VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

Jolanta Šinkūnienė

HEDGING IN WRITTEN ACADEMIC DISCOURSE: A CROSS – LINGUISTIC AND
CROSS – DISCIPLINARY STUDY

Summary of doctoral dissertation

Humanities, Philology (04 H)

Vilnius, 2011

This doctoral dissertation was written at Vilnius University in 2006 – 2011.

Research supervisor:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Inesa Šeškauskienė (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

The dissertation will be defended at the Council of Philology of Vilnius University:

Chair

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Jurgis Pakerys (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Members:

Prof. Habil. Dr. Ineta Dabašinskienė (Vytautas Magnus University, Humanities, Philology –04 H)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Violeta Kalėdaitė (Vytautas Magnus University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Meilutė Ramonienė (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Dr. Loreta Vaicekauskienė (Institute of the Lithuanian Language, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Opponents:

Prof. Habil. Dr. Aurelija Usonienė (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Jūratė Ruzaitė (Vytautas Magnus University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

The public defence of the dissertation is to be held in the meeting of the Council of Philology of Vilnius University at 13 o'clock on 05 April 2011 in the Faculty of Philology, Vilnius University, V. Krėvė room.

Address: Universiteto st. 5, LT-01513, Vilnius, Lithuania.

The summary of the dissertation was sent out to relevant institutions on _____ March 2011.

The dissertation is available at the library of Vilnius University.

1

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS

Jolanta Šinkūnienė

AUTORIAUS POZICIJOS ŠVELNINIMAS RAŠYTINIAME MOKSLINIAME
DISKURSE: GRETINAMASIS TYRIMAS

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka

Humanitariniai mokslai, filologija (04 H)

Vilnius, 2011

Disertacija rengta 2006 – 2011 metais Vilniaus universitete.

Mokslinis vadovas:

doc. dr. Inesa Šeškauskienė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos mokslo krypties taryboje:

Pirmininkas

doc. dr. Jurgis Pakerys (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Nariai:

prof. habil. dr. Ineta Dabašinskienė (Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

doc. dr. Violeta Kalėdaitė (Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

doc. dr. Meilutė Ramonienė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

dr. Loreta Vaicekauskienė (Lietuvių kalbos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Oponentai:

prof. habil. dr. Aurelija Usonienė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

doc. dr. Jūratė Ruzaitė (Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Disertacija bus ginama viešame Filologijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2011 m. balandžio mėn. 05 d. 13 val. Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos fakultete, Vinco Krėvės auditorijoje.

Adresas: Universiteto g. 5, LT-01513, Vilnius, Lietuva.

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2011 m. kovo mėn. _____ d.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje.

HEDGING IN WRITTEN ACADEMIC DISCOURSE: A CROSS – LINGUISTIC AND CROSS – DISCIPLINARY STUDY

Introduction

The object of this dissertation is hedging in Lithuanian and English research articles in the field of humanities and biomedical sciences. As there is a great variety of linguistic resources which convey the pragmatic function of hedging, this research is limited to certain lexical hedges: modal auxiliaries, lexical verbs and adverbials, which are analysed within the conceptual categories of epistemic modality, evidentiality and vagueness.

The aim of the research is to identify hedging devices, their functions and distribution in linguistic and medical research articles in Lithuanian and English and to explore to what extent hedging is language-specific and discipline-specific. In order to achieve the research aims several tasks were set:

1. To compile a comparable corpus of medical and linguistic research articles in Lithuanian and in English.

2. To identify principle forms of modal auxiliaries, lexical verbs and adverbials acting as hedging devices as well as their frequency distribution in research articles in both disciplines.

3. To explore semantic peculiarities that enable those lexical items to perform the pragmatic function of hedging in academic text.

4. To identify communicative goals and pragmatic intentions hedging devices serve to realize in a scientific text.

5. To identify cross-linguistic and cross-diciplinary similarities and differences of hedging in academic discourse.

Data and methods. Contrastive and comparative perspectives employed in many cross-linguistic studies are the key methods used in this research. The contrastive methodology is especially relevant in this study as it highlights common hedging features in the two languages and disciplines as well as the aspects that are unique to either Lithuanian or English, or to either medical or linguistic scientific discourse. This research is also based on corpus linguistics methods, as a comparable corpus *CompAc*

had to be compiled for the research purposes. The composition of the *CompAc* corpus is reflected in table 1:

Table 1. The *CompAc* corpus composition and size

Subcorpus type	Number of words	Number of research articles
Lithuanian linguistic research articles	79 799	20
Lithuanian medical research articles	65 487	20
The Lithuanian language total:	**145 286**	**40**
English linguistic research articles	116 489	20
English medical research articles	71 108	20
The English language total:	**187 597**	**40**
Total:	**332 883**	**80**

In building up the corpus, general corpus compilation principles were followed (Kennedy 1998; McEnery, Wilson 2001) and criteria for specialized corpora observed (Bowker, Pearson 2002).

Randomly selected research articles had to comply with a number of requirements in order to be included in the corpus: all of them came from scientific refereed journals (for example, *Medicina*, *Medicinos teorija ir praktika*, *Baltistica*, *Kalbotyra*, *Kalbų studijos*, *The New England Journal of Medicine*, *English for Academic Purposes*, *English for Specific Purposes*, *Journal of English Linguistics*, etc.), their publishing span was between 2000 and 2009, the set length of the articles was between 2000 and 8000 words (excluding quotations, bibliography, notes, tables, diagrams, examples, schemas). Also an attempt was made to cover as wide a range of topics in each discipline as possible. For example, in the linguistic subcorpus, the selected articles in both languages were from the areas of applied linguistics, semantics, syntax, accentology, computational linguistics, phonology, morphosyntax. The range of the topics in the medical articles covered cardiology, oncology, anesthesiology, vaccination, gynecology, etc. The present research concentrated on American English. Articles for the English subcorpus were selected from scientific journals published in the USA or

from international journals which accepted both varieties. The affiliation of the authors had to be universities in the USA.

As can be seen from Table 1, the articles in English were lengthier than in Lithuanian, therefore raw frequencies of the identified hedging devices were normalized to 1000 words to allow for comparisons between the two languages and the two disciplines. All of the articles were read and analyzed manually, and the relevant markers deemed as having hedging potential were separated from the corpus with appropriate amount of context. This way the lists of hedges were generated in both languages and disciplines. The second step of the analysis was to confirm the frequencies of the selected lexical items with *WordsmithTools* software program, version 5 (Scott 2008). In the qualitative analysis, the hedging items were analysed in terms of their semantics, usage patterns and pragmatic and communicative functions performed in the text. Quantitative and qualitative findings were compared between the two languages and the two disciplines.

Some of the hedging tendencies identified in the *CompAc* corpus were verified in larger databases: *the British National Corpus* (www.corpus.byu.edu/bnc/), *the Corpus of Contemporary American English* (www.corpus.byu.edu/coca/), *the Corpus of Academic Lithuanian* (www.coralit.lt), *the Corpus of the Contemporary Lithuanian Language* (www.donelaitis.vdu.lt).

Research novelty and relevance. This research is one of the first attempts to have a more comprehensive look at Lithuanian academic discource, its cross-disciplinary peculiarities in terms of realisations and content of author stance. Author stance which has been widely researched within several past decades in various languages and in various genres has received little attention in Lithuanian semantic and pragmatic studies. The present research based on two languages and two disciplines does not only reveal cross-linguistic differences in the realisations of author stance but also shows cross-disciplinary differences in Lithuanian and English academic discourse. The pragmatic concept of hedging is discussed here within a close perspective on the linguistic categories of epistemic modality, evidentiality and vagueness thus making a semantic pragmatic interface the main focus of this research. The results of the research could benefit teachers and students exploring academic genres, interested in academic

persuasion and interaction of the writer and the reader. This analysis could also be of interest to Lithuanian scientists writing in English, as well as to translators, editors and specialists in other professions who deal with various cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary issues.

Defence statements:

1. The most frequent hedging devices used by the Lithuanian researchers in the analyzed articles were adverbials, whereas the English researchers preferred lexical verbs as hedges.

2. The results of the cross-linguistic research indicate that according to the main parameters of the analysis, the English authors of the analyzed research articles employ hedges more frequently than the Lithuanian authors.

3. The results of the cross-disciplinary research show that both Lithuanian and English medical researchers tend to use fewer hedges than linguists. The variety of hedges employed in the analyzed articles of both disciplines is also different. In both Lithuanian and English linguistic articles a greater variety of hedges has been observed.

4. Hedging devices with epistemic and epistential (Faller 2002) values were employed more frequently than markers of vague language in both Lithuanian and English investigated research articles.

The structure. The dissertation consists of introduction, two literature review chapters (*Hedging in Academic Discourse*; *Modality, Evidentiality, Vagueness*), a chapter on data and methods, three research chapters (*Modal Auxiliaries as Hedging Devices*, *Lexical Verbs as Hedging Devices*, *Adverbials as Hedging Devices*), conclusions and implications, a list of references and empirical sources used for this research.

Previous research on hedging. During the last few decades there has been a growing interest in academic discourse as well as in writer identity and the presence of author's voice in scientific writing. It has been suggested by extensive research that academic discourse is far from being purely rigid and propositional. The author's explicit or implicit presence in academic texts does not only exist but is also employed as a tool to pursue a variety of pragmatic and rhetoric functions (Myers 1989; Hyland 1998a, 2004, 2005b; Breivega et al. 2002; Latour 2002, among others). The expression of

author stance has been investigated within various theoretical frameworks and focusing on different aspects: as a part of metadiscourse (Crismore, Farnsworth 1990), within the framework of politeness theory (Brown, Levinson 1978; Meyers 1989), discussing author identity models (Ivanič 1998; Tang, John 1999; Vladimirou 2007) and evaluation aspects (Thompson, Hunston 2001; Martin, White 2005). The expression of author stance is closely related to two major pragmatic functions, hedging and boosting, which are frequently employed in academic text to qualify the author's claims and to create a bond between the author and the reader (Hyland 2005b).

Hedging plays a significant role in academic discourse because it allows scientists to phrase their claims, to report results, to express criticism with caution and at the same time qualify their commitment to the propositions. Being categorical might not be wise for the scientist in the long run, as after some time even the most powerful and sound conclusions might be proven wrong (Hyland 1998a; Hyland 2004). Besides, very often there are alternative ways to interpret the results of scientific research, so it is important to leave space for other opinions of academic community members and generally have in mind disciplinary conventions of politeness relevant in the field. Due to those and other reasons scientists often resort to mitigating their statements while creating text.

The terms *hedge* and *hedging* were coined in 1973 by Lakoff who referred to them as linguistic means of making a proposition „fuzzier or less fuzzy" (Lakoff 1973: 471). Drawing on the prototype theory and fuzzy sets theory, Lakoff considered hedges as a means to mark non-prototypicality of certain items within certain categories. Lakoff's perspective on hedging was purely semantic, the post-Lakoffian studies expanded the concept of hedging integrating various other semantic and pragmatic aspects (Prince et al. 1982; Hubler 1983; Myers 1989; Salager-Meyer 1994, 1997; Hyland 1995, 1996a, 1996b, 1996c, 1998a).

At the beginning of scholarly research into hedging, various studies concentrated on different discourse types in English. However, the end of the 20th century saw a keen interest in hedging from various cross-linguistic perspectives. Interesting results were obtained from hedging studies in Bulgarian and English (Vassileva 1997, Vassileva 2001), Portuguese and English (Réfega de Figueiredo-Silva 2001), German and English

(Kreutz, Harres 1997), Finnish and English (Luukka, Markkanen 1997), Norwegian, French and English (Vold 2006), Spanish and English (Cabanes 2007, Martin-Martin 2008), Serbian and English (Trbojevic Milosevic 2010). The majority of cross-linguistic studies reveal that hedging is a peculiar feature of Anglo-Saxon writing tradition.

Another interesting aspect of hedging studies in scientific discourse is the distribution of hedges in different disciplines. According to some studies (Markkanen, Schroder 1997; Vold 2006) disciplinary variaton in the use of mitigating devices is not as significant as might be expected. On the other hand, the results of other studies (Varttala 2001; Hyland 2005a; Falahati 2006; Vázquez, Giner 2008) suggest that researchers in different disciplines hedge to different extents. Those divergent results prove that more studies are needed to explore the phenomenon of hedging both from cross-disciplinary and cross-linguistic perspectives.

In empirical hedging studies many classifications of hedges are used but two major classificational patterns are based on either functional or formal criteria. Classifications based on functional criteria (for instance, Hyland 1998a) concentrate on the pragmatic functions which hedges are employed to perform. Though they are interesting from a theoretical perspective, they are usually difficult to apply to empirical data. While the usage of certain hedging devices can be clearly explained in terms of one or another pragmatic function, obvious from the context, in many cases the pragmatic functions overlap, making it difficult to ascribe one or another function to a particular hedge. This was the main reason why a functional classification was not adopted in this research.

The second classificational type (Varttala (2001); Vassileva (2001); Salager-Meyer (1997)) is based on the formal criteria, however, those classifications differ in their scope. In some classifications only lexical items are included, while others include various morphosyntactic items as well. In this research the second classificational approach based on formal criteria was chosen. Due to the limited scope of this research, only modal auxiliaries, lexical verbs and adverbials were analyzed as hedges in the research articles in both languages and both disciplines. The results of the research showed that their semantic content had elements of either epistemic modality, or

evidentiality, or vagueness, thus placing those three linguistic categories at the center of this research.

Epistemic modality is one of the widely discussed issues in linguistics and is especially rich in the proposed theoretical frameworks and interpretations. For the purposes of this study it is enough to follow the basic distinction between epistemic modality and non-epistemic modality. Epistemic modality can be defined as reflecting „the speaker's judgment of the likelihood that the proposition underlying the utterance is true, the epistemic scale of likelihood ranging from weak epistemic possibility (*That may be John*) to epistemic necessity (*That must be John*)" (Depraetere, Reed 2006: 274). Another important aspect of the concept of epistemic modality is the speaker's commitment to the truth of the proposition. By communicating the judgment about the likelihood of the state of affairs, the speaker inevitably communicates his or her personal commitment to the statement. Bybee et al. emphasize the importance of speaker commitment in the expression of epistemic modality. An unqualified statement means full commitment on the part of the speaker, while „markers of epistemic modality indicate something less than a total commitment" (Bybee et al., 1994: 179). The possibility to qualify the degree of speaker commitment to propositions becomes especially important in academic text, where the author has to carefully weight his or her own claims, evaluate claims of the other authors, while also trying to follow various sociopragmatic conventions. This places epistemic modality at the center of hedging studies.

Hyland states that despite an obvious polyfunctional nature of modal verbs, hedging can only be related to their epistemic meanings (Hyland 1998a: 105). According to Markkanen and Schrodder, hedging and modality (especially epistemic modality) could be related in two ways: „either modality is the wider concept and includes hedges, or the other way round, hedging is the umbrella term and epistemic modality a part of it" (Markkanen, Schrodder 1997: 7). However, the question is whether it is really necessary to decide which category includes which. During the recent years, much has been written about the polyfunctionality of various linguistic items (van der Auwera et al. 2005; Traugott 2007). The idea of polyfunctionality can be applied not only on the semantic level, but also on the pragmatic one. An epistemic modality marker can have other

semantic values, for example, an element of evidentiality, and at the same time perform a pragmatic hedging function of softening the claim, making it more polite, etc.

Another important aspect is that the pragmatic function of hedging will only be realized if the audience recognizes this pragmatic intent of the author (Markkanen, Schroder 1997: 9). This fact highlights the importance of context in the interpretation of hedging, an aspect which has been emphasized both in the research on modal markers (Hyland 1996c: 434; Klinge 1996: 37; Nuyts 2001a: 180; Hoye 2009: 126) and in the research on hedging (cpt. literature review on the importance of context in hedging studies, Salager –Meyer 2000: 180-182).

One more concept which is important in hedging studies is the concept of evidentiality. Evidentiality is defined as „a linguistic category whose primary meaning is source of information" (Aikhenvald 2004: 3). Markers of evidentiality are important in academic discourse as scholars do not only communicate their findings, ideas and assumptions, but also make references to other works and research as well as other sources of information. However, not every reference to a particular source of information can be considered hedging. In scientific text there are numerous cases of linguistic marking of reference, such as, *x claims, according to x, x suggested* etc. At first sight the use of all these expressions might look like the author's wish to hide behind other people's ideas and thus avoid the responsibility for his or her own statements. In academic text, however, this is a natural way for the author to make a review of the existing research, to show the existing viewpoints and thus create his or her own research space and introduce his or her own study. It seems then that a discussion about the link between hedging and evidentiality is futile. However, there are various interpretations of evidentiality and its markers which cast additional light on the concept of hedging and add certain new dimensions to the expression of author stance. One of the questions related to this study is a widely discussed issue whether there is a relationship between evidentiality and epistemic modality and what kind of relationship it is (de Haan 1999; Dendale & Tasmowski 2001; Nuyts 2006; Cornillie 2009; Mortelmans 2009).

The conceptual difference between the two categories is undoubtedly clear and efficiently summarized by de Haan, who claims that „evidentiality asserts evidence,

while epistemic modality evaluates evidence" (De Haan 2005: 380). However, many markers are polyfunctional in nature, and besides the encoded source of information element they also convey other meanings, for example, modal. To separate several meanings and to state which one is dominating is difficult and often impossible (Dendale, Tasmowski 2001: 345). Faller (2002) calls such cases *epistentials*, which means that one marker contains several meanings and one semantic element becomes predominant in a particular context.

Due to this semantic polyfunctionality some scholars contend (van der Auwera, Plungian 1998: 86) that there is an overlap of the categories of epistemic necessity and evidentiality, and this overlap manifests itself when the source of information is mental activity – inference. In such cases the speaker does not have access to the primary information source and has to rely on his or her inferential judgement. This entails an element of doubt which traditionally has been ascribed to epistemic modality.

This aspect becomes important in the analysis of academic discourse, where the linguistic choices the author makes are largely strategic and well thought over. The markers that have epistemic evidential basis are different from purely epistemic markers that are mosty associated with a lower degree of certainty on the part of the speaker. Within the framework of this research, the view is taken that the expressions of direct evidentiality (for example, *x claims, according to x,* etc) are not considered hedges as the main function they serve is not to help the author avoid responsibility for the proposition but to provide background for the research problem the author discusses. Only such evidentiality markers which also have the overlapping element of epistemic modality have the potential to act as hedges. These markers convey additional author stance perspectives and dimensions than just epistemic markers.

Vagueness is one more linguistic category that links closely with the concept of hedging. When Lakoff introduced the concept of hedges in 1973, he already emphasized their inherent semantic element of vagueness that does not allow to judge whether statements modified by hedges are absolutely true or false, as in his example:

Approximately half of the prime numbers are of the form 4N + 1.

(Lakoff 1973: 467)

From a pragmatic perspective, vague language markers also allow the author to avoid full responsibility for the claim, because modified by such markers, the claim becomes less categorical. Vague language was considerably explored by Channell (1990; 1994), who described various ways of vague language formation. In her work, Channell does not explicitly link vague language and hedging, but most of the communicative goals and pragmatic intentions that she describes in relation to the concept of vague language, can also be observed in the use of hedges. The key intentions are a wish to keep to politeness conventions, a wish to avoid criticism, a lack of specific information, etc. (Channell 1990: 98; Channell 1994: 173-191).

Meyers (1996) also emphasized the importance of vague language in academic discourse. Just like Channell, Meyers first of all associates vagueness with an intentional choice of the author. In most of the cases, there is a possibility of a more exact statement, but the author avoids it. For Meyers, this strategic vagueness is not a realization of some specific pragmatic intention, but a natural part of the knowledge creation process in science.

It has to be mentioned, that in this study not all the expressions of vague language are considered hedges. In some of the cases, the borderline between hedges and boosters becomes less clear. For example, Varttala (2001) considers intensifying adverbs *significantly, greatly, markedly* to be hedges because they have an indefinite degree reference. Eventhough this is the case, the functional role of those markers is not to diminish the commitment of the author (which has traditionally been associated with hedging), but to increase it, which is a different pragmatic function, that of boosting.

These are the major theoretical preliminaries of this research. Three categories of hedges under analysis (modal auxiliaries, lexical verbs and adverbials) are discussed in chapters 5, 6 and 7. Each chapter presents the key issues of each hedging category as well as quantitative and qualitative findings of the research.

Modal auxiliaries as hedging devices in medical and linguistic research articles in English and Lithuanian. Eventhough modal verbs in the English language are frequently mentioned as prototypical markers of epistemic modality, they are not always the most frequent hedging devices (Hyland 1998a; Varttala 2001; Vold 2006).

Each modal auxiliary can express more than one modal meaning and, as it has been mentioned, only epistemic meanings are associated with hedging.

It has been observed that especially in academic language *may*, which is traditionally associated with epistemic tentative possibility, becomes interchangeable with *can* in expressing theoretical possibility (Declerck 1991: 397; Dekeyser et al. 2004: 107; Leech 2004: 76). This means that *may* in the empirical data has to be very carefully analyzed in order to distinguish between its meaning of a mere theoretical possibility that does not perform the function of hedging and its epistemic meaning which allows *may* to act as a hedge.

A related issue is the range of modal meanings that are ascribed to *can*. Coates (1983) claims that of all modal verbs *can* is the only modal auxiliary that does not convey an epistemic meaning in its positive form (Coates 1983: 19, 85). Since only epistemic meanings are associated with hedging, this entails that *can* in fact can not perform the function of hedging because in affirmative contexts it mainly marks theoretical possibility but not the speaker's assessment of the likelihood of the proposition. Eventhough there is some tendency of *can* developing epistemic meaning in positive contexts (Coates 1995; Varttala 2001; Rezzano 2004), the empirical data of this research did not confirm this tendency.

In the Lithuanian language there are two modal verbs *galėti* and *turėti* which can convey an epistemic meaning. The verb *galėti* corresponds to *can/may/might/could* and can convey both epistemic and non-epistemic possibility. The verb *turėti* ('have to') also conveys both epistemic and non-epistemic meanings and also retains its premodal meaning of possession (Holvoet 2007).

The results of the quantitative and qualitative analysis of modal verbs as hedges in English and Lithuanian research articles yielded certain similarities and certain differences. In the analyzed English linguistic and medical research articles quite similar frequency distribution of the epistemic readings of modal verbs *could, may, might* was observed: 2.2 per 1000 words, n = 158 in the medical texts and 2.4 per 1000 words, n = 282 in the linguistic texts. *May* and *might* are predominant epistemic modals used as hedges in both disciplines. 68% of *may* occurrences and 60% of *might* occurrences have an epistemic reading and perform the function of hedging in the linguistic articles. In the

medical articles 66% of *may* occurrences and 76% of *might* occurrences have an epistemic reading and act as hedges. On the other hand, *could* is more frequently used to express a non-epistemic meaning. Only 33% of its uses were epistemic in the linguistic texts. In the medical texts epistemic readings account for 34% of *could* occurrences. In the analyzed research articles in English the modal verb *can* was not used in its epistemic meaning and therefore did not perform the function of hedging. Inferential *must* was not used at all in the medical articles, whereas in the linguistic articles its usage was peripheral: 0.05 per 1000 words, n = 6. There were no significant cross-disciplinary differences in the usage of modal verbs as hedges in the analyzed English articles.

The analysis of the Lithuanian research articles yielded different tendencies of the usage of modal verbs as hedges. The predominant meaning conveyed by *galėti* and *turėti* forms is non-epistemic. The possibility verb *galėti* was nearly two times more frequent in the linguistic articles, however, the ratio between epistemic and non-epistemic readings is similar in both disciplines (see table 2). Among all the conjugated forms of *galėti* the third person present tense form *gãli* is the most frequent form both in medical and linguistic texts: 1.54 per 1000 words, n = 101 in the medical articles, and 3.58 per 1000 words, n = 286 in the linguistic articles. However, this form is not frequently used as a hedge in its epistemic meaning: 0.46 per 1000 words, n = 30 in the medical texts, and 0.61 per 1000 words, n = 49 in the linguistic texts.

Another very frequently used form of *galėti* is the impersonal modal *galima* which conveys only non-epistemic meaning (Holvoet 2007). Its frequency is 1.3 per 1000 words, n = 83 in the medical texts, and 3.3 per 1000 words, n = 259 in the linguistic texts. Like in English, only epistemic forms of Lithuanian modal verbs performed the function of hedging. Non-epistemic readings did not convey author stance and mainly marked theoretical possibility. The distribution of epistemic and non-epistemic readings of all *galėti* forms is presented in table 2:

Table 2. Relative frequency of epistemic vs. non-epistemic readings of *galėti*

Galėti meaning (all forms of the verb)	Linguistic research articles	Medical research articles
Epistemic	13 %	15 %
Non-epistemic	87 %	85 %

The second modal verb analysed in the Lithuanian research articles was *turėti*. *Turėti* is a very frequent word in the Lithuanian language, but its high frequency is a result of its meaning of posession. In its epistemic necessity meaning this modal verb is peripheral in the texts of both disciplines (0.05 per 1000 words, n = 3 in the medical texts and 0.09 per 1000 words, n = 7 in the linguistic texts). There are no significant cross-disciplinary differences in the usage of modal verbs acting as hedges in the analyzed Lithuanian articles. It can only be mentioned that in the medical articles *galėti* was used slightly less often in its both epistemic and non-epistemic readings than in the linguistic articles.

Lexical verbs as hedging devices in medical and linguistic research articles in English and Lithuanian. Lexical verbs deemed as hedges were classified into four semantic groups: *verbs of utterance*, *mental verbs*, *verbs of intent* and *verbs of seeming* in both languages. The results of quantitative analysis of lexical verbs acting as hedges in the English subcorpus are presented in table 3.

Table 3. Raw frequencies and normalized frequencies (per 1000 words) of lexical verbs identified as hedging devices in medical and linguistic research articles in English

Lexical verbs (hedges)	Medical research articles		Linguistic research articles	
	Raw frequencies	Normalized frequencies	Raw frequencies	Normalized frequencies
Verbs of Utterance	88	1.24	201	1.7
Mental Verbs	51	0.7	117	1.00
Verbs of Intent	3	0.04	17	0.2
Verbs of Seeming	15	0.21	152	1.30
Total	157	2.2	487	4.2

18 different lexical verbs performing the function of hedging were identified in the English medical subcorpus. Verbs of utterance (for example, *suggest, indicate, propose*) were the most frequent lexical verbs acting as hedges in the medical articles in English. *Suggest* as a hedge was particularly frequent in the medical texts, primarily in constructions with an inanimate subject as in *our data suggest, our results suggest* (0.9

per 1000 words, n = 67). Though generally frequent in use, the verb *indicate* (0.8 per 1000 words, n = 54) was far less common as a hedge (0.2 per 1000 words, n = 12). In its non-hedging uses, *indicate* conveyed certainty rather than uncertainty or was used in explanatory contexts, such as, for example, *table 4 indicates*, *as indicated above*, *indicated by example (28)*. Mental verbs (*believe*, *assume*, *consider*, etc.) were the second most frequent semantic group of hedges among lexical verbs in the medical articles. The predominant hedge in this category was *believe* (0.2 per 1000 words, n = 13). Verbs of intent (*seek*) and verbs of seeming *(seem*, *appear*) were peripheral in the medical articles in English.

In the English linguistic articles 28 different lexical verbs were identified as hedges. The most prominent semantic group of lexical verbs employed as hedges in the linguistic texts, just like in the medical texts, were verbs of utterance. *Suggest* was the most commonly employed lexical verb expressing mitigation (1 per 1000 words, n = 113). *Indicate* was a frequent verb (1 per 1000 words, n = 113), however, in most of its uses this polysemous marker had the meaning of *show* rather than *suggest*. As a hedge, *indicate* was not predominant in the linguistic texts (0.2 per 1000 words, n = 23). Within the mental verbs group in the linguistic articles the most frequent hedges were *tend* (0.3 per 1000 words, n = 34)*, assume* (0.2 per 1000 words, n = 22) and *think* (0.2 per 1000 words, n = 17). Verbs of intent (*attempt*, *seek*, *try*) were not very frequently used in the linguistic texts.

The most noticeable cross-disciplinary difference appeared to be the usage of verbs of seeming as hedges. Verbs of seeming in the linguistic articles were one of the most frequent hedges within the lexical verbs category, whereas in the medical articles their frequency was significantly lower (see table 3).

The results of quantitative analysis of lexical verbs acting as hedges in the Lithuanian articles are presented in table 4.

Table 4. Raw frequencies and normalized frequencies (per 1000 words) of lexical verbs identified as hedging devices in medical and linguistic research articles in Lithuanian

Lexical verbs (hedges)	Medical research articles		Linguistic research articles	
	Raw frequencies	Normalized frequencies	Raw frequencies	Normalized frequencies
Verbs of Utterance	18	0.27	41	0.51
Mental Verbs	41	0.63	101	1.27
Verbs of Intent	7	0.11	34	0.43
Verbs of Seeming	1	0.02	6	0.08
Total	67	1.02	182	2.28

A more diverse range and a more frequent usage of lexical verbs as hedges was observed in the Lithuanian linguistic texts. Linguists employed 22 different lexical verbs as hedges, whereas medical researchers used only 9. The most frequent semantic group of verbs acting as hedges in both linguistic and medical Lithuanian texts were mental verbs (for example, *manyti* 'think', *laikyti* 'hold/consider', *linkti* 'tend'). Verbs of intent (for example, *mėginti, bandyti* 'try', *siekti* 'seek') were not frequently used in the linguistic articles and quite rare in the medical articles. Verbs of seeming (*atrodyti* 'seem') in both disciplines were peripheral (see table 4).

Adverbs and adverbials as hedging devices in medical and linguistic research articles in English and Lithuanian. Adverbs and adverbials identified as hedges in the corpus of research articles were classified into three semantic groups: epistemic, epistemic-evidential and vague language markers. Table 5 shows raw frequencies and normalized frequencies (per 1000 words) of all three groups of adverbs and adverbials acting as hedges in English and Lithuanian articles.

Table 5. Raw frequencies and normalized frequencies (per 1000 words) of adverbs and adverbials identified as hedges in English and Lithuanian linguistic and medical research articles

Adverbs / adverbials (hedges)	EN linguistics normalized fr. (raw frequencies)	EN medicine normalized fr. (raw frequencies)	LT linguistics normalized fr. (raw frequencies)	LT medicine normalized fr. (raw frequencies)
Epistemic	**1.00** (116)	**0.56** (40)	**0.75** (60)	**0.05** (3)
Epistemic-evidential	**0.22** (26)	**0.03** (2)	**0.64** (51)	**0.08** (5)
Vague language markers	**2.04** (238)	**1.18** (84)	**2.91** (232)	**1.13** (74)
Total:	**3.26** (380)	**1.77** (126)	**4.30** (343)	**1.25** (82)

As can be seen from table 5, the most frequent category of adverbials found in hedging use in the English articles was vague language markers. This group of hedges was further subdivided into approximators (for example, *approximately*, *around*, *about*, *nearly, roughly*), qualification hedges (for example, *basically*, *essentially*, *generally*) and indefinite degree hedges *(*for example, *fairly*, *rather*, *quite*, *slightly*, *somewhat*). Typical epistemic adverbs used in the English texts were *probably*, *perhaps*, *likely*, *potentially*, whereas the most frequent epistemic-evidential adverbs used in the articles were *presumably* and *apparently*.

Adverbs and adverbials were the second most frequently used group of hedges in the English linguistic texts and the third most frequent group in the English medical texts. Linguists employed 37 different adverbs and adverbials as hedges: 9 epistemic, 7 epistemic-evidential ir 21 vague language markers. The variety of adverbs and adverbials in the English medical articles was smaller. Altogether there were 21 different types of hedges used: 5 epistemic, 2 epistemic-evidential and 14 vague language markers.

In the analyzed Lithuanian research articles, adverbs and adverbials were the most frequent hedges in both medical and linguistic research articles. Linguists used 35

different hedges in this category: 10 epistemic, 7 epistemic-evidential and 18 vague language markers. In the medical articles the variety was smaller. Overall 17 different hedges were used: 3 epistemic, 2 epistemic-evidential and 12 vague language markers.

The semantic content of most of the adverbs and adverbials acting as hedges in the Lithuanian research articles turned out to be nearly equivalent to adverbs and adverbials used in the English research articles. The group of vague language markers consisted of approximators (for example, *apie* 'around', *maždaug* 'approximately', *apytikriai*, *apytiksliai* 'nearly'), qualification hedges (for example, *iš esmės*, 'basically', *iš principo* 'essentially', *daugmaž, daugiau ar mažiau* 'more or less') and indefinite degree hedges (for example, *gana* 'rather', *šiek tiek* 'slightly'). Typical epistemic adverbials used as hedges were *gal, galbūt* 'perhaps', *greičiausiai, veikiausiai* 'most probably', whereas the most frequent epistemic-evidential adverbial acting as a hedge was *matyt* 'presumably'.

The variety of adverbs and adverbials acting as hedges provides many opportunities for the authors of scientific text to qualify their certainty and commitment towards the truth of the proposition.

Conclusions

1. The results of the quantitative analysis revealed that the frequency of hedges in the analyzed articles depends both on the language and discipline.

1.1. The overall incidence of hedges in the analyzed English research articles was 8.52 per 1000 words, n = 1599, whereas in the analyzed Lithuanian research articles the overall incidence of hedges was 5.65 per 1000 words, n = 821.

1.2. In both Lithuanian and English medical research articles fewer hedges were used than in the linguistic research articles. 1156 hedges (9.92 per 1000 words) were identified in the English linguistic texts and 443 hedges (6.23 per 1000 words) were observed in the English medical texts. In the Lithuanian linguistic articles the overall incidence of hedges was 623 hedges (7.81 per 1000 words), whereas in the medical research articles the number of occurrences of hedges was 198 (3.02 per 1000 words).

One of the reasons determining such a tendency could be a different nature of the investigated disciplines. Researchers in the biomedical field usually base their assumptions and conclusions on more concrete research findings, yielded by laboratory

experiments and there might be less space for possible interpretations. It could be one of the reasons why biomedical researchers tend to express a stronger and less hedged position. In the humanities, a straightforward interpretation of the research results is often unlikely, that is why authors of scientific texts might resort to a more cautious, hedged expression of their arguments.

2. The type of the most frequent lexical hedges depends on the language (English *vs.* Lithuanian).

2.1. Adverbs and adverbials were the most common mitigating devices in the analyzed Lithuanian linguistic and medical research articles (overall number of occurrences in the linguistic texts n = 343, 4.3 per 1000 words; overall number of occurrences in the medical texts n = 82, 1.3 per 1000 words), whereas the least frequently employed hedging devices were modal verbs (overall number of occurrences in the linguistic articles n = 98, 1.2 per 1000 words; overall number of occurrences in the medical articles n = 49, 0.8 per 1000 words).

2.2. In the analyzed English linguistic texts the most frequent hedges were lexical verbs: 4.2 per 1000 words, n = 487. In the analyzed English medical texts both lexical verbs and modal verbs were nearly equally frequently employed as hedges. Overall incidence of lexical verbs as hedges was 157, 2.2 per 1000 words, overall incidence of modal verbs as hedges was 160, 2.3 per 1000 words.

3. The variety of hedging devices is determined by the discipline.

In the English linguistic texts 70 different types of hedges were identified, whereas in the English medical texts 43 different types of hedges were observed. In the Lithuanian linguistic articles the number of different hedges was 61; in the medical articles 29 different hedges were used. These results reflect a preference (or a need) by linguists to use more diversified ways of expression in constructing a scientific argument.

4. Pragmatic functions performed by hedges are similar in both Lithuanian and English articles. Researchers in both languages and disciplines seemed to employ hedges for similar reasons: to communicate modesty and deference to the academic community, to diminish the strength of the statements, to avoid full commitment to the truth of the proposition.

5. Hedging devices with epistemic and epistemic-evidential values were employed more frequently than vague language markers in both Lithuanian and English investigated research articles.

AUTORIAUS POZICIJOS ŠVELNINIMAS RAŠYTINIAME MOKSLINIAME DISKURSE: GRETINAMASIS TYRIMAS

Reziumė

<u>Darbo objektas</u> – autoriaus pozicijos švelninimas humanitarinių (kalbotyros) ir biomedicinos (medicinos) sričių moksliniuose straipsniuose anglų bei lietuvių kalbomis kaip semantikos ir pragmatikos sąveiką iliustruojantis reiškinys. Dėl didelės kalbinių vienetų, potencialiai galinčių atlikti sąšvelnių funkciją, įvairovės šiame darbe apsiribota tik tam tikromis raiškos priemonėmis: modaliniais veiksmažodžiais, leksiniais veiksmažodžiais ir prieveiksmiais bei *aplinkybiniais žodžiais* (angl. *adverbials*), kurie tiriami iš episteminio modalumo, evidencialumo ir neapibrėžtumo kategorijų perspektyvos.

<u>Darbo tikslai ir uždaviniai</u>

Šio darbo tikslai:

1. Nustatyti sąšvelnių vartosenos kiekybines tendencijas bei raiškos ypatumus moksliniuose kalbotyros ir medicinos straipsniuose lietuvių ir anglų kalbomis.

2. Išsiaiškinti, kokie veiksniai lemia autoriaus pozicijos raišką mokslo kalboje: konkreti mokslo sritis ar kalbos ypatumai.

Šiems tikslams pasiekti keliami tokie uždaviniai:

1. Sudaryti medicinos ir kalbotyros mokslinių straipsnių palyginamąjį tekstyną lietuvių ir anglų kalbomis.

2. Nustatyti, kokie modaliniai veiksmažodžiai, leksiniai veiksmažodžiai, prieveiksmiai ir aplinkybiniai žodžiai vartojami autoriaus pozicijai švelninti moksliniuose tekstuose ir kaip dažnai šią funkciją jie atlieka.

3. Ištirti šių leksinių vienetų semantikos ypatumus, leidžiančius atlikti pragmatinę sąšvelnio funkciją.

4. Atskleisti sąšvelnių atliekamų pragmatinių funkcijų pobūdį.

5. Identifikuoti tarpkalbinius ir tarpdisciplininius sąšvelnių vartosenos panašumus ir skirtumus.

Darbo naujumas, aktualumas ir problematika

Ši disertacija yra pirmas bandymas išsamiau patyrinėti autoriaus pozicijos raiškos aspektus lietuvių mokslo kalboje. Pastaraisiais dešimtmečiais kalbotyroje daug dėmesio skiriama autoriaus pozicijos raiškai moksliniame diskurse, akcentuojamos įvairios teksto kūrimo strategijos, leidžiančios autoriui ne tik perteikti informaciją skaitytojui, bet ir kurti santykį su juo, jį paveikti. Autoriaus pozicijos tyrimų kontekste prabilta apie kultūrinį identitetą akademinėje kalboje, svarstoma, kas lemia akademinio diskurso raišką: individualūs, atskiroms kalboms ir kultūroms būdingi bruožai ar universalesnė dalykinė specifika. Autoriaus pozicijos *švelninimas* (angl. *hedging*), kuris daug ir įvairiai analizuotas skirtingose kalbose kaip vienas autoriaus pozicijos raiškos aspektų, lietuvių akademiniame diskurse kol kas beveik visai netyrinėtas. Skirtingų mokslo krypčių anglų ir lietuvių kalba parašytų tekstų pagrindu atliktas tyrimas parodo ne tik tarpkalbinius ir tarpkultūrinius skirtumus, bet ir lietuvių bei anglų akademinės kalbos tarpdisciplininius ypatumus. Darbo problematika yra glaudžiai susijusi su kalbotyroje plačiai tyrinėjamomis episteminio modalumo, evidencialumo, neapibrėžtumo kategorijomis, kurios lietuvių akademinio diskurso kontekste kol kas menkai tyrinėtos.

Darbo vertė ir pritaikymas

Šiuo darbu siekiama atkreipti dėmesį į autoriaus pozicijos raišką ir jos savitumą skirtingose disciplinose ir apskritai į lietuvių mokslo kalbos ypatumus bei tradicijas. Tikimasi, kad ši disertacija paskatins tolesnius šio įdomaus, pasaulyje plačiai aptariamo, bet lietuvių mokslo kalboje mažai nagrinėto reiškinio tyrimus. Sąšvelnių tyrimo rezultatai galėtų praversti baigiamuosius darbus rašantiems studentams ir mokslinio diskurso ypatumų juos mokantiems dėstytojams, pasitarnautų mokslininkams, kuriantiems tekstą anglų kalba, vertėjams ir redaktoriams, savo darbe nuolat susiduriantiems su tarpkalbine ir tarpkultūrine specifika.

Ginamieji teiginiai

1. Iš darbe tyrinėtų leksinių vienetų sąšvelnių pragmatinei funkcijai atlikti lietuvių kalboje dažniausiai vartojami prieveiksmiai ir aplinkybiniai žodžiai, o anglų kalboje – leksiniai veiksmažodžiai.

2. Lietuvių kalboje tyrinėtomis leksinėmis priemonėmis autoriaus poziciją linkstama švelninti rečiau nei anglų: tai patvirtina, kad sąšvelniai – nuo kalbos priklausomas reiškinys.

3. Tarpdisciplininiai skirtumai yra mažiau ryškūs nei tarpkalbiniai. Tai patvirtina tam tikrus disciplininius panašumus: tyrinėtuose medicinos mokslo straipsniuose abiejose kalbose autoriaus pozicija švelninama rečiau ir sąšvelnių įvairovė yra menkesnė nei kalbotyros straipsniuose.

4. Sprendžiant iš tyrinėtų leksinių vienetų vartosenos, abiejų kalbų straipsniuose dažnesni episteminį ir episteminį-evidencinį semantinį elementą turintys sąšvelniai nei neapibrėžtumo žymikliai.

Tyrimo metodai ir medžiaga

Šiame darbe taikoma keletas tyrimo metodų. Gretinamoji analizė, pagrindinis šio darbo metodas, leidžia atskleisti kalbos reiškinio skirtingose kalbose savitumą bei išryškinti jo universalius bruožus. Ši metodika, anot Hylando, ypatingai tinka akademinio diskurso studijoms, nes bet koks tarpdisciplininis tyrimas jau inherentiškai yra lyginamasis (Hyland 2006). Gretinamąja analize pagrįsti sąšvelnių tarpdalykiniai ir tarpkalbiniai tyrimai gali parodyti jų vartosenos tendencijas ir tradicijas akademinėje kalboje, patvirtinti jau pastebėtą sąšvelnių raiškos priemonių bei atliekamų funkcijų spektrą ir atskleisti naujų sąšvelnių vartosenos ypatumų.

Šis tyrimas taip pat remiasi tekstynų lingvistikos metodais, tirtas susidarytas palyginamasis dvikalbis tekstynas *CompAc* (332 883 žodžiai), kuris susideda iš medicinos ir kalbotyros mokslinių straipsnių lietuvių ir anglų kalbomis.

Disertacijos struktūra

Disertaciją sudaro įvadas, dvi literatūros apžvalgos dalys, tyrimo metodų ir medžiagos pristatymo skyrius, trys analizės dalys, išvados, cituotos literatūros ir empirinės medžiagos šaltinių sąrašas. Kiekviena analizės dalis yra skirta vienos sąšvelnių grupės (modalinių veiksmažodžių, leksinių veiksmažodžių ir prieveiksmių bei aplinkybinių žodžių) vartosenos tendencijoms abiejose kalbose ir disciplinose aptarti: pirmiausia supažindinama su probleminiais konkrečios leksinių vienetų grupės aspektais, toliau pristatomi analizės rezultatai. Disertacijos išvadose pateikiami rezultatų apibendrinimai ir pasvarstymai apie tolesnes tyrimo perspektyvas.

Tyrimo rezultatai ir išvados

Šiame darbe tyrinėtas vienas autoriaus pozicijos raiškos mokslo kalboje aspektas – sąšvelnių vartosena angliškuose ir lietuviškuose kalbotyros ir medicinos moksliniuose straipsniuose. Tyrimas atskleidė šiuos pagrindinius sąšvelnių vartosenos ypatumus analizuotoje medžiagoje:

1. Tiriamosios medžiagos kiekybinė analizė leidžia teigti, kad sąšvelnių vartojimo dažnį lemia ir konkreti kalba, ir disciplina.

1.1. Pagal analizuojamus rodiklius anglakalbiai mokslininkai sąšvelnius vartojo maždaug 1,5 karto dažniau nei lietuviai. Tyrinėtuose angliškuose straipsniuose nustatyti 1599 sąšvelnių vartojimo atvejai (normalizuotas dažnis 1000 žodžių imtyje – 8,52), lietuviškuose straipsniuose jų buvo 821 (normalizuotas dažnis 1000 žodžių imtyje – 5,65).

Tokios sąšvelnių vartosenos tendencijos dera su kai kurių kitų tarpkalbinių sąšvelnių tyrimų rezultatais (žr., pavyzdžiui, Vassileva 1997, 2001; Réfega de Figueiredo-Silva 2001; Vold 2006; Trbojevic Milosevic 2010). Tendencija rečiau vartoti sąšvelnius kitose, ne anglų, kalbose yra aiškinama įvairiai. Vassileva (1997, 2001), komentuodama bulgarų autorių pasirinkimą moksliniuose straipsniuose žymiai rečiau, lyginant su anglakalbiais mokslininkais, vartoti sąšvelnius, atkreipia dėmesį į skirtingas rašymo mokymo tradicijas: anglakalbių švietimo sistemoje rašymo mokymui skiriama daug daugiau dėmesio nei bulgarų (Vassileva 2001: 99). Prancūzų mokslininkų sąšvelnių vengimą Vold (2006) aiškina skirtingais *akademinės kultūros* (angl. *academic cultures*) stiliais: prancūzų mokslininkai yra labiau kategoriški ir tiesmukiški nei anglakalbiai kolegos (Vold 2006: 82–84). Trbojevic Milosevic (2010) serbų tiesmukiškumą interpretuoja kaip tam tikrą kultūrinį bruožą, atsiskleidžiantį kalboje.

Kadangi šio tyrimo rezultatai pagrįsti 40 lietuviškų straipsnių analize, negalima daryti apibendrinimų apie lietuvių mokslininkų akademinį stilių ar kultūrinių bruožų įtaką jo formavimuisi, tačiau vis dėlto reikia pripažinti, jog *kokie*, *kaip* ir *kiek* sąšvelniai vartojami, greičiausiai priklauso nuo konkrečios kalbos suteikiamų galimybių, tam tikrų susiklosčiusių rašymo tradicijų bei kultūrinių ypatumų, nulemiančių autorių pasaulėžiūrą.

1.2. Angliškuose ir lietuviškuose medicinos mokslo straipsniuose vartota mažiau tyrinėtų kategorijų sąšvelnių nei kalbotyros. Angliškuose kalbininkų straipsniuose pagal tyrinėjamus rodiklius buvo nustatyti 1156 sąšvelnių pavartojimai (normalizuotas dažnis 1000 žodžių imtyje – 9,92), medikų straipsniuose – 443 (normalizuotas dažnis 1000 žodžių imtyje – 6,23). Lietuviškuose kalbotyros straipsniuose nustatyti 623 sąšvelnių pavartojimai (normalizuotas dažnis 1000 žodžių imtyje – 7,81), medicinos mokslo straipsniuose – 198 (normalizuotas dažnis 1000 žodžių imtyje – 3,02).

Viena iš priežasčių, lemiančių tokią tendenciją, tikėtina, yra skirtingas tyrinėtų disciplinų pobūdis. Biomedicinos moksluose remiamasi konkretesniais, laboratoriniais tyrimais pagrįstais duomenimis, juose yra mažiau erdvės interpretacijoms, todėl medikai savo poziciją reiškia tvirčiau. Humanitariniuose moksluose neretai įžvalgas tenka grįsti mažiau konkrečiais rezultatais, nes tyrinėjant kalbą ne visuomet pavyksta rasti vienareikšmių atsakymų, todėl tokiuose tekstuose ir daugiau sušvelnintos autoriaus pozicijos raiškos. Kalbotyros straipsniuose dažniau vartojami sąšvelniai pabrėžia svarstomąjį teiginių pobūdį, leidžiantį kurti glaudesnį santykį su skaitytoju, pakviesti jį pokalbio. Medikų kuriamame diskurse tai yra taip pat svarbu, tačiau sprendžiant iš abiejose disciplinose nustatytų sąšvelnių dažnio ir pobūdžio, medikai į tai atsižvelgia kiek rečiau.

2. Dažniausiai pasirenkama leksinių vienetų kaip sąšvelnių grupė labiau priklauso nuo kalbos nei nuo disciplinos.

2.1. Tyrinėtuose moksliniuose straipsniuose lietuvių kalba dažniausiai kaip sąšvelniai buvo vartojami prieveiksmiai ir aplinkybiniai žodžiai, rečiau – leksiniai veiksmažodžiai. Rečiausiai abiejų disciplinų straipsniuose kaip sąšvelniai buvo vartojami modaliniai veiksmažodžiai. Kalbotyros straipsniuose prieveiksmių ir aplinkybinių žodžių, vartotų kaip sąšvelniai, absoliutus dažnis – 343 (normalizuotas dažnis 1000 žodžių imtyje – 4,3), leksinių veiksmažodžių – 182 (normalizuotas dažnis 1000 žodžių imtyje – 2,3), o modalinių veiksmažodžių – 98 (normalizuotas dažnis 1000 žodžių imtyje – 1,2). Medicinos mokslo straipsniuose prieveiksmių ir aplinkybinių žodžių, vartotų kaip sąšvelniai, absoliutus dažnis – 82 (normalizuotas dažnis 1000 žodžių imtyje – 1,3), leksinių veiksmažodžių – 67 (normalizuotas dažnis 1000 žodžių imtyje – 1), o modalinių veiksmažodžių – 49 (normalizuotas dažnis 1000 žodžių imtyje – 0,8).

2.2. Dažniausioje tirtų lietuviškų straipsnių sąšvelnių – prieveiksmių ir aplinkybinių žodžių – grupėje dominavo neapibrėžtumo sąšvelniai: medicinos mokslo straipsniuose jie sudarė 90 % visų šios grupės žymiklių, o kalbotyros straipsniuose – 67 %. Episteminiai ir episteminiai-evidenciniai aplinkybiniai žodžiai kalbotyros straipsniuose buvo vartoti kiek rečiau (atitinkamai 18 % ir 15 %), o medicinos mokslo straipsniuose – žymiai rečiau (atitinkamai 4 % ir 6 %) nei neapibrėžtumo prieveiksmiai ir aplinkybiniai žodžiai. Taip greičiausiai yra dėl didelės neapibrėžtumą perteikiančių žymiklių įvairovės: kalbotyros straipsniuose buvo nustatyta 18 skirtingų žymiklių, o medicinos mokslo straipsniuose – 12 (daugiau kiekybinių duomenų pateikiama 7 skyriuje).

2.3. Iš kiek rečiau kaip sąšvelniai vartotų leksinių veiksmažodžių grupės lietuvių kalba mentaliniai veiksmažodžiai buvo dažniausi: medicinos mokslo straipsniuose jie sudarė 61 %, o kalbotyros straipsniuose – 55 % visų kaip sąšvelniai vartotų leksinių veiksmažodžių. Kalbėjimo ir ketinimo veiksmažodžiai vartoti rečiau, o atrodymo veiksmažodžiai beveik nevartoti abiejų disciplinų straipsniuose (daugiau kiekybinių duomenų pateikiama 6.5 skyriuje).

2.4. Tyrinėtuose kalbotyros ir medicinos mokslo straipsniuose anglų kalba dažniausiai kaip sąšvelniai buvo vartojami leksiniai veiksmažodžiai. Tiesa, medicinos mokslo straipsniuose kaip dažniausios dominavo dvi grupės: leksinių veiksmažodžių ir modalinių veiksmažodžių. Kalbotyros straipsniuose leksinių veiksmažodžių, vartotų kaip sąšvelniai, absoliutus dažnis – 487 (normalizuotas dažnis 1000 žodžių imtyje – 4,2). Kiek rečiau kalbotyros straipsniuose kaip sąšvelniai vartojami prieveiksmiai ir aplinkybiniai žodžiai: absoliutus jų dažnis – 380 (normalizuotas dažnis 1000 žodžių imtyje – 3,3) bei modaliniai veiksmažodžiai: absoliutus dažnis – 289 (normalizuotas dažnis 1000 žodžių imtyje – 2,5). Medicinos mokslo straipsniuose modalinių veiksmažodžių, vartotų kaip sąšvelniai, absoliutus dažnis – 160 (normalizuotas dažnis 1000 žodžių imtyje – 2,3), o leksinių veiksmažodžių – 157 (normalizuotas dažnis 1000 žodžių imtyje – 2,2). Prieveiksmiai ir aplinkybiniai žodžiai medicinos mokslo straipsniuose buvo vartojami kiek rečiau: absoliutus jų dažnis – 126 (normalizuotas dažnis 1000 žodžių imtyje – 1,8).

2.5. Dažniausiai angliškuose straipsniuose vartotų sąšvelnių – leksinių veiksmažodžių – grupėje dominavo kalbėjimo veiksmažodžiai: jie sudarė 56 % visų medicinos mokslo straipsniuose kaip sąšvelniai vartotų leksinių veiksmažodžių, o kalbotyros straipsniuose – 41 %. Mentaliniai, ketinimo bei atrodymo veiksmažodžiai buvo vartojami rečiau (daugiau kiekybinių duomenų pateikiama 6.4 skyriuje).

2.6. Prieveiksmių ir aplinkybinių žodžių grupėje dažniausiai kaip sąšvelniai abiejų disciplinų straipsniuose anglų kalba buvo vartojami neapibrėžtumo žymikliai: kalbotyros straipsniuose jie sudarė 62 % visų šios grupės žymiklių, o medicinos moksliniuose straipsniuose – 66 %. Episteminiai ir episteminiai-evidenciniai žymikliai buvo vartojami rečiau: kalbotyros straipsniuose jie atitinkamai sudarė 31 % ir 7 %, o medicinos moksliniuose straipsniuose – 32 % ir 2 % visų prieveiksmių ir aplinkybinių žodžių, vartotų kaip sąšvelniai. Kaip ir lietuvių kalboje, toks žymiklių pasiskirstymas anglų kalboje greičiausiai yra dėl didelės neapibrėžtumą perteikiančių žymiklių įvairovės: kalbotyros straipsniuose buvo nustatyta 21 skirtingas žymiklis, o medicinos mokslo straipsniuose – 14 (daugiau kiekybinių duomenų pateikiama 7 skyriuje).

3. Sąšvelnių vartosenos įvairovė priklauso nuo disciplinos.

Kalbotyros straipsniuose anglų kalba buvo pavartota 70 skirtingų autoriaus poziciją švelninančių priemonių, medicinos mokslo straipsniuose – 43, lietuvių kalba atitinkamai – 61 ir 29. Toks vartotų leksinių vienetų įvairovės skirtumas yra suprantamas: mokslininko mediko prototipinis įrankis yra mikroskopas, o kalbininko – žodis, todėl sąšvelnių raiška ir lietuviškuose, ir angliškuose kalbotyros straipsniuose yra įvairesnė ir spalvingesnė.

4. Semantiniai ypatumai, leidžiantys atlikti pragmatinę sąšvelnio funkciją, yra panašūs abiejose kalbose.

4.1. Abiejų kalbų moksliniuose straipsniuose nustatytų sąšvelnių dominuojantis semantinis turinys yra panašus: dažniau vartoti episteminiai ir episteminiai-evidenciniai, o ne neapibrėžtumo žymikliai. Taip, tikėtina, nutinka dėl didesnės kalbinių vienetų, perteikiančių episteminio modalumo ir episteminius-evidencinius reikšmės atspalvius, įvairovės (tokias reikšmes gali įgyti ir modaliniai veiksmažodžiai, ir leksiniai veiksmažodžiai, ir prieveiksmiai bei aplinkybiniai žodžiai). O neapibrėžtumo semantinis

turinys reiškiamas tik prieveiksmiais ir aplinkybiniais žodžiais, todėl ši reikšmė buvo realizuojama rečiau.

4.2. Nors konceptualūs skirtumai tarp evidencialumo ir episteminio modalumo yra aiškūs, konkrečių žymiklių reikšmės išsidėsto tam tikrame kontinuume: viename jo krašte atsiduria prototipiniai, tik epistemiškumą perteikiantys kalbiniai vienetai (*gal / perhaps*, *galėti / may* ir pan.), o kitame – evidencinį pagrindą turintys žymikliai, išlaikę ir abejonės elementą (*seem / atrodyti*, *presumably / matyt* ir pan.). Dominuojantis pastarųjų žymiklių semantinis elementas – episteminis ar evidencinis – gali išryškėti kontekste.

5. Pragmatinės sąšvelnių atliekamos funkcijos yra panašios abiejose tirtose kalbose ir disciplinose.

Vertinant pagrindines sąšvelnių atliekamas pragmatines funkcijas reikšmingų tarpkalbinių ar tarpdalykinių skirtumų nepastebėta. Pagrindinis sąšvelnių vartosenos tikslas – sumažinti teiginio kategoriškumą ir atsakomybę už kalbamos propozicijos teisingumą, o tai gali lemti įvairios priežastys. Mokslinio teksto autorius gali rinktis sušvelnintą raišką reikšdamas kritiką, jei abejoja savo teiginių teisingumu, nenori apkrauti skaitytojo pernelyg tiksliais duomenimis, taip pat siekdamas susilpninti vieną argumentacijos aspektą, kad labiau išryškėtų kitas ir t. t. Pragmatinių funkcijų yra įvairių, tačiau jas ne visada lengva vieną nuo kitos atskirti, jos dažnai yra susipynusios.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF DISSERTATION

1. Šinkūnienė, J. 2010. Personal pronouns and authorial presence in written academic discourse. *Filologija* 15, 124-141.

2. Šinkūnienė, J. 2008. Hedging in Lithuanian and English research articles: a cross-disciplinary and cross-linguistic study of lexical hedges. *Kalbotyra* 58/3, 97 – 108.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF DISSERTATION

2009-12-02. *Inferential (deductive) and Assumptive matyt ('presumably') in Academic Discourse.* International workshop on Non-grammatical Evidentiality in the Baltic Languages: content, realizations, functions. Vilnius University (Vilnius, Lithuania

2009-11-13. *Personal Pronouns and Authorial Presence in Written Academic Discourse: a Cross-disciplinary and Cross-linguistic Investigation.* International scientific conference "Tekstas: lingvistika ir poetika". Šiauliai university, university of Latvia (Šiauliai, Lithuania)

2008-04-24. *Autoriaus pozicijos švelninimas: tarpdalykiniai ir tarpkalbiniai raiškos priemonių ypatumai.* Naujausi humanitariniai tyrinėjimai – 2008: respublikinė doktorantų mokslinė konferencija, Vilnius university (Vilnius, Lithuania)

Jolanta Šinkūnienė 1994 m. baigė Anglų filologijos specialybės studijas Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos fakultete, 1995 m. profesines vertimo studijas Vilniaus universitete, 1999 m. tarptautinio verslo studijas Tarptautinio verslo mokykloje. Vilniaus universiteto, Filologijos fakulteto Anglų filologijos katedroje dirba nuo 2003 m. 2006 metais pradėjo Vilniaus universiteto humanitarinių mokslų doktorantūros studijas. Doktorantė buvo išvykusi dalinių studijų į Antverpeno universitetą (2010.03 – 2010.08). 2010 m. disertantė buvo 43-iosios tarptautinės SLE (Societas Linguistica Europaea) konferencijos, kuri įvyko 2010 m. rugsėjo 2–5 d. Vilniuje, VU Filologijos fakultete, organizacinio komiteto sekretorė.

Jolanta Šinkūnienė graduated from Vilnius university with a diploma in English Philology in 1994. In 1995 she obtained a diploma in specialized translation studies (Vilnius University) as well as a diploma in International business management studies (Vilnius University) in 1999. Since 2003 Jolanta Šinkūnienė has been working at the Department of English Philology, Faculty of Philology, Vilnius University. In 2006 she became a PhD student at Vilnius University. During her PhD studies she was on Erasmus study visit at the University of Antwerp (March – August, 2010). She was the secretary of the 43rd International Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, which took place at Vilnius University on 2-5 September, 2010.