

A Situational Semantic Analysis of Evidentiality in Jeff Abbott's *Panic*

Asst. Prof. Jasim Mohammed Hasan
Shatt Al Arab University College

Abstract

Situation semantics is an information-based theory that seeks to understand linguistic utterances in terms of the information conveyed. It provides a relational theory of meaning, aiming to unearth and analyze the meaning of words and the consequent relations between them. Language, in its essence, is a generic representation of information or events that can be construed in different and various ways. Thus, a situational semantic analysis helps to decipher the hidden, concealed emotions, schemes and intentions. Linguistic evidentiality is the category, wherein, the information source is coded in the sentence. There are two main types of evidential present in structured sentences, namely, direct evidence (audio, visual and sensory) and indirect evidence (inferential, reported and reasoning). The present study aims to conduct an empirical analysis of evidentiality in Jeff Abbott's *Panic*, through analysing evidentiality markers to show how these markers affect readers' comprehension of events, and create a sense of suspense.

Keywords: Situation semantic, evidentiality, Panic, Jeff Abbott, evidential markers

Introduction

Introduced by mathematician Jon Barwise (1980), Situation Semantics is “a mathematically based theory of natural language semantics.” The theory of situation semantics was developed with the contribution by John Perry and other philosophers in the 1980s and was initially presented in the book *Situations and Attitudes*, written by Perry and Barwise (Delvin, 2011:1). Initially, the theory of situation semantics was perceived as synthetic, having a mathematical ontology constructed on a theory that has been predominantly set. Perry and Barwise talk of the situation in the paper, *The Situation Underground* as:

“The world consists not just of objects, or of objects, properties, and 1 relations, but of objects having properties and standing in relations to one another. And there are parts of the world, clearly recognized (although not precisely individuated) in common sense and human language. These parts of the world are called situations. Events and episodes are situations in time, scenes are visually perceived situations, changes are sequences of situations, and facts are situations enriched (or polluted) by language” (The Situation Underground, 1980). (ibid: 1-2)

Situations are a critical part of the world, and the mathematical concepts that are used in the situation theory, as well as the situation semantics, are considered as real parts that exist in the world. The situation semantics administers a ‘relational theory of meaning,’ portraying the meaning of an expression as a relation that exists between the discourse situation or the utterance, a situation that has been described and the speaker’s connection function. The Situation theory, under which the *Situation Semantics Analysis* is entrenched, is facilitating and influencing the

oscillation and wavering of information (Remberger, 2011: 2). It is convenient as well as applicable as a method that is used in the analysis of the semantic phenomena. The situation semantics was initially developed as a realistic approach that dealt with the semantics of the propositional attitudes. Developed by Keith Devlin (1980), as a theory of information it was later on transformed into a formal model that portrayed the flow of information. Concerned with the epistemic properties linked to information, situation semantic theory aimed at bringing ontology back into the field of information theory and semantics. Situation semantic analyses information and the explanations are intrinsically based on the several numbers of ontological categories. Ontologically new, the situation semantics theory considers the linguistic phenomena as well. Considered as the most controversial theories in formal semantics, the situation theory is developed as an amalgam of three concepts such as the attunement, constraints, and partiality (Papafragou et al, 2011: 2). Rupp and Umist (1989: 308) explain these concepts as follows:

“Attunement: an organism must be attuned to similarities between situations, what we have called uniformities, and to relationships that obtain between these uniformities... (Barwise & Perry, 10).

Constraints: systematic relations of a special sort between different types of the situation... These systematic constraints are what allow one situation to contain information about another. Attunement to these constraints is what allows an agent to pick up information from one situation about another. (Barwise & Perry, 94).

Partiality: Situation types are partial. They don't say everything there is to say about everyone or even everything about the individuals appearing in the situation type. (Barwise & Perry, 9)”.

The amalgamation of the main features, i.e., attunement, constraints, and partiality are based on the relation theory in meaning. Naturally, language and its

expressions carry only a limited extent of information, therefore producing only a partial image of the utterances and the situations that are described. Situational semantics plays a critical role in creating a clear distinction between the meaning and the interpretation of utterances and it enables a definite and coherent interpretation of the situation that is being described. That is, the described situation becomes the precise echo of the actual situation (Blackwell, 2004). As the sentences only carry the meaning of the situation and not the original essence of it, the situation semantic theory acts as the mirror that reflects the utterance in its original contingency. The situation semantic theory is further classified on the basis of the utterance situation, and it is enclosed by differing types of information, that is; speaker connections and discourse situation. The speaker connections are implicated in the linguistic attunement, which is shared between the listener and the speaker for effective communication. In speaker connections, the discourse situation, the described situation, and the speaker connections are connected to each other, creating a relation. The speaker connections vary according to the different authors that describe them. It is, basically, a set of definite constraints that are rooted in culture and the speakers of any particular language are attuned (Pereltsvaig, 2012). This allows the speakers of the language to assign the exact meaning to the occurrences and the expressions of it.

On the other hand, discourse situation is a critical part of the utterance situation and deals with the facts that are external to the utterance or the discourse. The external elements that discourse situation considers are the identity of the listener and the speaker, the spatial and the temporal location of the conversation. It often takes the information regarding the mental state of the listener as well as the speaker into consideration while determining the discourse situation. It is critical to embed the discourse situation before the determination of the interpretation. As compared to the traditional semantic theories such as the Montague Semantics, the

recent situation semantic theories vary in several aspects. When compared to the Situation Semantic theory, the traditional theories focus on the true condition and is valued over the content of the utterance (Recanati, 2006: 19). The sentence is interpreted through a set of words that can possibly act as the meaning of the utterances. It is through these words the answer to the possible questions are determined. The interpretations can often result in situations where the meaning of the sentence is completely altered than what the utterance conveyed. This has resulted in the Berman and Perry suggesting that partial interpretations have the potential to conjoin all the necessary truths (ibid: 20).

Situation Semantics is the philosophy of language, developed as the alternative to the theory of formal truth-conditional semantics by Tarski. Under situational semantics, the meaning of a sentence is not directly produced by the truth conditions. In order to determine the meaning pertaining to a specific sentence, the relation of the sentence to the situation during which it has been uttered, and the information regarding the speaker of the sentence are relevant. The meaning that is pertaining to the expression simply cannot be expressed through the way the expression has been used by a speaker (Recanati, 2006: 19). In order to describe the meaning of the expression used, the relation between the circumstances where the expression has been used has to be extracted. In a way, situation semantics is described as the alternative that has been developed as the alternative to 'possible world semantics.' Linguistic expressions are examined by considering the partial words rather than the complete words. There is no restraint or constraint as to what the situations are, what the possible words are or what the events are. According to the Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy (2017), situations in the situation semantics are;

“Structured entities consisting of relations and individuals standing in those relations”(Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, 2017).

And also;

“Situations are particulars” (Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, 2017).

Although there are several foundational issues relating to situation semantics, the partiality approach developed by the situation semantics has led to the conjoining of fresh approaches that are genuine in nature. Stojanovic (2011: 2-3) describes situational semantics in eight different variations of themes, such as;

- Partiality: partial is considered as the exception, where it only gives the partial idea. It only gives us a part of the reality, and the rest of the utterance is left open.
- The efficiency of language: under this, it is stated that the same words can be used in various situations and contexts to refer to different things.
- A relational theory of meaning: under this theory, it is maintained that the meaning of an utterance is to be seen as the standing relationship between the situations. The relational theory of meaning states that it is not an independent entity that can be detached from the language and the world.
- Constraints and uniformities: Under this theory, it is shown that the different types of uniformities aid the agents in easily classifying the reality. This classification enhances the capacity and aids in coping up with the new situations. *“It helps the agents cope with the new situations that continually arise, and constraints are then seen as uniformities that arise among the ways in which situations relate to one another, while attunement to such constraints enables cognitive agents to "pick up information about one situation from another”*.

- Reference relation and the relata: It is the “*account of reference that departs from the standard account on two scores, instead of taking reference to be a relation between a sentence and its truth value, it takes it to be a relation between utterances and (other) situations; secondly, instead of taking reference to be relation between a name (or another singular term) and an individual, it takes it to be a relation again between utterances (of those terms) and other situations*”. It grounds the utterances on the relations that are held between the individuals in this sort of situations (to the speaker on the one hand and to the person being referred to on the other hand).
- Truth as the uniformity, across different situations: Under this theory, it is strongly stated that the truth is simply the device that aids in the classification of situations. That is, “*truth partitions situations of a certain type, in particular, utterance situations, in terms of a certain property that they share, viz. that there is some (appropriately related) situation that they accurately describe*”.
- Attitude reports and semantic innocence: Under this theory, the need to encompass the same meaning of information at its time of utterance. It includes constructions such as ‘believes that,’ ‘sees’ etc.
- The primacy of situations: Where there is both an epistemological and metaphysical point of view and is encompassed of situations while the other present categories such individuals, locations, properties, etc. emerge as uniformities.

Linguistic evidentiality is the category, wherein, the information source is coded in the sentence. Linguistic evidentiality is the indication of the nature of the evidence that is produced regarding a given statement. Linguistic evidentiality

examines and probes into ascertaining of the evidence, in fact, and if it does exist as assumed, it examines the factuality behind the evidence. Evidentiality is described as '*the linguistic encoding of the information source*.' Linguistic evidentiality acts as a bridge between the human thoughts and language. Language and thought are interlinked with each other, but have differing perspectives and varying developments (Gentner & Boroditsky, 2001). Studies have revealed that linguistic evidentiality has the ability to audit and oversee the origin as well as the development of a person's belief. Human beings have the ability to reason the evidence that influenced one to invest the belief in, i.e., one has the ingenuity to decide if something was told to them, if they had witnessed it or if the event had taken place on the basis of evidence that is available in nature. Evidentiality states that each person differs from the other and has varying opinions when compared to each other (Papafragou et al, 2011: 1).

The evidentiality markers in the English language act as the distinctions that encode the source distinctions. Basically, evidential markers are lexical in nature. Evidentiality or evidential markers are classified into two different basic categories, i.e., direct access or perception and indirect access. The direct access is encompassed of evidence in the form of audio, visual and sensory. The indirect access is encompassed of a report from others, reasoning and influential. The evidential or the evidentiality markers are based on the reliability of the informational sources that are relevant and legit.

The evidentiality scale produces pragmatic effects such as assuming the informative quality of the speaker (Papafragou et al, 2011: 5). Evidentiality examines the relationship between language and the conceptual/intentional systems of an individual (Hauser, Chomsky and Fitch, 2002: 1569).

'Panic' by Jeff Abbott

Born in 1963, Jeff Abbott is regarded as the most eminent of the suspense writers in the United States of America. The American literature of suspense fictions holds a special spot for Abbot and his novels. Began his career as a detective fiction writer, Abbot turned to writing thriller fiction soon. The central theme of Abbot's novels is, the idea of ordinary people getting caught up in danger that is extraordinary as compared to their daily normal life and fights to get a hold of the old life back. Abbott has been a bestseller in Australia, Ireland, France and the United Kingdom. The first ever novel of Abbott 'The Jordan Poteet mysteries' was published in 1994 and late on continued to write and publish several thriller fictions all around the globe. A number of Abbott's novels have been converted into movies, considering the well-structured plot, theme, and characters Abbott incorporate in the novels¹. Abbot has been called as 'one of the best thriller writers in the business' by the Washington Post (2010), and the novels have been called as 'compulsively readable' by the Chicago Sun-Times (2011). The novels *Panic*, *Collision*, and *Adrenaline* are being made into movies and are under script development. The novel *Panic* was nominated for the Thriller Award².

The novel, *Panic* was written in 2005 and was regarded as one of the most renowned works of Jeff Abbott. The novel revolves around the life of 24-year-old Evan Casher, a documentary filmmaker who leads a very normal life. Everything takes a turn when Evan receives a call from his mother asking him to rush home to her, in urgency.

"When the phone woke Evan Casher, he knew something was wrong"
(*Panic*, Ch. 1).

¹https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jeff_Abbott

²<https://jeffabbott.com/about/>

Confused, Evan packs his bag with essentials such as his laptop and work-related documents and videos and starts the two-hour drive to his mother in Austin. But, everything topples down when Evan reaches home and finds his mother on the floor, dead. Murdered. A shocked Evan was attacked by two people and escapes death as another man comes to his rescue. Unable to make ends meet, Evan contacts the police who initiates the investigation of his mother's death. As the story prolongs, Evan comes to realize that his whole life has been an intrinsically constructed lie and his mother and father hid the truths from him, leaving him more confused and helpless. The other major characters in the novel are Mr. Casher (Evan's father), Carrie (the girl Evan had recently met and fell in love with) and The Deeps. The plot thickens as the readers are brought to the revelation that Evan's mother had a list of the name of the members and clients of the secret organization called The Deeps and that it is suspected that the copy of the names has reached the hands of Evans. The members of the secret organization kill his mother and attempt to murder Evan, in order to avoid the public reach of The Deeps. Evan is caught between the struggle to avenge his mother's death, find his father, and find out the truth about Carrie and to uncover the secrets that controlled his past, present, and his future. Throughout the novel, Abbott has developed a sense of mystery behind the portrayal of Carrie, with Evan being unable to find out about the lenience Carrie has; towards the CIA or The Deeps.

Similar to the protagonist of Jeff Abbott, the readers are left assuming. There is a sense of uncertainty that Abbott has portrayed throughout the novel, where nobody can come to a conclusion without the author providing any information regarding it. Evan's helplessness in a state of horror where everything depends on him finding the truth behind his identity. The only hope Evan has in surviving is to discover the truth that stays hidden beneath it all. The novel *Panic* has received well-acclaimed criticism on Abbott's writings skills of creating a sense of mystery

even in the smallest of places. The book was well received for its amalgam of themes, bringing family and love together to create a tragedy that was globally sympathized with¹.

“...it’s a smart, intelligent thriller that keeps you unsteady and guessing throughout, combining the best elements of such novels as MARATHON MAN and nearly everything that Robert Ludlum ever wrote, and whipping it into a verbal frenzy that is all Abbott’s own.”

—Joe Hartlaub, BookReporter.com

“...beautifully written and sensitively read.... Ganser brings all of Abbott’s many characters—the killers, the baffled police, and the ambiguous Carrie, who might be working for the enemy—to instant, unhyped life, letting Abbott’s story about a man whose past has been an elaborate pretense unwind with breath-catching strength.”

—Publishers Weekly

“Panic isn’t just good. Abbott’s an award-winning mystery author, but with Panic, Abbott clearly takes his writing to another level. The plotting is nothing short of brilliant. It reads like a rocket-propelled roller coaster ride, and the surprises are genuine surprises, especially the stunner at the end. Evan Casher is an intriguing, layered character, but Abbott doesn’t let his deft characterizations get in the way of his plot or slow the story. With Panic, Abbott can safely take his seat alongside Harlan Coben, Dan Brown and John LeCarre. He’s that good.”

—Mark Terry, the Oakland Press²

Situational Semantic Analysis

¹<https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/884204.Panic>

²These three quotes are from: https://jeffabbott.com/book_praise/panic/

Situational semantics aids in the development of a relational theory of meaning and provides a relational theory of meaning, aiming to unearth and analyze the meaning of words and the consequent relations between the words. With the help of the evidentiality markers, the researcher aims to decipher the hidden, concealed emotions, schemes and intentions. In order to examine the hidden intentions and schemes present in the novel, the researcher aims to analyze the evidential present in the novel with the help of the evidentiality markers. The language English does not have evidential that are grammaticalized. In the English language when there is a dialogue like '*The old woman did it!*' the readers are not given a clear image as to the authenticity of it. One can never be sure if it is indeed the old woman who committed whatever it was that she was accused of (Moss, 2010). The readers are unclear as to if the person who said the dialogue has witnessed the old woman committing the crime, heard some other person making the accusation against the old woman, or inferred the old woman's guilt from any sort of indirect evidence such as fingerprints on the weapon that was used to commit the crime. In other languages such as Tuyaca, Turkish, Serbian, Yukaghir, etc. situations like these have expressions that portray the exact meaning of the situations rather than giving out assumptions that are unclear and often confusing. Making use of the evidentiality markers in English, the researcher aims to find the hidden emotions and messages that are incorporated in the novel by the author. According to Gurajek (2010:72), the types of evidentiality markers in English are as follows;

Table 1: Types of Evidentiality in the English language.

Evidentiality Type	Representations in English

Direct	Visual Auditory Tactile Olfactory Gustatory		<p>1. Subject – perceiver verbs: see, hear, feel, taste, and smell.</p> <p>(first person subject)</p>
Indirect	Inferred	Deductive	<p>1. Subject-perceiver verbs: see, hear, feel, taste, and smell (followed by ‘that’ clause).</p> <p>2. Subject-percept verbs: look, sound, feel, smell, taste (followed by like).</p> <p>3. verbs seem and appear</p> <p>4. modal verb must</p> <p>5. Modal adverb: perhaps, probably, certainly.</p>
		Assumptive	<p>1. verbs seem and appear</p> <p>2. the modal verb <i>will</i></p>
		Quotative	<p>1. Subject-perceiver verbs: see, hear, feel, taste, and smell. (Third Person Subject)</p> <p>2. Subject-percept verbs: look, sound, feel, smell, taste. (Past Tense)</p>

	Reported		3. verbs seem and appear 4. reported speech
		Hearsay	1. verbs seem and appear 2. reported speech 3. Expressions: I've heard, I've been told, He/she is said to be, etc. 4. adverbs: apparently, reportedly, supposedly, allegedly

The evidential markers as developed by Gurajek (2010) is a modified version of the Palmer's (2001) idea of evidential and evidential markers. Popovc (2010), points out the similarities that Gurajek and Palmer have in the classification of evidentiality, which also has similarities to the categorizations as proposed by Aikhenvald (Niketic, 2016:46).

By analyzing the excerpt from *Panic* by Jeff Abbott, the current study aims to find the incorporation of hidden emotions, schemes and intentions of the writer through the actions of the characters in the novel. Being a mystery – thriller novel, *Panic* has the incorporation of hidden and concealed emotions. It is the core of mystery novels to have concealed ideas, to create a sense of anticipation in the readers. In accessing the evidential markers in the novel, which may act as the evidence to clarify a scene or a situation, the researcher will discuss both direct and indirect evidentiality.

Direct and Indirect Evidentiality in "*Panic*"

In this part of the paper, the researcher will investigate the evidential markers in Jeff Aboott's *Panic*. More specifically, the two types of evidentiality, direct and indirect, will be analyzed to find out how these types function as tools serving the intension of the writing, and increasing the suspense for readers.

1. Direct Evidentiality

First, the analysis shows that the direct evidential markers used are few in number, as explained in the table below:

Table (1): Direct Evidentiality in *Panic*

No.	Evidential Marker	No. of occurrences
1	Hear/ heard	23
2	See/ saw	22
3	Feel	5

According to Gurajek, as stated earlier, direct evidential markers can be visual, auditory, tactile, olfactory, or gustatory. In the analysis of the novel, it has been found that only three direct evidential markers are identified: auditory (hear), visual (see), and tactile (feel). Below are examples from the novel on direct evidentially.

Hear

*'Carrie. I **heard** nothing from you this morning. For almost two hours. P. 30*

*'I **heard** a hiss.' For the first time Carrie heard a tremble in Dezz's voice. P. 82*

*At least what I **heard** in the rare moments I gave you any thought.' He tipped a stream onto Gabriel's cut. 'The drink you wanted. Enjoy.' P. 98*

*'Their voices ... I **heard** their voices. I'm sure.' Pretty sure, he thought. But not one hundred percent sure. P. 136*

*'I **hear** an idiot pissing his pants.' Dezz pushed Evan up the back-porch steps, his gun nestled at the back of Evan's head P. 296*

See

*'That fucker scared the piss out of me. I **see** him again, he's dead.' Then Dezz – small but wiry, with a look in his eyes as if he always had a fever – P. 27*

*She had a warm, Southern accent and sounded as if she ought to be a friend's sweet mother. '**See** if you see what I see.' P. 60*

*So we could talk to you, if you or Mr. Gabriel was in possession of the phone. And I **see** that you are.' P. 109*

*Shadey shook his head. 'It's not nice to **see** you. No fucking way nice to **see** you. I got an FBI agent I'm supposed to call if I **see** your smiling face.' P. 120*

'I see you sitting on your ass, pointing a gun. You're not even close,' Dezz said. 'Put the gun down. Come inside. Or I'll march back inside and I'll break your father's spine. P. 295

Feel

'Your mother trusted me, and I failed her. I feel responsible. But remember, I shot through the rope, I saved your life.' P. 77

'I know. I feel the same. You would have liked my father, Evan.' P. 203

'It's oddly liberating to tell you what I always kept secret. I feel like I'm shedding an old coat.' P. 228

2. Indirect Evidentiality

Unlike direct evidential markers, the analysis shows that the number of indirect evidentiality markers is noticeably bigger. As the table below shows, different types of indirect evidentiality have been revealed in the novel:

Table (1): Direct Evidentiality in *Panic*

No.	Evidential Marker	No. of occurrences
1	See/ saw	186
2	Hear/ heard	81
3	Feel / felt	30
4	Taste/ tasted	7

5	Smell/ smelt	5
6	Appear/ appeared	16
7	Seem/ seemed	31
8	Look like	12
9	Sound	11
10	Must	48
11	Will	86
12	Perhaps	4
13	Probably	25
14	Certainly	3
15	Apparently	3
16	Reportedly	1
17	Supposedly	4
18	Allegedly	1

It is clear that visual and auditory indirect markers, *see* and *hear* respectively, are the most frequent markers. All the occurrences of these verbs are associated with second and third person subjects. The verb "see" is used 186 times. Below are some examples:

See

Evan wanted to twist around, see the man's face, but he couldn't. The noose tightened, pulling savagely into Evan's throat.P. 6

The last thing Evan saw was the speedometer inching past ninety as Gabriel slammed his fist into Evan's head, sending it smashing into the driver's window, and the world went black.P. 24

'Well, I would think whoever killed his mama didn't want him talking about what he saw. My worry is that the Austin police done let Evan down, letting him get kidnapped.P. 57

'No,' she said. 'No, he doesn't. I'm sure of it.'
She could see he didn't believe her. She poured coffee. Jargo came out of his room, pale.P. 64

Gabriel laughed, a cold, sick sound. 'You don't tell them shit, son. They don't stop. They hunt you till they find you, they see what you know, and if you know too much, then they kill you.P. 68

'Your house—' Gabriel gasped, and a second bullet hit him, this time in the shoulder. Gabriel shrieked, twisted in the dirt with a stunned look on his face. Evan could see a man's legs walking toward him.P. 86

She did not see the men following her from across the street, staggered apart by thirty yards, all three closing in on her.P. 222

Additionally, the verb "hear", as an indirect marker, is used 81 times. The examples below shows how the verb is used as indirect evidence:

Hear

*The naked, almost frightening neediness – a tone he had never **heard** in his mother's voice – made her sound like a stranger to him. 'Um, okay, Mom, I can leave in an hour or so.'* **P. 2**

*Evan **heard** another eruption of shots, the sound of weight crashing into shrubbery outside the windows.*

Then an awful silence. **P. 7**

*The police might have **heard** the attack over the radio. Or Carrie, she might be calling 911 in Houston and reporting the attack. Or a busybody on this street might be peeking out his window, dialing for help. The cops might arrive at any second.* **P. 20**

*A minute later he **heard** the tread of feet on stairs. Then the rasp of a key in a lock. The bedroom door opened; Gabriel stood in the doorway. A sleek black pistol holstered at his side.* **P. 45**

*Did you kill my mother? He'd **heard** two voices, that he was sure of, but this was only one guy.* **P. 87**

*Evan **heard** a slight sound, two sharp thweets, maybe an alarm peep announcing a door had opened and closed.* **P. 217**

*'He's coming,' Carrie said. Evan **heard** the panic rise in her voice. A dim glow shone when she switched on his phone.* **P. 306**

Will, Must, Seem and Probably

Other indirect evidentiality markers with high frequencies are: *will*, *must*, *seem* and *probably*, which have often implied uncertainty, unfulfilled intensions, and assumptions:

*I get you out of the country, provide you a new identity and access to a bank account in the Caymans, which your mother had me arrange. If you're careful, no one **will** ever find you.***P. 47**

*But soon the authorities **will** be looking to anyone who knows me for information.***P. 227**

*'She **must** have been afraid if she was packing your dad's gun.'*

*'I just don't know.'***P. 10**

*The other information. Khan **must** have it all – the name of every Deep, every financial account they used, every detail of their operations. No wonder Jargo wanted him dead. 'I want a copy of every file.'***P. 230**

*'I don't know if he knew or not. I'm telling you what his mother knew. He... he doesn't **seem** to know much.'*

*'Does he know or not?'***P. 100**

*He **probably** gave them your mom's computer password so Jargo could look for the files.***P. 67**

*She'd snapped pictures in Dover, stolen the military data. Delivered the goods to Khan. But **probably** not here, not in his safe spot. She'd probably handed him the stolen data and photos on a CD, in a park, in a theater, in a café.***P. 240**

Discussion of Results

As revealed in the statistics and tables, the writer has used the indirect evidentiality markers more than the direct ones. The information conveyed and events reported are brought to readers through third-party people, not the speaker. The author has made use of the markers as a means of reflecting the feeling and emotions of the characters according to the course of the story. However, there is a sense of uncertainty in the dialogues that leaves the readers with different assumptions. This sort of uncertainty is caused by the use of indirect markers. The author has portrayed the information as being reported by someone, reasoned and inferred as well. At times, it can be because the source is irrelevant to the situation. The adverbs apparently, reportedly and allegedly are employed so as to define the passive constructions that are present in the novel.

Through incorporating "see" and "hear", most of the events and information are seen or heard by other people. Moreover, the uses of "see" and "hear" as direct evidence are often related to normal events, which hardly play a role in helping readers get knowledge of the plot of the story, or make correct assumptions.

In addition to the various indirect evidence markers discussed above, the researcher has found that a huge number of indirect reported "hearsay" words has been used. The verb "said" has been used with third person subjects 641 times. Therefore, it becomes clear that the majority of events depicted in the novel are expressed through third party people. This has, the researcher believes, played a significant role in increasing the degree of uncertainty in the mind of readers, to

such an extent that the readers can difficultly infer or expect what is coming. The table below shows the uses of the indirect reported hearsay "said" with different subjects:

Table (3): The Uses of "said" with First, Second, and Third Person Subjects

No.	Kind of Subject	No. of Occurrences
1	With 1 st person	9
2	With 2 nd person	2
3	With 3 rd person	641

The table above shows two valuable points. First, reported speech, as indirect evidence, is a main technique in the novel to uncover information and actions to readers. Second, the information source, as conveyed by other people, is not specified and ascertained. The examples below show how important events and information are stated by others:

*'Thank you for not asking questions right now,' she **said**. 'I love you and I'll see you soon, and I'll explain everything.'* **P. 2**

*'Be still,' a voice **said**. 'Or you're dead.' It was a young man's voice. Amused, saying dead in a cruel singsong. Day-ed.* **P. 6**

Durless said. 'He, according to you, chased the killers off, called you by name, claimed he was a friend of your mom's, and tried to get you to leave with him.P. 11

The reporter said two officers were beaten and injured and gave a description of Evan Casher and a bald-headed assailant.P. 28

'Dezz,' Jargo said in a cold voice. 'His father is a crack shot. It's not unreasonable that he might have taught Evan about guns. 'P. 93

Conclusion

Having carried out a situational semantic analysis of evidentiality in Jeff Abbott's *Panic*, the researcher has arrived at some concrete conclusions. As a text full of evidentiality markers, it has been found that the number of indirect evidence markers is noticeably bigger when compared to those direct ones. Those markers, it is moreover revealed, play an influential role in creating uncertainty and suspense in the mind of readers. With such a mystery novels, this technique, uncovering the events, facts and information through evidential markers, proves to be a successful one, as the element of mystery is maximized, leaving the readers of the novel assuming about the events and what to come.

References

- Abbott, J. (2004). **Panic**. Penguin: US.
- Barwise, J. and Perry, J. (1983). **Situations and Attitudes**. Bradford Books: MIT Press.
- Blackwell. (2004). **Situational semantics**. *Blackwell Reference Online*. doi: 10.1111/b.9781405106795.2
- Devlin, K. (2011). **Situation Theory and Situation Semantics**. Center for the Study of Language and Information, 12-60.
- Gujarek, B. (2010). **EVIDENTIALITY IN ENGLISH AND POLISH**. *Types of Evidentiality*. MSc by Research Linguistics. The University of Edinburgh.
- Hauser, M. et al (2002). **The Faculty of Language: What Is It, Who Has It, and How Did It Evolve**. Vol. 298, No. 5598 (Nov. 22, 2002), pp. 1569-1579.
- Niketic, P. (2016). **EVIDENTIALITY IN ENGLISH AND SERBIANQUALITY DAILY PRESS**. *Linguistics and Literature*, 14(1), 41-61.
- Papafragou, A. (2011). **Evidentiality in Language and Cognition**. HHS Public Access, 1-10. doi: 10.1016/j.cognition.2006.04.001
- Pereltsvaig, A. (2012). **Evidential markers in Yukaghir languages**. *Languages of the world*.
- Recanati, F. (2006). **Pragmatics and Semantics**. In **Handbook of Pragmatics**. Eds. Laurence Horn and Gregory Ward. Blackwell.
- Remberger, E. (2012). **Evidential markers and quotation**. *Studies in Language*, 12 (1), 51-97.

Rupp, C.J., and Umist C. (1989). **Situation Semantics and Machine Translation**.
<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/5dcb/dbeaa16e0da3e70e0f5853db44379297ff11.pdf>

Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy. (2017). **Situations in Natural Language Semantics**. Retrieved from, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/situations-semantics/>

Stojanovic, I. (2011). **Situation Semantics**. Chapter for the volume Introduction to the Philosophy of John Perry, ed. by Raphael van Riel.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jeff_Abbott

<https://jeffabbott.com/about/>

<https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/884204.Panic>