczak-Nowak"* by Dominika Wielowieyska
54. *Albo dajcie nam ich gnębić, albo sami ich sobie bierzcie* by Dawid Warszawski
55. *Czy państwo polskie jeszcze istnieje?* by Marek Beylin
56. *Kocury i myszki, czyli dlaczego polska demokracja potrzebuje prawyborów* by Jacek Żakowski
57. *Ile jeszcze niemowląt musi zamarznąć w polskich lasach, żeby zmiękło pisowskie serce?* by Antoni Podolski
58. *Sprawa Kurdej-Szatan pokazała, że zabójstwo cywilne to metoda autorytarnej władzy* by Eliza Michalik
59. *Powstanie partia antyszczepionkowców?* by Magdalena Środa
60. *Pandemia w Polsce: władza jest winna pasywnej zbrodni publicznej* by Roman Kuźniar
61. *Po klęsce nad Bugiem. Smutny bilans "sukcesów" PiS w obronie rubieży UE* by Paweł Wroński
62. *Katastrof ci u nas dostatek, ale władza się nie przejmuje* by Monika Olejnik
63. *Ziobro przejdź do konfrontacji z UE, a obóz władzy trzeszczy w szwach. Będzie bunt?* by Dominika Wielowieyska
64. *Putin udaje konserwatystę. Polskę i UE czeka test solidarności* by Michał Steć

Rzeczpospolita

1. *Co idzie nie tak* by Jacek Dąbała
2. *Prawo kolanem przepychane. PiS znów idzie na rympał i to nie tylko z Polskim Ładem.* by Łukasz Warzecha

3. *Nasze własne dusze* by Jerzy Surdykowski
4. *ZUS przeciw matkom* by Marek Kobyłański
5. *Wzmocnienie wojska będzie bardzo kosztowne* by Marek Domagalski
6. *Śmierć w Pszczynie a wyrok Trybunału Konstytucyjnego* by Tomasz Terlikowski
7. *Ostrożnie z Bąkiewiczem* by Michał Szuldrzyński
8. *Drożyna bije w ład* by Andrzej Stec
9. *Czy ekonomia szkodzi środowisku* by Noga, Karpa
10. *Śmierć i zakupy* by Mariusz Cieślak
11. *Stanęło ćwierć miliona wojska...* by Witold M. Orłowski
12. *Czas na zmiany w energetyce* by Michał Niewiadomski
13. *Na rynku znów poleje się krew* by Krzysztof Adam Kowalczyk
14. *Narzędzie walki z kryzysem* by Anna Kordecka
15. *Co się będzie śniło mundurowym* no author
16. *Prawo kolanem przepychane* by Łukasz Warzecha
17. *Apokaliptyczny rozmach zielonej rewolucji* by Jan Maciejewski
18. *Jak to na wojence ładnie...* by Andrzej Malinowski
19. *Klimatyczna ucieczka w przód* by Michał Niewiadomski
20. *Polska-UE. Sześć lat na spakowanie walizek?* by Bogusław Chrabota
21. *USA otwierają nowy front z Polską. Mogą wycofać wojska?* by Jędrzej Bielecki
22. *PiS otworzył dużo frontów* by Michał Szuldrzyński
23. *Trudna jesień PiS* by Michał Szuldrzyński
24. *Prawo i Sprawiedliwość okopuje Polskę na wschodzie* by Artur Bartkiewicz
25. *Nie wsiadajcie w samolot do Mińska* by Jerzy Haszczyński
26. *Figury na szachownicy Hołowni* by Bogusław Chrabota
27. *PiS rozpoczyna walkę o samorzady* by Michał Szuldrzyński
28. *Pełzająca rekonstrukcja* by Zuzanna Dąbrowska
29. *Jak premier wywołał III wojnę światową* by Michał Szuldrzyński
30. *Splecione losy Glapińskiego i Morawieckiego* by Michał Szuldrzyński
31. *Niewygodna dyskusja* by Anna Słojewska
32. *Spotkanie Morawiecki-Le Pen: tragiczny błąd premiera* by Jędrzej Bielecki
33. *Koalicja Zdrowego Rozsądku albo...* by Michał Szuldrzyński
34. *Póki jeszcze jest Merkel* by Jędrzej Bielecki
35. *Solą wojska jest rezerwa.* by Marek Kozubal
36. *Hipokryzja megagwiad. Dlaczego Bono milczy ws. ataku na Ukrainę?* by Jacek Cieślak
37. *Nowy Świat i Rosyjskie Przedmieście. Zachód się przebudził* by Jerzy Haszczyński

38. *Oby pomaganie bliźnim Polakom się nie znudziło* by Michał Szuldrzyński
39. *Kijów jak Warszawa, Zelenski jak Starzyński* by Paweł Rożyński
40. *Zelenski Dawidem Europy* by Rusłan Szoszyn
41. *Powtórka z Reagana* by Jędrzej Bielecki
42. *Kronika zapowiedzianej śmierci* by Artur Ilgner
43. *Być jak Wołodymyr Zelenski* by Artur Bartkiewicz
44. *Będzie eksterminacja na Ukrainie* by Bogusław Chrabota
45. *Wojna Rosji z Ukrainą: Nie wystarczy milczeć na trwogę* by Artur Bartkiewicz
46. *Bohaterowie z Wyspy Węży* by Bogusław Chrabota
47. *Konflikt rosyjsko-ukraiński? Napaść to nie konflikt* by Jakub Ekier
48. *Solidarni z Ukrainą* by Bogusław Chrabota
49. *Polska polityka w punkcie zwrotnym* by Michał Szuldrzyński
50. *Bojkot za każdą cenę* by Mirosław Żukowski
51. *Putin zmylił Zachód* by Jędrzej Bielecki
52. *Czas na solidarność i odpowiedzialność* by Michał Szuldrzyński
53. *Gdy Putin zablokuje nam bankomat* by Michał Szuldrzyński
54. *Wojna u bram* by Bogusław Chrabota
55. *Egzamin przed Historią* by Michał Szuldrzyński
56. *Czy Putin pójdzie dalej* by Bogusław Chrabota
57. *Nie możemy zostać sami przeciw Rosji* by Mirosław Żukowski
58. *Czy Władimir Putin pójdzie dalej* by Bogusław Chrabota
59. *Strachy na Lachy* by Michał Szuldrzyński
60. *Ukraina bez dobrego wyjścia* by Jędrzej Bielecki
61. *Putin robi wielki krok ku wojnie* by Jędrzej Bielecki
62. *Morawiecki w matni* by Bogusław Chrabota
63. *Prezydent decyduje nie tylko o wecie* by Zuzanna Dąbrowska
64. *Polska, Niemcy, Rosja i Ziobro* by Artur Bartkiewicz
65. *Bubel prawny zaszkodził TVN7* by Wiktor Ferfecki
66. *Oszolamiający sukces Prezesa* Michał Szuldrzyński
67. *Zawiedziony jak Jarosław Kaczyński* by Michał Szuldrzyński
68. *Cywilizacja na opak* by Jerzy Haszczyński
69. *Pokerowa rozgrywka wokół Ukrainy* by Jędrzej Bielecki
70. *Krok w tył daje pole do negocjacji* by Michał Szuldrzyński
71. *Takie mamy państwo...* by Zuzanna Dąbrowska
72. *Znaki nadchodzącej wojny* by Jerzy Haszczyński

73. *Europoseł Patryk w piaskownicy* by Artur Bartkiewicz
74. *Wielka orkiestra (ds.) państwowej wszechmocy* by Bogusław Chrabota
75. *Niedzielski – minister, który zawiódł wszystkich* by Artur Bartkiewicz
76. *Machiavelli i żaba* by Artur Ilgner
77. *Politycy powinni posłuchać wyborców* by Jędrzej Bielecki
78. *Minister Czarnek traci siłę przebicia* by Joanna Ćwiek
79. *Polskie szachy polityczne* by Bogusław Chrabota
80. *Grzechy ciężkie w Janowie* by Bogusław Chrabota
81. *Dzień politycznych cudów* by Michał Szuldrzyński
82. *Pouczająca porażka* by Michał Szuldrzyński
83. *Bo to zła ustawa była* by Michał Szuldrzyński
84. *Powrót do pierwszej ligi* by Jerzy Haszczyński
85. *Poselska zrzutka na Polski Ład* by Zuzanna Dąbrowska
86. *Cyfrowi giganci zdejmują maski* by Michał Płociński
87. *Michniewicz - selekcyoner z disco polo* by Stefan Szczepłak
88. *Wbrew polskiej racji stanu* by Jerzy Haszczyński
89. *Lex Kaczyński nie ma szans w Sejmie* by Zuzanna Dąbrowska
90. *Folwark Łukaszenki* by Rusłan Szoszy
91. *Pojedynek czy loteria* by Michał Szuldrzyński
92. *Coraz więcej wątpliwości* by Michał Szuldrzyński
93. *Ratują nas pracownicy ze wschodu* by Bogusław Chrabota
94. *PiS chce wziąć opozycję na litość* by Michał Szuldrzyński
95. *Rozmawiać ponad głową pani kurator* by Zuzanna Dąbrowska
96. *Kto tu pierwszy mrugnie* by Zuzanna Dąbrowska
97. *Znowu została nam tylko Ameryka* by Jerzy Haszczyński
98. *Z piątą falą pandemii będą walczyć słupki* by Joanna Ćwiek
99. *Rok charakteryzatorów* by Joanna Szczepkowska
100. *Gdzie jest rozum Barbary Nowak?* by Joanna Ćwiek
101. *Mur stawiamy tylko na granicy* by Joanna Ćwiek

Appendix 2

Modal adverbs and evidentials found in the corpus:

The Guardian

Modal adverbs	
Type	Markers
Certainty and Doubt	<i>Likely, certainly, perhaps, unlikely, more likely, of course, probably, improbably, arguably, maybe, doubtless, definitely, no doubt, undoubtedly, most likely,</i>
Actuality and reality	<i>In fact,</i>
Other	<i>Kind of, like, sort of, so to speak, mainly, roughly,</i>

Evidentials	
Type	Markers
Experiential	<i>Seem, that shows, it was a clear example, it seemed, he had made clear statements, obviously, clearly, seemingly, obvious, it is clear, It's never been clearer, evident, The pattern is now clear; But what is clear is that, evidently,</i>
Cognitive	<i>I know, I suppose, I think, I believe, we know, presumably,</i>
Communicative	<i>As the Observer story showed, as he puts it, from that perspective, as John Maynard Keynes famously quipped; As the Observer reports, according to, as Bilingham says, as Eden Harper calls them, as Hawley noted, apparently, As the site's lead archaeologist, Dr Rachel Wood, said, As the Good Law Project's Jolyon Maugham puts it,</i>

The Telegraph

Modal adverbs	
Type	Markers
Certainty and Doubt	<i>Perhaps, maybe, likely, certainly, unlikely, no doubt, of course, unlikely, no doubt, probably, undoubtedly, arguably, I have no doubt, definitely, more likely,</i>

Actuality and reality	<i>In fact, actually,</i>
Other	<i>It sounds like, sort of, it was like, kind of, so to speak, typically, roughly,</i>

Evidentials	
Type	Markers
Experiential	<i>Obvious, that seems, it was quite clear, clearly, appear, appearing, that shows, appear, seemingly, it is abundantly clear, appears, appeared, that reveals, obviously, evident, most of us have experienced, I have experienced, we have seen,</i>
Cognitive	<i>I know, I think, that means, we know, presumably, they know, you know, I don't know, presumably, I believe, whatever that means, we have come to the conclusion,</i>
Communicative	<i>This suggests, I say that, according to, As Lord Frost said, In the view of Jim Allister, apparently, Research suggests, in my view, as Jacob Rees-Mogg later put it, as Frances Haugan said, it implies,</i>

Gazeta Wyborcza

Modal adverbs	
Type	Markers
Certainty and Doubt	<i>Może, zdecydowanie, oczywiście, zapewne, być może, pewnie, raczej, niewątpliwie, prawdopodobnie, na pewno, chyba, najprawdopodobniej, niby, bez wątpienia, z pewnością, jakoby</i>
Actuality and reality	<i>Rzeczywiście, faktycznie,</i>
Other	

Evidentials	
Type	Markers
Experiential	<i>Wydaje się, oczywiste, wyraźnie, jawnie, najwyraźniej,</i>
Cognitive	<i>Myślę, sądzę</i>
Communicative	<i>Widać, rzekomo, mówi się,</i>

Rzeczpospolita

Modal adverbs	
Type	Markers
Certainty and Doubt	<i>Raczej, może, oczywiście, na pewno, zapewne, z pewnością, jakoby, niewątpliwie, chyba, być może, zdecydowanie, bez wątpienia, pewnie, prawdopodobnie, niezdecydowanie,</i>
Actuality and reality	<i>Faktycznie, rzeczywiście,</i>
Other	

Evidentials	
Type	Markers
Experiential	<i>Oczywiste, najwyraźniej, wydaje się, ewidentnie, wyraźnie, jawnie,</i>
Cognitive	<i>Muszę,</i>
Communicative	<i>Podobno, według, zdaniem ministra obrony, jego zdaniem, jej zdaniem, zdaniem Bidena, rzekomo, zdaniem polityków SP, zdaniem komisarza,</i>