

## Evidential adjectives in Lithuanian academic discourse

**Anna Ruskan**

Department of English Philology

Vilnius University

Universiteto g. 5

LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania

Tel.: +370 5 2687 228

E-mail: anna.ruskan@flf.vu.lt

### Abstract

The present study explores the functional distribution of the neuter adjectives *akivaizdu* ‘evident, obvious’, *aišku* ‘clear’, *natūralu* ‘natural’ and *panašu* ‘likely’ in Lithuanian written academic discourse. The research focuses on the CTP (complement-taking-predicate) and parenthetical use of the adjectives and presents basic quantitative and qualitative findings of these patterns of use. The data have been collected from the Corpus of Academic Lithuanian represented by texts from biomedical sciences, humanities, physical sciences, social sciences and technological sciences.

The research shows that the adjectives under consideration primarily express the source of information the author uses for a claim but not the author’s degrees of commitment towards the proposition. These adjectives signal that the author obtains knowledge for the proposition through inferences based on external and/or internal sources of evidence. Inferences in academic discourse are intersubjective as they mark the availability of evidence to the reader.

**Key words:** evidential functions, inference, external sources of evidence, internal sources of evidence, intersubjectivity, argumentation, academic discourse

### 1 Introduction

The present study investigates functions of lexical evidential markers in written academic discourse. It is argued that these markers may play an important role in developing the author’s argumentation strategies and his/her relationship with the reader as they indicate and specify the sources of information the author uses for a claim (Wiemer 2006b;

Boye & Harder 2009). Lexical evidential markers include verbs, adjectives and adverbs (Chafe 1986) and such functional lexemes as particles, prepositions, and conjunctions (Wiemer 2006b). This is a fairly new field of research as most attention has been paid to the morphological coding of evidentiality (Anderson 1986; Willett 1988; Aikhenvald 2004).

The purpose of the present study is to identify evidential functions displayed by the neuter adjectives *akivaizdu* ‘evident, obvious’, *aišku* ‘clear’, *natūralu* ‘natural’ and *panašu* ‘likely’<sup>1</sup> in Lithuanian written academic discourse. The research focuses on the CTP (complement-taking-predicate) and parenthetical use of the adjectives, e.g.:

### CTP use

- (1) <...> *palyginus šias sąvokas akivaizdu, kad jos nėra tapačios.* (S)  
 ‘<...> having compared these concepts it is **evident** that they are not identical.’<sup>2</sup>

### Parenthetical use

- (2) *Kalba, aišku, yra priemonė, lemianti žmonių tarpusavio bendravimą.* (S)  
 ‘Language, **clearly/of course**, is a means that determines human communication.’

When the given adjectives function as CTPs, the most frequent type of complementation is *that*-clauses. Individual adjectives may also take *wh*-clauses, *if/whether*-clauses or infinitive-clauses. Unambiguous cases of parenthetical use refer to the adjectives in medial and final positions. In the initial position they are “syntactically indeterminate between matrix clauses (with *that* deleted) and true parentheticals” (Brinton 2008, 12) and thus considered as CTPs with a zero complementizer. The adjectives which do not take a complement clause are referred to as predicatives, e.g.:

### CTP use with a zero complementizer

- (3) <...> *ką išskiria muzika? Akivaizdu: iš praktinės kasdienybės ji išskiria garsą*  
 <...> (H)  
 ‘<...> what are the distinguishing features of music? It is **evident**: in everyday reality it marks sound <...>.’

### Predicative use

- (4) *Ar tai gali būti panašu į realybę?* (P)  
 ‘Can it be **similar** to reality?’

<sup>1</sup> The lexical correspondence of the Lithuanian feminine adjective form *panaš-i* and masculine form *panaš-us* is the English adjective *similar*, however the neuter form *panaš-u* used as a CTP corresponds to *likely*.

<sup>2</sup> All examples have been translated into English by the author of the article.

The present study examines the evidential functions of CTPs and parentheticals. The study raises the question as to whether structural differences contribute to different evidential functions of the neuter adjectives under analysis. Structural differences of the neuter adjectives are marked by their different English translation correspondences. When the adjectives *akivaizdu*, *aišku*, *natūralu* and *panašu* function as CTPs, their English translation correspondences are the adjectives *evident*, *obvious*, *clear*, *natural* and *likely*, while their parenthetical use is rendered by the adverbs *evidently*, *obviously*, *clearly*, *naturally* and *apparently*. More discussion on the possible cross-linguistic equivalents of neuter adjectives is provided in Section 3.

The study gives particular importance to the discussion of the role of the source of information in developing the author's argumentation strategies and his/her relationship with the reader. It is argued that different sources of evidence highlight the different roles of the author in academic discourse and that all sources of evidence are shared with the reader. The distribution of CTPs is also compared across different scientific disciplines, namely soft disciplines (humanities and social sciences) and hard disciplines (biomedical sciences, physical sciences and technological sciences).

## 2 Methods and data

The research has been conducted by applying a corpus-driven methodology, which has been very effective in the studies on modality, evidentiality and academic discourse (Simon-Vandenberg & Aijmer 2007; Aijmer 2008; Usonienė, Jasionytė 2010; Hyland 2006, 2008, 2009). The data have been obtained from the Corpus of Academic Lithuanian (Corpus Academicum Lithuanicum – CorALit, about 9 million words; <http://www.coralit.lt/>) which is comprised of academic texts published from 1999 to 2009. The corpus contains the sub-corpora of biomedical sciences (1, 638, 444 words), humanities (2, 028, 906 words), physical sciences (1, 527, 455 words), social sciences (1, 510, 981 words) and technological sciences (1, 964, 827 words). The texts represented include monographs, research articles, book reviews, abstracts, summaries, acknowledgements and textbooks.

After excluding the repeated occurrences of the adjectives *akivaizdu* 'evident, obvious', *aišku* 'clear', *natūralu* 'natural' and *panašu* 'likely' and their use in citations, the number of the analysed adjectives equals 1, 528. The overall number of the analysed occurrences and their frequency per 1000 words is given in Table 1.

Adjective	Raw frq	Frq/1000
<i>akivaizdu</i> ‘evident, obvious’	778	0.09
<i>aišku</i> ‘clear’	557	0.06
<i>natūralu</i> ‘natural’	139	0.02
<i>panašu</i> ‘likely’	54	0.01
<b>Total</b>	<b>1528</b>	<b>0.18</b>

Table 1. Number of occurrences and frequency per 1000 words in the CorALit

The most frequent neuter adjectives in the CorALit are *akivaizdu* ‘evident, obvious’, *aišku* ‘clear’ and *natūralu* ‘natural’, and the least frequent adjective is *panašu* ‘likely’. Such frequency can be motivated by the fact that the adjectives *akivaizdu* ‘evident, obvious’, *aišku* ‘clear’ and *natūralu* ‘natural’ refer to reliable sources of information, while the adjective *panašu* ‘likely’ can refer to sources which are insufficient or doubtful. As academic discourse is supposed to contain reliable sources and well-grounded arguments, the preference in the use of the adjectives becomes clear.

### 3 Background

Lexical evidential markers have been thoroughly studied in English academic discourse (Biber *et al.* 1999; Biber 2006). In English, evidential verbs, adjectives, nouns and adverbs have been primarily regarded as stance markers which express both the source of information and the author’s commitment towards the proposition, i.e. epistemic modality. The growing interest in the subject has also resulted in insightful studies on French academic discourse. Grossmann and Wirth (2007) have explored lexical markers of expectation in French from a comparative perspective with English, while Grossmann and Tutin (2010) have examined the evidential functions of the French verb *voir* ‘see’. In Lithuanian, the realizations of lexical evidentiality in academic discourse have been scarcely addressed as most attention has been devoted to the intensive exploration of morphological expressions of evidentiality (Gronemeyer 1997; Holvoet 2004, 2007; Lavine 2006; Wiemer 2006a) and studies on evidential verbs and particles in the language of the press and in fiction (Usonienė 2001, 2002, 2003; Wiemer 2007, 2010a, 2010b). There is no study related to academic discourse except for the consideration of the hedging functions of the evidential-epistemic adverbials *matyt* ‘evidently’, *tarsi* ‘as if’ and *mano nuomone/supratimu* ‘in my opinion/view’ in linguistics and medicine (Šinkūnienė 2011).

The morphosyntactic properties and functional distribution of the neuter adjectives *akivaizdu* ‘evident, obvious’, *aišku* ‘clear’, *natūralu* ‘natural’ and *panašu* ‘likely’ have

been addressed in Lithuanian linguistics but not within the category of evidentiality. The types of complement clauses the adjectives subordinate have been analysed by Tekorienė (1990), while their parenthetical use has been discussed by Akelaitis (1992). In both studies the neuter adjectives have been regarded as markers of epistemic modality. The adjectives *akivaizdu* ‘evident, obvious’ and *aišku* ‘clear’ have been considered as markers of certainty, the adjective *panašu* ‘likely’ as a marker of probability and the adjective *natūralu* ‘natural’ has been connected with expectation (Tekorienė 1990).

Cross-linguistically, when the neuter adjectives *akivaizdu* ‘evident, obvious’, *aišku* ‘clear’, *natūralu* ‘natural’ and *panašu* ‘likely’ function as parentheticals, they partially resemble the functions of the adverbs *evidently*, *obviously*, *clearly*, *naturally* and *apparently* in English (Simon-Vandenberg & Aijmer 2007) and the lexemes *oczywiście* ‘obviously, of course’, *naturalnie* ‘naturally’, *rzecz jasna/prosta* ‘clearly, of course’ in Polish (Tutak 2003). This functional similarity can be attributed to the slightly different functions of the corresponding Lithuanian adverbs *akivaizdžiai* ‘evidently, obviously’, *aiškiai* ‘clearly’, *natūraliai* ‘naturally’ and *panašiai* ‘similarly’. Preliminary research has shown that these adverbs frequently function as adverbs of manner and thus modify the verb or adjective phrase but not the entire proposition. In *Lithuanian grammar* (Ambrasas (ed.) 1997) neither the neuter adjectives under consideration nor the corresponding adverbs have been ascribed to the group of modal adverbs.

In the present study the neuter adjectives will be discussed against the background of the source of information, intersubjectivity and epistemic modality. An explanation of these notions is provided in the following paragraphs.

The notion of the source of information refers to the ways in which the speaker obtains the information for the proposition (Aikhenvald 2004). Its semantics is reflected in major typological taxonomies, in which the opposition is drawn between direct and indirect types of evidence (Willett 1988; Plungian 2001; Aikhenvald 2004) or sources of evidence which derive from the speaker or other people and are referred to as “SELF” and “OTHER” (Frawley 1992). Similarly to other European languages, in Lithuanian the formally marked evidential value is indirect evidence, indicating that the information for the proposition has been obtained through inferences or a verbal report.

In the current study inferences represent the most significant value. Drawing on Squartini’s classification of inferences in Romance languages (Squartini 2001, 2008), in this research they are distinguished by the criteria of external and internal sources of evidence referred to as “OTHER” and “SELF”. External sources of evidence may pertain to sensory evidence or reports, while internal sources of evidence may indicate the author’s knowledge of facts and assumptions. The sources of evidence “OTHER”

and “SELF” have turned out to be more revealing in defining inferences in academic discourse than the criteria of “perceptual” and “conceptual” evidence suggested in the literature (Diewald & Smirnova 2010<sup>3</sup>) as they highlight “the balance between the speaker’s involvement as opposed to the import of external evidence” (Squartini 2008, 925) and help to define the author’s argumentation strategies and his/her relationship with the reader.

Marking the source of information in academic discourse is closely connected with the author’s assumptions about the reader’s knowledge of the described situation because the reader is a part of an academic community who evaluates the author’s judgment and credibility. Thus the author may signal the shared status of evidence the proposition rests on and develop the strategies of engaging the reader into discourse. The shared status of evidence has been defined as intersubjectivity (Nuyts 2001) and reader engagement strategies have been discussed within the dialogical approach to evidentiality (Martin & White 2005). Intersubjective meanings can be expressed explicitly by the pronouns *we* and *everyone* or implicitly by the impersonal constructions *it seems that/it is clear that* (Marín Arrese 2009). The dialogical dimension of evidentiality becomes manifest through the contextual clues of rhetorical questions, accepted background knowledge, concessive connectives or by other means. The important outcome of sharing the source of evidence with the reader is high reliability of the information conveyed in the proposition (Cornillie 2009).

The widely discussed issue of the evidential-epistemic overlap also arises in this study. Drawing on Nuyts’ (2001) research on the mental state predicates *think*, *believe*, *guess*, it is assumed that the linguistic unit may be used both as an evidential and epistemic marker, but that one of the functions is foregrounded due to the contextual environment. The conceptual distinction between evidentiality and epistemic modality (Wiemer 2006b; Cornillie 2009) has been applied in the present study. It is maintained that evidentiality marks a process of reasoning which leads the speaker to the proposition, while epistemic modality evaluates the proposition in terms of its degrees of likelihood (Cornillie 2009, 47).

#### **4 Morphosyntactic properties: quantitative findings**

The morphosyntactic analysis has shown that the neuter adjectives *akivaizdu* ‘evident, obvious’, *aišku* ‘clear’, *natūralu* ‘natural’ and *panašu* ‘likely’ function most frequently as CTPs. The distribution of the patterns of use is given in Table 2.

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf. “inferring from results” and “inferring from reasoning” in Willett 1988; “inferentials” and “presumptives” in Plungian 2001; “inference” and “assumption” in Aikhenvald 2004; “circumstantial” and “generic” in Squartini 2008.

Adjective	CTP + <i>that/other</i> <sup>4</sup> S	CTP Ø S	Parenthetical	Predicative
<i>akivaizdu</i> ‘evident, obvious’	715	17	3	43
<i>aišku</i> ‘clear’	342	122	67	26
<i>natūralu</i> ‘natural’	117	1	0	21
<i>panašu</i> ‘likely’	38	0	4	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>1212</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>102</b>

Table 2. Distribution of patterns of use (raw frequency) in the CorALit

The overall number of the CTPs is 1, 352, which makes up 89% of the total use of the adjectives, while the total number of the parentheticals is 74. The preferred use of CTPs to parenthetical use can be explained by the genre of written academic discourse. Since parentheticals often function as pragmatic markers and are more characteristic of oral discourse, their use in written discourse is not favoured (Brinton 2008, 17). The most common CTPs are the adjectives *akivaizdu* ‘evident, obvious’ and *aišku* ‘clear’, while the most frequent parenthetical is the adjective *aišku* ‘clear’. When used parenthetically the adjectives *akivaizdu* ‘evidently, obviously’ and *panašu* ‘likely’ are much less frequent and the adjective *natūralu* ‘natural’ is never used as a parenthetical.

The distribution of the neuter adjectives used as CTPs in particular scientific disciplines, namely in soft disciplines and hard disciplines shows that CTPs are more common in soft than hard disciplines. The normalized frequency per 1000 words of CTPs in soft and hard disciplines is given in Table 3.

Adjective (CTP)	Soft disciplines	Hard disciplines
<i>akivaizdu</i> ‘evident, obvious’	0.12	0.07
<i>ai ku</i> ‘clear’	0.08	0.03
<i>natūralu</i> ‘natural’	0.02	0.01
<i>panašu</i> ‘likely’	0.001	0.001
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.22<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>0.11</b>

Table 3. Normalized frequency per 1000 words of CTPs in soft and hard disciplines in the CorALit

<sup>4</sup> The adjectives *akivaizdu* ‘evident, obvious’ and *aišku* ‘clear’ take *wh*-clauses. The adjective *aišku* ‘clear’ also takes *if/whether*-clauses and the neuter adjective *natūralu* ‘natural’ takes infinitive-clauses.

<sup>5</sup> The difference is statistically significant as the result of the Log Likelihood test equals +172, 61, which shows the overuse of the CTPs in soft disciplines in relation to hard disciplines.

The dominant use of the CTPs in soft disciplines in Lithuanian academic discourse reflects Hyland’s findings (2006, 2008) of the prevalent use of stance and engagement markers in these disciplines in English academic discourse. Hyland connects the different distribution of stance and engagement markers across scientific disciplines with different argumentation strategies. In hard disciplines argumentation rests on the facts that “speak for themselves”, “unmediated nature” as well as “linear and problem-oriented knowledge construction” (Hyland 2006, 29-34; 2008, 14-17). The use of linguistic markers which prove the validity of arguments becomes redundant. On the contrary, in soft disciplines arguments are subjected to interpretation and can be contradicted more easily than in hard disciplines. Thus authors have to use more evidential markers in order to convince their readers. The dominance of CTPs in soft disciplines can also be explained by the interactional functions of the adjectives. In hard disciplines there is less room for interaction with readers and therefore fewer markers that perform these functions (Hyland 2006, 34; Hyland 2008, 14).

## 5 Functional distribution

The analysed neuter adjectives display various functions in written academic discourse when they are used as CTPs and parentheticals. Their functional distribution is presented in Table 4. The adjectives *akivaizdu* ‘evident, obvious’, *aišku* ‘clear’ and *natūralu* ‘natural’ are primarily used to express inferences. The adjective *panašu* ‘likely’ functions as an inferential marker but it also triggers uncertainty and thus qualifies as an evidential-epistemic marker. No differences have been identified in the evidential functions displayed by CTPs and parentheticals. The present study focuses on the evidential and evidential-epistemic functions of the adjectives, while the other functions (discourse marker, marker of cognition) are only briefly sketched.

Functions	Evidential (Inferences)	Evidential - Epistemic	Discourse Marker	Other (cognition)
<i>akivaizdu</i> ‘evident, obvious’	+	–	–	+
<i>aišku</i> ‘clear’	+	–	+	+
<i>natūralu</i> ‘natural’	+	–	–	–
<i>panašu</i> ‘likely’	–	+	–	–

Table 4. Distribution of functions of CTPs and parentheticals in the CorALit



## 5.1 Evidential functions: inferences

The adjectives *akivaizdu* ‘evident, obvious’, *aišku* ‘clear’ and *natūralu* ‘natural’ express inferences based on external and internal sources of evidence. Inferences drawn from external sources of evidence represent conceptualizations based on sensory evidence or products of research (results of surveys, questionnaires), reports and rules available to the author and the whole academic community, while inferences drawn from internal sources of evidence represent conceptualizations based on the author’s reasoning from facts or shared background knowledge. The former type of inferences is distinguishable by the criterion “OTHER” and the latter type of inferences is determined by the criterion “SELF”. Examples (5) – (8) illustrate inferences based on external sources of evidence, e.g.:

- (5) *Apžvelgus <...> iliustracijas, akivaizdu, kad jose susiformavo dailininko <...> samprata apie teksto ir vaizdo ryšį <...>. (H)*  
‘Having looked <...> at the illustrations, it is **evident** that they reflect the artist’s <...> conception of the relationship between the text and the picture <...>.’
- (6) *<...> dabartinė muzika <...> esti visai kitu pagrindu, negu klasikinė. Tas pats, aišku, vyksta ir dailės muziejuose. Visur matomas meno paradigmu skirtumas ir jų koegzistencija. (H)*  
‘<...> contemporary music <...> is based on something different than classical music. The same, **clearly**, happens in art museums. We can see the difference and co-existence of art paradigms everywhere.’
- (7) *Analizuojant paskelbtąsias užsienio šalių tyrinėtojų publikacijas akivaizdu, kad didesnė dalis tyrinėjimų skirta filtravimo algoritmams sukurti <...> (T)*  
‘Studying the publications of foreign researchers it is **evident** that most of the research is devoted to designing algorithms for filtering <...>’
- (8) *Taigi iš antrojo termodinamikos principo aišku, kad norint sukurti mašiną, veikiančią šiluminės energijos sąskaita, būtina turėti mažiausiai du skirtingų temperatūrų šilumos šaltinius. (T)*  
‘So from the second law of thermodynamics it is **clear** that if one wants to design a heat energy run machine, it is necessary to have at least two sources of heat of different temperatures.’

Examples (5) and (6) highlight the visual dimension of the adjectives as they illustrate visual evidence as the basis of the proposition. Examples (7) and (8) represent external conceptual evidence as the author’s inferences stem from the products of the research available to the whole academic community. In academic discourse, inferences based on external sources of evidence are primarily drawn from the results of the author’s or other

researchers' intellectual activities and to a lesser extent from purely sensory evidence, which can be explained by the genre of written discourse. Written discourse is highly-structured and well-thought out and therefore it is natural that authors resort to conceptual rather than sensory evidence, which frequently serves as the basis of inferences in spoken discourse (Cornillie 2010). However, sensory evidence and external conceptual evidence can be closely entwined and not always easily discriminated.

Drawing inferences from sensory evidence or other types of external evidence, the author assumes the role of an analytical observer/reporter who informs the reader about the observations following from the conducted research. The author's analytical descriptions are emphasized by the verbs *žvelgti* 'look, cast a glance', *pažvelgti* 'glance, look', *apžvelgti* 'examine, review', *peržvelgti* 'glance over', *žvilgtelėti* 'have a look', *analizuoti* 'analyse', *atsižvelgti* 'consider', *lyginti* 'compare', *vertinti* 'evaluate, assess' which collocate with the nouns *ilustracija* 'illustration', *paveikslas* 'picture', *duomenys* 'data', *rezultatai* 'results', *publikacija* 'publication', *atsakymas* 'answer' and the prepositional phrases *iš duomenų/rankraščio/ataskaitos/analizės/formulių/pavyzdžio* 'from the data, manuscript, report, analysis, formulas, example'. Such specification of the sources of evidence facilitates the comprehension of the text (cf. "textual circulation" in Grossman & Tutin 2010) and contributes to the organization of discourse (Cornillie 2010).

Inferences distinguished by the criterion "SELF" express more authorial sources of evidence as they reflect the author's knowledge of the facts and assumptions. They differ from the inferences marked as "OTHER" not only in the sources of evidence they are based on but also in their rhetorical effects. Relying on facts, the author aims to convince the reader of the view expressed in the proposition and thus performs the role of an arguer<sup>6</sup> rather than the role of an analytical observer/reporter. Although the reader may also know the facts which lead to the proposition, only the author juxtaposes these facts with the effect of persuasion. This use is illustrated by examples (9) – (11), in which the sources of evidence are indicated by *nes* 'because'-clause, *jei* 'if'-clause, the linking adverbial *todėl* 'therefore/so' and the verb of deontic necessity *reikia* 'need', e.g.:

- (9) *Akivaizdu, kad šį klausimą reikia nagrinėti toliau, nes didėjant ištirtų medžiagų skaičiui jis tampa aktualesnis.* (T)  
 'It is **evident** that this question has to be considered further because with the increasing number of the analysed material it is becoming more urgent.'
- (10) *Bet jeigu sakinį „Aš matau savo ranką judant“ aš laikysiu viena iš evidencijų sakiniui „Mano ranka juda“, antrojo teisingumas, aišku, nėra presuponuojamas pirmojo teisingumo.* (H)

<sup>6</sup> Cf. The author's role of a researcher, writer, arguer, evaluator in Fløttum, Kinn & Dahl 2006.

‘But if I consider the sentence “I see my hand moving” as the evidential basis for the sentence “My hand is moving”, the truth of the second sentence, **clearly**, is not presupposed by the truth of the first.’

- (11) *Kinijoje vyravusių konfucionizmo mokymų pagrindas buvo taiki ir darni visuomenė, todėl natūralu, kad ir sprendžiant nesutarimą buvo siekiama ne įvertinti konkrečias aplinkybes ir nustatyti kaltus asmenis, o sutaukyti šalis ir išsaugoti gerus jų santykius.* (S)

‘In China the basis of the dominant Confucianism teachings was peaceful and harmonious society, therefore/so it is **natural** that trying to solve a conflict they did not aim to examine the circumstances and find guilty but to placate the parties and preserve their good relationships.’

Inferences determined by the criterion “SELF” may lack supporting evidence for the proposition as the author assumes that the information should also be known to the reader because it pertains to common background knowledge (Simon-Vandenberg & Aijmer 2007). Appealing to shared background knowledge, authors may project their readers as members of the same academic community and establish a solidarity relationship with them (Hyland 2009, 124-125). This use is illustrated in (12) – (14).

- (12) *Tačiau net ir be didesnių mokslinių tyrinėjimų aišku, kad dabartinė Vidurio Europa pasižymi kitomis visuomeninio ir kultūrinio gyvenimo savybėmis negu vakarinė, šiaurinė ar pietinė senoji žemyno dalis.* (S)

‘Even without any greater research it is **clear** that present-day Central Europe differs in its social and cultural aspects of life from the western, northern and southern parts of the Old Continent.’

- (13) *Pirmiausia kiltų klausimas, kokiais knygos ženklais galėtume laikyti XVI a. knygoje paliktus piešinius? Akivaizdu, kad piešinių senosiose knygoje yra labai įvairių.* (H)

‘First of all, the question would arise: what kind of book markers could be the illustrations left in the 16th century books? It is **evident** that old books contain various illustrations.’

- (14) *Natūralu, jog vaikui ikimokyklinio amžiaus tarpsnyje artimiausias sociumas yra šeima.* (S)

‘It is **natural** that at the pre-school age the closest social unit to a child is family.’

In (12) the author explicitly claims that no evidence is necessary to realize that present-day Central Europe is different from other parts of Europe as this knowledge is self-evident to the reader. The motivation for this statement lies in the author’s intention to

foreground the information expressed in the proposition. In (13) the reader's background knowledge is activated by addressing the reader with the question and providing the immediate answer. In (14) the shared background knowledge is implied because, such is the nature of things, the family is the closest social unit to a child at the pre-school age. These inferences reflect the interactive nature of the evidential adjectives and present the author in the role of a negotiator who may engage in a dialogue with the reader. The dialogical strategies become especially manifest when the author explicitly or implicitly signals agreement or disagreement with the reader's point of view, as in examples (15) and (16):

- (15) *Šie veiksniai i skirti žvelgiant iš ekonominių pozicijų, tačiau akivaizdu, kad visus sprendimus priima žmonės, kuriuos veikia organizacijos kultūra.* (S)  
 'These factors have been singled out from an economic perspective, **but** it is **evident** that all decisions are made by the people who are influenced by the culture of an organization.'
- (16) *Lietuvos žmonės negali tikėtis greitų pokyčių gerinant šalies ekonominę ir socialinę padėtį. Tačiau pradėti kažkada reikia. Pirmiausia, aišku, reikėtų parengti ilgalaikę (bent iki 2020m.) šalies ekonominės plėtros viziją <...>.* (S)  
 'Lithuanians cannot expect sudden changes while improving the economic and social situation of the country. However, it is necessary to start doing it one day. First of all, **clearly**, it would be necessary to prepare a long-term (at least until 2020) vision of the economic development <...>.'

In (15) the author admits the reader's possible point of view but the concessive marker *tačiau* 'but, however' and the adjective *akivaizdu* 'evident, obvious' emphasize the author's alternative point of view. In (16) the author gives some recommendations, which are marked by the verbs of deontic necessity *reikia* 'need' and *reikėtų* 'would be necessary' (subjunctive form), and expects the reader to accept them. In Martin and White's terms (2005), these examples could demonstrate the strategies of authorial "pronouncement" and "concurrence". The former strategy refers to the author's emphasis, interpolation and the latter pertains to the author's assumption that the reader would agree with the author's point of view.

Inferences expressed by the neuter adjectives *akivaizdu* 'evident, obvious', *aišku* 'clear' and *natūralu* 'natural' reflect the intersubjective nature of academic discourse. The research reveals that intersubjectivity is created not only by the impersonal constructions the adjectives are used in but also by the explicit indication of external sources of evidence, explicit reasoning of the author as well as the appeal to shared background knowledge. The dominant component of external or internal evidence underlying the

inference defines the author's role in argumentation and his/her relationship with the reader. The reasons for providing various types of evidence can be connected with the author's attempt to make the reader knowledgeable about the subject, to convince of the validity of the proposition or negotiate with him/her about the information in the proposition. All the inferences present strong authorial arguments which cannot be easily refuted or contradicted. The strength of arguments stems from reliable and shared sources of evidence (sensory evidence, other researchers' publications, laws, facts, shared background knowledge).

## 5.2 Evidential-epistemic functions

The adjective *panašu* 'likely' does not only mark inferences drawn from external and/or internal sources of evidence but also triggers doubt and thus means epistemic possibility. Depending on the context, the evidential or epistemic function becomes foregrounded, e.g.:

- (17) *Panašu, kad šios svetainės buvo kuriamos už Afganistano ribų – vaizdo medžiagos jose praktiškai nebuvo, o dauguma informacijos buvo verbalinė.* (S)  
 'It is **likely** that these websites were created beyond the borders of Afghanistan – basically, there was no visual material, most of the information was verbal.'
- (18) <...> *autoriai taip pat bando susieti pykčio emociją su siekimo tikslais. Panašu, kad siekimo tikslų blokavimas gali būti viena iš pagrindinių pykčio emocijos kilmės priežasčių <...>.* (S)  
 '<...> the authors are also trying to associate the emotion of anger with the achievement of aims. It is **likely** that blocking the achievement of aims can be one of the main reasons for the emotion of anger <...>.'
- (19) *Kas filosofijai – kasdienybė? Atrodo, filosofinė mintis nukreipta į bendrybes <...>. Panašu, kad kasdienybė – mūsų gyvenimo nebyli aplinka, kur aidi išskirtinių įvykių aidai.* (H)  
 'What is everyday life, according to philosophy? It seems that philosophical thought is aimed at generalizations <...>. It is **likely** that everyday life is the silent environment of our life, full of echoes of special events.'

In (17) the evidential function becomes foregrounded due to the visual evidence the author relies on. However, the author chooses this adjective but not *akivaizdu* 'evident, obvious' or *aišku* 'clear' because evidently there must be some reservations preventing the author from full commitment towards the proposition. In (18) and (19) the function of epistemic possibility becomes more dominant due to the contextual elements which contain uncertainty. In (18) this function is strengthened by the phrase *autoriai taip pat bando* 'the authors are also trying', and in (19) the author's uncertainty is marked by the rhetorical question and the verb *atrodo* 'seem' in the preceding sentences.

The use of the neuter adjective *panašu* ‘likely’ can also be motivated by remote, obscure and insufficient sources of evidence, e.g.:

- (20) *Zasvyrės pilkapiuose <...> rasti žmonių kapai su žirgais. Šiuose pilkapiuose rastos laužavietės. Panašu, kad žirgai ir žmonės buvo sudeginti pilkapio vietoje. Atrodo, kad pilkapis pradėtas pilti dar degant laužui. Tai liudija nesudegę rąstai (Tautavičius, 1952š).* (H)

‘In the burial mounds of Zasvyrė <...> the human graves with the horses have been found. In these burial mounds the bonfire places have been found. It is **likely** that the horses and the people had been burnt in the place of the burial mound. It seems that the burial mound was started when the bonfire was still burning. It is testified by the unburnt logs (Tautavičius, 1952š).’

- (21) *Todėl ir liko neaišku, kiek garbės konsulų Stokholme turėjo Lietuva 1927–1940 m. – du, tris, keturis ar daugiau (skurdi šaltinių bazė apsunkena atsakymo paieškas), o juo labiau kada baigiasi pirmasis ir prasideda antrasis Lietuvos konsulatų Švedijoje funkcionavimo etapas – 1931 ar 1933 metais? Panašu, kad pirmasis garbės konsulatų steigimo etapas Švedijoje tęsėsi ne iki 1930 m. <...> o gerokai ilgiau – iki 1933 metų.* (H)

‘Therefore it remains unclear how many honorary consuls of Lithuania there were in Stockholm in 1927–1940 – two, three, four or more (the poor database makes the search difficult), and especially when the first period of the activities of the Lithuanian consulates in Sweden ended and the second started – 1931 or 1933? It is **likely** that the first period of the establishment of honorary consulates in Sweden did not last until 1930 <...> but much longer – until 1933.’

In (20) the author has access to historical and archeological evidence but opts for the adjective *panašu* ‘likely’ because this evidence is remote and does not always allow for the drawing of definite conclusions. Similarly in (21), there is lack of sufficient and reliable evidence pointing to the exact dates of the establishment of Lithuanian consulates in Stockholm. The author indicates the obscurity of the database and strengthens the meaning of uncertainty by the posing of a question. As the adjective *panašu* ‘likely’ originally pertains to comparison and similarity, it is compatible in the contexts which trigger uncertainty.

Similarly to the Lithuanian adverbials *matyt* ‘evidently’ and *tarsi* ‘as if’ (Šinkūnienė 2011), the neuter adjective *panašu* ‘likely’ displays the syncretism of evidential and epistemic functions. In its evidential-epistemic function the adjective *panašu* ‘likely’ could also be compared to the English adverb *obviously* used as a weak inferential, which comes close in meaning to hearsay (Aijmer 2008). More research is needed to explore whether the adjective *panašu* ‘likely’ can function as a marker of reportive evidentiality.

Such a hypothesis can be raised on the basis of the fact that in Slavic languages the cognates of *panašu* ‘likely’ relate to hearsay meanings. In Polish the lexeme *podobno* ‘they say’ refers to opinions expressed by other people (Tutak 2003; Wiemer 2006b), while in Russian the cognate *похоже* ‘similar/it seems’ pertains to inferences based on other people’s words (Letuchiy 2010).

### 5.3 Discourse marker and other functions

The current analysis has also revealed that the neuter adjectives can function as discourse markers or markers of cognition. Drawing on research into the structural and functional peculiarities of discourse markers (Simon-Vandenberghe & Aijmer 2007, 300-301; Brinton 2008, 17-18; Nau & Ostrowski 2010, 8-13), in this research they have been regarded as “a pragmatic category” which may display interpersonal or textual functions. In (22) the author does not refer to the source of information but rather emphasizes the part of the clause in the scope of the neuter adjective and thus draws the reader’s attention to the communicated information, e.g.:

- (22) *Lietuvos problemų nei Rytų, nei Vakarų mokslininkai neišspręs. Lietuvos pedagogai yra pajėgūs įveikti vaikų darželiams ir mokykloms iškilusias problemas, aišku, atsižvelgdami į pažangias <...> idėjas <...>. (S)*  
‘Neither scientists from the East nor West can solve Lithuanian problems. Lithuanian educators are capable of solving the problems that have arisen in kindergartens and schools, **of course**, paying attention to innovative <...> ideas <...>.’

The function of cognition is realized in contexts where there is no explicit or implicit indication of the source of information for the proposition but the report of the author’s mental state or the author’s report of another person’s inference, e.g.:

- (23) *<...> net po XVI a. <...> teismų reformos ne visada aišku, kuris teismas kokią bylą kompetentingas spręsti <...> (H)*  
‘<...> even after the reforms of the courts in the 16th century it was not always **clear** which court was competent to solve a particular case <...>’
- (24) *N. Garnhamo nuomone, akivaizdu, kad kai kuriose šalyse VT modelis buvo pernelyg artimas valdančiosios politinės klasės <...> interesams. (S)*  
‘In N. Garnham’s opinion, it is **evident** that in some countries VT model was too connected with the interests <...> of the ruling political class.’

## 6 Concluding remarks

Against the background of the research on lexical evidential markers in English and other languages, it becomes apparent that in Lithuanian the neuter adjectives play a prominent role in realizing evidential functions. The neuter adjectives under analysis function as important linguistic means which give validity and credibility to the author's judgements, establish a relationship with the reader, and help organize discourse.

The distribution of the patterns of use of the neuter adjectives in academic discourse shows that they are more frequently used as CTPs than parentheticals. The dominant use of the CTPs suggests that written Lithuanian academic discourse favours strategies of planned discourse and avoids parenthetical inserts which may convey a vague meaning. However, it has been observed that the adjectives also expressed the source of information when they were used parenthetically and only to a minor extent functioned as discourse markers devoid of evidential functions. In academic discourse, the structural differences of the neuter adjectives do not reveal marked differences in evidential functions as both CTPs and the parentheticals display the same evidential functions. The question of structural-functional correlation should be explored further in other genres (fiction, language of the press) as the frequency of the parentheticals in academic discourse is not high. The research has also revealed that individual neuter adjectives show different tendencies for parentheticalization. The most frequent parenthetical marker is *aišku* 'clearly'.

The current study proves that the adjectives *akivaizdu* 'evident, obvious', *aišku* 'clear', *natūralu* 'natural' and *panašu* 'likely' cannot be fully explained within the domain of epistemic modality as they primarily mark the source of information. Only the adjective *panašu* 'likely' displays the evidential-epistemic overlap when it refers to insufficient, remote sources of evidence or other contexts triggering uncertainty. The neuter adjectives under analysis express inferences distinguished by external and internal sources of evidence referred to as "OTHER" and "SELF". In academic discourse, the sources of evidence "OTHER" and "SELF" have turned out to be significant because they foreground the author's role in argumentation and his/her relationship with the reader. In resorting to external sources of evidence, the author functions as an analytical observer/reporter who leads the reader throughout discourse, while relying on internal sources of evidence the author may demonstrate persuasive argumentation or dialogical engagement with the reader.

In line with the latest research (Hyland 2006, 2008, 2009; Šinkūnienė 2011), this study stresses the intersubjective dimension of academic discourse reflected by the explication of the sources of evidence and reference to common background knowledge. Functional



parallel can be drawn between the inferential use of the neuter adjectives under consideration and the infinitive form *matyti* ‘see’, which also expresses intersubjective inferences drawn from objective evidence (Usonienė 2003, 211).

This study can be supplemented and improved by the analysis of the neuter adjectives in other genres (fiction, language of the press) and comparison of their use in academic discourse. Future research can concentrate on the quantitative findings of inferences based on evidence and inferences lacking supporting evidence. It would be interesting to examine the relationship between types of inferences and particular scientific disciplines.

### **Acknowledgements**

The current study has been carried out within the project *Investigating Author Stance in Lithuanian Academic Discourse* (Project No LIT-2-34) funded by the Research Council of Lithuania. The ideas for the paper were presented during my stay as a guest researcher at the Department of Baltic Languages, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, which was possible thanks to the Mobility Grant for PhD students provided by Vilnius University. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Professor Nicole Nau for her constructive suggestions concerning my research and her kind assistance during my stay. I am also very grateful to my colleagues from the Department of Baltic Languages at Adam Mickiewicz University for their remarks and questions while discussing the ideas underlying the present study. Finally, I would like to give my warmest thanks to Aurelija Usonienė for insightful comments and helpful advice in developing this paper and to Mark Fearon for proofreading the text.

### **Abbreviations**

B – Biomedical sciences

H – Humanities

P – Physical sciences

S – Social sciences

T – Technological sciences

### **Data sources**

CorALit *Lietuvių mokslo kalbos tekstynas* (Corpus Academicum Lithuanicum).  
Available at: <http://www.coralit.lt/>

## References

- Aijmer, Karin. 2008. Modal adverbs in interaction – *obviously* and *definitely* in adolescent speech. *The dynamics of linguistic variation: Corpus evidence on English past and present*. Terttu Nevalainen *et al.*, eds. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 61-83.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Akelaitis, Gintautas. 1992. *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos įterptiniai vienetai (semantika, struktūra, paskirtis diskurse)*. [Parentheticals in contemporary Lithuanian (semantics, structure, functions in discourse)]. Humanitarinių mokslų daktaro disertacija [PhD dissertation]. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.
- Ambrasas, Vytautas, ed. 1997. *Lithuanian grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
- Anderson, Lloyd B. 1986. Evidentials, paths of change, and mental maps: Typologically regular asymmetries. *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*. Wallace Chafe & Johanna Nichols, eds. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation. 273-312.
- Biber *et al.* 1999. *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Biber, Douglas. 2006. *University language. A corpus-based study of spoken and written registers*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Boye, Kasper & Peter Harder. 2009. Evidentiality: Linguistic categories and grammaticalization. *Functions of Language* 16 (1), 9-43.
- Brinton, Laurel J. 2008. *The comment clause in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1986. Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing. *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*. Wallace Chafe & Johanna Nichols, eds. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation. 261-272.
- Cornillie, Bert. 2009. Evidentiality and epistemic modality: On the close relationship between two different categories. *Functions of Language* 16 (1), 44-62.
- Cornillie, Bert. 2010. An interactional approach to epistemic and evidential adverbs in Spanish conversation. *Linguistic realization of evidentiality in European languages*. Gabriele Diewald & Elena Smirnova, eds. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 309-330.
- Diewald, Gabriele & Elena Smirnova. 2010. *Evidentiality in German. Linguistic realization and regularities in grammaticalization*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fløttum, Kjersti, Torodd Kinn & Trine Dahl. 2006. “We now report on...” versus “Let us now see...”: Author roles and interaction with readers in research articles. *Academic discourse across disciplines*. Ken Hyland & Marina Bondi, eds. Bern: Peter Lang. 203-224.
- Frawley, William. 1992. *Linguistic semantics*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Gronemeyer, Claire. 1997. Evidentiality in Lithuanian. *Working Papers*. Lund: Lund University. 93-112.
- Grossmann, Francis & Françoise Wirth. 2007. Marking evidentiality in scientific papers: The case of expectation markers. *Language and discipline perspectives on academic discourse*. Kjersti Fløttum, ed. New Castle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 202-218.
- Grossmann, Francis & Agnès Tutin. 2010. Evidential markers in French scientific writing: The case of the French verb *voir*. *Linguistic realization of evidentiality in European languages*. Gabriele Diewald & Elena Smirnova, eds. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 279-308.
- Holvoet, Axel. 2004. Evidencialumo kategorija. [The category of evidentiality]. *Gramatinių kategorijų tyrimai*. [Studies in grammatical categories]. Axel Holvoet, Loreta Semėnienė, red. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas. 105-120. [*Lietuvių kalbos gramatikos darbai 2.*]
- Holvoet, Axel. 2007. *Mood and modality in Baltic*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Hyland, Ken. 2006. Disciplinary differences: Language variation in academic discourse. *Academic discourse across disciplines*. Ken Hyland & Marina Bondi, eds. Bern: Peter Lang. 17-45.
- Hyland, Ken. 2008. Disciplinary voices. Interactions in research writing. *English Text Construction 1* (1), 5-22.
- Hyland, Ken. 2009. Corpus informed discourse analysis: The case of academic engagement. *Academic writing. At the interface of corpus and discourse*. Maggie Charles, Diane Pecorari & Susan Hunston, eds. London, New York: Continuum. 110-128.
- Lavine, James E. 2006. Is there a passive evidential strategy in Lithuanian? *Papers from the 42<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Jacqueline Bunting *et al.*, eds. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society. 41-55.
- Letuchiy, Alexander. 2010. Syntactic change and shifts in evidential meanings: five Russian units. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 63 (4), 358-369.
- Marín Arrese, Juana I. 2009. Effective vs. epistemic stance, and subjectivity/ intersubjectivity in political discourse. A case study. *Studies on English modality. In honour of Frank Palmer*. Anastasios Tsangalidis & Roberta Facchinetti, eds. Bern, Berlin: Peter Lang. 23-52.
- Martin, James R. & Peter R. R. White. 2005. *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nau, Nicole & Norbert Ostrowski. 2010. Background and perspectives for the study of particles and connectives in Baltic languages. *Particles and connectives in Baltic*. Nicole Nau & Norbert Ostrowski, eds. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, Academia Salensis. 1-37.

- Nuyts, Jan. 2001. *Epistemic modality, language, and conceptualization: A cognitive-pragmatic perspective*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Plungian, Vladimir A. 2001. The place of evidentiality within the universal grammatical space. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 349-357.
- Simon-Vandenberg, Anne-Marie & Karin Aijmer. 2007. *The semantic field of modal certainty. A corpus-based study of English adverbs*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Squartini, Mario. 2001. The internal structure of evidentiality in Romance. *Studies in Language* 25 (2), 297-334.
- Squartini, Mario. 2008. Lexical vs. grammatical evidentiality in French and Italian. *Linguistics* 46 (5), 917-947.
- Šinkūnienė, Jolanta. 2011. *Autoriaus pozicijos švelninimas rašytiniame moksliniame diskurse: gretinamasis tyrimas*. [Hedging in written academic discourse: A cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary study]. Humanitarinių mokslų daktaro disertacija [PhD dissertation]. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.
- Tekorienė, Dalija. 1990. *Bevardės giminės būdvardžiai*. [Neuter adjectives]. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Tutak, Kinga. 2003. *Leksykalne nieczasownikowe wykładniki modalności epistemicznej w autobiografiach*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Usonienė, Aurelija. 2001. Veiksmazodžio *matyti* komplementų tipai: formos ir reikšmės sąveika. [Complementation of the verb *matyti* 'see': interaction of form and meaning]. *Baltistica* 36 (1), 115-124.
- Usonienė, Aurelija. 2002. Types of epistemic qualification with verbs of perception. *Kalbotyra* 52 (3), 147-154.
- Usonienė, Aurelija. 2003. Extension of meaning: Verbs of perception in English and Lithuanian. *Meaning through language contrast: The Cambridge Papers*. Vol. 1. Katarzyna M. Jaszczolt & Ken Turner, eds. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 193-220.
- Usonienė, Aurelija, Erika Jasionytė. 2010. Towards grammaticalization: Lithuanian acquisitive verbs *gauti* ('get') and *tekti* ('be gotten'). *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia*. Vol. 42 (42), 199-220.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2006a. Grammatical evidentiality in Lithuanian (a typological assessment). *Baltistica* XLI (1), 33-49.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2006b. Particles, parentheticals, conjunctions and prepositions as evidentiality markers in contemporary Polish (A first exploratory study). *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 3, 5-67.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2007. Lexical markers of evidentiality in Lithuanian. *Rivista di Linguistica* 19 (1), 173-208.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2010a. Lithuanian *esą* – a heterosemic reportive marker in its contemporary stage. *Baltic Linguistics* 1, 245-308.

- Wiemer, Björn. 2010b. On the lexicographic treatment of Lith. *esq* (From a background of other particles in Lithuanian and elsewhere). *Particles and connectives in Baltic*. Nicole Nau & Norbert Ostrowski, eds. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, Academia Salensis. 171-212.
- Willett, Thomas. 1988. Across-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12 (1), 51-97.

## Evidenciniai būdvardžiai lietuvių akademiniam diskurse

Anna Ruskan

### Santrauka

Straipsnyje nagrinėjama bevardės giminės būdvardžių *akivaizdu*, *aišku*, *natūralu* ir *panašu* vartoseną lietuvių rašytiniame akademiniam diskurse. Tyrimo tikslas yra aptarti šių būdvardžių morfosintaksinį statusą, nustatyti jų funkcijas ir svarbą autoriaus argumentacijai reikšti. Straipsnyje pateikiama kiekybinė ir kokybinė būdvardžių analizė. Tyrime remiamasi tekstylių inspiruota metodologija – medžiaga yra paimta iš Lietuvių akademinio teksto, kurį sudaro įvairių mokslo sričių tekstai.

Kokybinė ir kiekybinė bevardės giminės būdvardžių *akivaizdu*, *aišku*, *natūralu* ir *panašu* analizė rodo, kad dažniausiai šie būdvardžiai vartojami kaip komplementiniai predikatai, kurie nurodo autoriaus žinių šaltinį, ir rečiau vartojami kaip parentezė. Komplementinė vartoseną yra dažnesnė negu parentetinė, nes parentezė yra labiau būdinga sakytiniam diskursui. Pažymėtina, kad socialiniuose ir humanitariniuose moksluose šie būdvardžiai yra dažnesni negu biomedicinos, technologijų ir fizinių mokslų srityse. Skirtinga kiekybinė būdvardžių distribucija įvairiose mokslo srityse paaiškinama mokslo sričių specifika.

Kiekybinė analizė atskleidžia, kad pagrindinė šių būdvardžių funkcija yra evidencinė, t.y. jie nurodo autoriaus žinių šaltinį. Šie būdvardžiai reiškia autoriaus numanymą, kuris gali remtis išoriniu arba vidiniu autoriaus žinių šaltiniu. Išorinis žinių šaltinis nurodo, kad autorius remiasi percepcijos duomenimis, tyrimo rezultatais, su kuriais supažindina ir skaitytoją. Vidinis žinių šaltinis nurodo, kad numanymas yra paremtas daugiau autoriaus samprotavimu arba prielaida apie skaitytojo žinias. Remdamasis vidiniu žinių šaltiniu, autorius įtikina skaitytoją propozicijos teisingumu arba pradeda su skaitytoju polemizuoti. Skirtingas numanymo pagrindas lemia skirtingą autoriaus poziciją. Numanymas akademiniam diskurse yra intersubjektyvus, nes autorius aiškiai nurodo žinių šaltinio prieinamumą skaitytojui.

Įteikta 2012 m. sausio mėn.