

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

Anna Ruskan

THE EXPRESSION AND CONTENTS OF NON-MORPHOLOGICAL  
EVIDENTIALITY IN LITHUANIAN:  
THE CASE OF NEUTER ADJECTIVES AND ADVERBS

Summary of doctoral dissertation  
Humanities, Philology (04 H)

Vilnius, 2013

This doctoral dissertation was written at Vilnius University in 2009-2013.

Research supervisor:

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

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

Chair:

**Prof. Dr. Vytautas Kardelis** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology ó 04 H)

Members:

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

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Erika Rimkutė** (Vytautas Magnus University, Humanities, Philology ó 04 H)

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Antanas Smetona** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology ó 04 H)

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

Opponents:

**Prof. Dr. Habil. Axel Holvoet** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology ó 04 H)

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

The public defence of the dissertation is to be held in the meeting of the Council of Philology of Vilnius University at 14 o'clock on 10 October 2013 in the Faculty of Philology, Vilnius University.

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

The summary of the dissertation was sent out to relevant institutions on \_\_\_\_ September 2013.

The dissertation is available at the library of Vilnius University.

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS

Anna Ruskan

NEMORFOLOGINIO EVIDENCIALUMO  
RAIŠKA IR TURINYS LIETUVIŲ KALBOJE:  
BEVARDŲ GIMINIS BŪDAS, DVARDAI IR PRIEVEIKSMIAI

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka  
Humanitariniai mokslai, filologija (04H)

Vilnius, 2013

Disertacija rengta 2009-2013 metais Vilniaus universitete.

Mokslinis vadovas:

**Prof. habil. dr. Aurelija Usonienė** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai ó filologija 04 H)

Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos mokslo krypties taryboje.

Pirmininkas

**Prof. dr. Vytautas Kardelis** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija ó 04 H)

Nariai:

**Prof. habil. dr. Ineta Dabašinskienė** (Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija ó 04 H)

**Doc. dr. Erika Rimkutė** (Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija ó 04 H)

**Doc. dr. Antanas Smetona** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija ó 04 H)

**Doc. dr. Jurgis Pakerys** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija ó 04 H)

Oponentai:

**Prof. habil. dr. Axel Holvoet** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija ó 04 H)

**Doc. dr. Jūratė Ruzaitė** (Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija ó 04 H)

Disertacija bus ginama viešame Filologijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2013 m. spalio mėn. 10 d. 14 val. Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos fakultete.

Adresas: Universiteto g. 5, LT-0513, Vilnius, Lietuva.

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinta 2013 m. rugsėjo mėn. \_\_\_\_ d.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje.

# THE EXPRESSION AND CONTENTS OF NON-MORPHOLOGICAL EVIDENTIALITY IN LITHUANIAN: THE CASE OF NEUTER ADJECTIVES AND ADVERBS

## INTRODUCTION

**The object of the research** is non-morphological evidentiality in Lithuanian realized by the neuter (non-agreeing<sup>1</sup>) adjectives *akivaizdu* ‘evident $\emptyset$ , *aišku* ‘clear $\emptyset$ , *ryšku* ‘clear, visible $\emptyset$  (literally ‘bright $\emptyset$ ), *panašu* ‘likely $\emptyset$ , *natūralu* ‘natural $\emptyset$  and the adverbs *akivaizdžiai* ‘evidently $\emptyset$ , *aiškiai* ‘clearly $\emptyset$ , *ryškiai* ‘clearly, visibly $\emptyset$  (literally ‘brightly $\emptyset$ ), *panašiai* ‘similarly $\emptyset$  and *natūraliai* ‘naturally $\emptyset$ . As these markers derive from the semantic domains of perception, comparison and knowledge, they have the potential to acquire evidential meanings and functions. The adjectives and the adverbs under study have been referred to as markers of non-morphological evidentiality since they contrast with the evidential participial constructions that are considered as morphological expressions of evidentiality.

**The aims of the research** are to explore non-morphological evidentiality realized by the non-agreeing adjectives and the adverbs in fiction and Lithuanian academic discourse, to complement the studies on author stance and adverbialization in Lithuanian and to account for the functional overlap (evidential epistemic, evidential and pragmatic) of the markers under study. To achieve these aims, the following **tasks** were set:

1. To investigate the morphosyntactic properties (Complement-Taking-Predicates (CTPs), adverbials) of the non-agreeing adjectives *akivaizdu* ‘evident $\emptyset$ , *aišku* ‘clear $\emptyset$ , *ryšku* ‘clear, visible $\emptyset$ , *panašu* ‘likely $\emptyset$ , *natūralu* ‘natural $\emptyset$  and the adverbs *akivaizdžiai* ‘evidently $\emptyset$ , *aiškiai* ‘clearly $\emptyset$ , *ryškiai* ‘clearly, visibly $\emptyset$ , *panašiai* ‘similarly $\emptyset$  and *natūraliai* ‘naturally $\emptyset$  to provide quantitative findings of the main patterns of use and identify their meanings and functions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Initially the term ‘neuter adjectives’ was adopted for the definition of the forms *akivaizdu* ‘evident $\emptyset$ , *aišku* ‘clear $\emptyset$ , *ryšku* ‘clear, visible $\emptyset$ , *panašu* ‘likely $\emptyset$ , *natūralu* ‘natural $\emptyset$  (Tekorien 1990). However, in the progress of the research it was replaced by the term ‘non-agreeing adjectives’ since the adjective forms under study retain only the formal features of the extinct neuter gender (Petit 2010).

2. To explore the distribution of evidential meanings and functions in fiction and academic discourse along the parameters of the source of evidence, subjectivity/ intersubjectivity and argumentative context.
3. To investigate the syntactic and semantic context of the markers that contributes to the evidential meanings and functions and to explore the contextual environment that adds to the loss of evidential semantics.
4. To discuss the semantic functional distribution of the non-agreeing adjectives and the adverbs under analysis paradigmatically.
5. To interpret double marking of evidentiality: the interaction of grammatical and lexical or two lexical evidential markers.

**The novelty and relevance of the research.** The realizations of non-morphological evidentiality have been widely investigated in European languages. The latest research of this functional conceptual domain has disclosed the inventory of evidential markers in English, German, Dutch, Italian, French, Spanish, Russian, Polish, Bulgarian, Latvian, Estonian and other languages and determined their relationship with epistemic modality. There are abundant studies on grammaticalization, lexicalization, pragmaticalization and adverbialization that deal with the diachronic development of evidential markers and their synchronic variation. The interaction of grammatical and lexical evidential markers has also received consideration. The intensive research into the domain of evidentiality in European languages has resulted in the design of a database of evidential markers that are recorded according to the set criteria (Wiemer, Stathi 2010).

Similarly to other European languages, the expression of non-morphological evidentiality in Lithuanian has become an important object of research. There are in-depth studies on the verbs of perception and seeming and evidential particles. There are also studies that deal with the evidential epistemic overlap of the markers and adverbialization in Lithuanian academic discourse. Despite these interesting and novel studies, there is no corpus-driven research on the evidential adjectives and adverbs and comparison of their distribution in different types of discourse (fiction and academic discourse). Corpus-driven methodology enables the researcher to apply statistical methods and draw grounded conclusions.

This research also complements the inventory of lexical evidential markers in Lithuanian and adds to the studies on the interaction between lexical and grammatical markers. The results of the research can be applied in lexicography, grammar, typological, contrastive and comparative studies.

**The following theses are to be defended:**

1. The non-agreeing adjectives used parenthetically display traces of adverbialization: syntactic mobility, the meaning of secondary predication and new discourse functions. These features indicate the grammatical status of the adjectives and make them similar to sentence adverbs.
2. Functions of stance adverbials expressed by the adverbs are determined by the semantic type of the verb the adverbs collocate with and evaluative elements in the context.
3. Having compared the morphosyntactic properties of the non-agreeing adjectives and the adverbs in fiction and academic discourse, it has been found out that the non-agreeing adjectives are used more frequently as evidential or other stance or pragmatic markers than the adverbs. The adverbs are used most frequently as manner adverbials that modify the quality of the predicate.
4. The non-agreeing adjectives and the adverbs can be used as evidential, evidential epistemic, evaluative and pragmatic markers. Their semantic functional distribution may vary in fiction and academic discourse.
6. Pragmatic markers reflect the loss of evidential meanings and functions: they emphasize a speech act and its participants. The multifunctionality and pragmaticalization of the markers under study correlates with the features of adverbialization.

**Review of previous research on evidentiality.** Notionally the category of evidentiality has been defined as the author's indications of the source of information for the proposition. Despite this unanimous notional definition of the category, the controversy arises as to the linguistic means encoding evidential meanings. In the literature there are two opposing views regarding the expression of evidential meanings. There are scholars who pursue the view that evidential semantics is exclusively coded by means of morphology and regard evidentiality as a grammatical category (Anderson

1986; Willett 1988; Aikhenvald 2003, 2004). The opposing view is represented by the scholars who treat this category as a functional conceptual domain and maintain that the definition of evidentiality cannot be determined by the linguistic form (Squartini 2007, 2008; Wiemer 2008; Wiemer, Stathi 2010; Boye, Harder 2009; Diewald, Smirnova 2010a, 2010b). According to the advocates of the latter view, evidential meanings can be expressed both by morphology and various lexical realizations (verbs, adjectives, sentence adverbs, parentheticals). The functional view of evidentiality has gained an important position in contemporary linguistics due to a number of reasons. First, both morphological and non-morphological means can convey the same or similar evidential meanings identified in taxonomies (Willett 1988; Plungian 2001; Aikhenvald 2004). Second, the boundary between grammatical and lexical means in a language can be fuzzy and thus confining the definition of the category to the form of expression largely delimits the scope and complexity of the category (Boye, Harder 2009). Third, both morphological and non-morphological evidential means may derive from the same sources, namely verbs of perception, communication and attitude (Boye, Harder 2009). Finally, to gain a holistic view of evidentiality it is necessary to evaluate both grammaticalized systems of evidentiality and the ones representing different stages of grammaticalization (Diewald, Smirnova 2010a). Since this thesis focuses on the categories of adjectives and adverbs that convey evidential meanings, evidentiality is treated as a functional conceptual domain that expresses the author's cognitive and/or communicative grounding for the proposition (Wiemer 2008).

In the taxonomies of evidential meanings the main opposition is drawn between direct and indirect types of evidence (Willett 1988, Plungian 2001; Aikhenvald 2004). Direct evidence signals that the author has direct perceptual access to the information or has participated in the events, whereas indirect evidence indicates that the author has gained information through inference or a verbal report. Another dichotomy of evidential meanings is based on the author's personal or impersonal access to the information. This opposition highlights whether the sources of evidence for the proposition derive personally from the author (SELF) or other people (OTHER) (Frawley 1992; Plungian 2001, 2011; Marín-Arrese 2007, 2009a). Although the notions of the *type of evidence* and *source of evidence* can be used synonymously, in this thesis they are discriminated. Types of evidence refer to the mode of knowing (direct evidence, inference, verbal



report), whereas sources of evidence pertain to particular types of perception or the author's knowledge of the world that allow grounding of the proposition.

The most relevant evidential value in the current research is inference. In the literature inferences are classified into conceptualizations based on the author's perception or reasoning (cf. *inferring from results* vs *inferring from reasoning*, Willett 1988; *inferentials* vs *presumptives*, Plungian 2001; *inference* vs *assumption*, Aikhenvald 2004; *circumstantial* vs *generic*, Squartini 2008; *perceptual* vs. *conceptual*, Diewald, Smirnova 2010b). Adopting Diewald and Smirnova's terminology, in this thesis inferences are classified into conceptualizations based on perceptual and/or conceptual sources of evidence.

Despite the neat delineation of the inferential semantics in the literature, there can be variation in its contents. Inferences can be unspecified or based on report/communicative sources of evidence (Plungian 2001; Squartini 2008). The most problematic type of inference is unspecified inference since it can border on the meanings of other conceptual domains. Squartini (2008) assigns inferences without the indication of a particular source of evidence to the evidential meaning of conjectures, while Wiemer and Kampf (2012) associate them with the meaning of epistemic modality. The reconciliation of the two views can be gained in introducing the category of *epistentials* (Faller 2002) that may exhibit both evidential and epistemic meanings.

Another evidential value pertinent to this research, though to a lesser extent, is reported evidence. The basic distinction of reported evidence lies in the identification of the source of report. Aikhenvald (2004) distinguishes *quotatives* that specify the exact source of the report and *hearsay* that does not reveal the source because it is unknown or unimportant.

One of the most controversial and complex aspects in the research on the category of evidentiality is its relationship with epistemic modality. In the literature for a long run the relationship between the two categories has been defined as one of inclusion. For instance, Palmer (1986) has considered evidentiality as a part of epistemic modality and vice versa, Chafe (1986) has included modality into the category of evidentiality. However, the inclusive relationship of the two categories has been criticized because such an approach hides the conceptual differences between the two domains and does

not account for the existence of markers that exclusively code evidential meanings (Plungian 2001, 2011; Faller 2002).

In the latest research the categories of evidentiality and epistemic modality have been treated as autonomous conceptual domains (Faller 2002; Squartini 2004, 2008; Wiemer 2006b, 2008; Cornillie 2009; Marín-Arrese 2007, 2009a, 2009b) and their notional affinities have been explained within the category of epistemicity (Boye 2001, 2010, 2012). Both categories make up the superordinate category of epistemicity because they relate to the author's knowledge or *justificatory support* for the proposition. Their distinguishing feature is the nature of the support. Evidentiality specifies the type of evidence (direct, indirect) the author uses for the proposition, whereas epistemic modality conveys the degree of the author's commitment towards the proposition (certainty, probability, possibility).

The intercategorical relationship between evidentiality and epistemic modality arises between the evidential meaning of direct evidence and epistemic certainty, and the evidential meaning of indirect evidence (inference) and epistemic probability. Although the relationship between inference and epistemic probability has been identified before (van der Auwera, Plungian 1998), Boye's as well as other scholars' (Cornillie 2009; Diewald, Smirnova 2010b) explanation for this relationship differs from van der Auwera and Plungian's explanation. While van der Auwera and Plungian (1998) argue that the meanings of inference and epistemic probability intersect and can be explained as a case of overlap, Boye (2010, 2012), Cornillie (2009), Diewald and Smirnova (2010a) refute such a view for a number of reasons. First, there are languages that code only inferences or epistemic probability (Boye 2010, 2012). Second, not all inferences are related to epistemic probability (Cornillie 2009). Finally, the evidential and epistemic meanings can be related only by implication because evidential markers can evoke different degrees of commitment and epistemic markers can be based on a number of sources of evidence (Diewald, Smirnova 2010a). This means that evidential meaning components are not inherent in epistemic markers and epistemic meaning components are not inherent in evidential markers. Therefore, it has been suggested that the intercategorical relationship between evidentiality and epistemic modality should be explained on the basis of similar sub-dimensions of the two categories. The category of evidentiality can be interpreted along the scale of *reliability of knowledge* or *evidentiary validity*, whereas

epistemic meanings can be evaluated along the *epistemic modal scale* (Cornillie 2009; Marín-Arrese 2009a; Boye 2012). Since there is no systematic correlation between the evidential and epistemic scale (Squartini 2008; Cornillie 2009; Marín-Arrese 2011), the two scales cannot be interpreted one within the other. In this thesis the overlap of evidential and epistemic values is not refuted because there are markers that indiscriminately reveal both evidential and epistemic values. Even the context does not always allow to determine the dominance of one or the other value.

The category of evidentiality has also been investigated along the dimension of subjectivity/intersubjectivity that specifies whether the evidence is accessible exclusively to the author or also to other participants of the situation (Nuyts 2001a, 2001b). The introduction of this dimension allows explanation of the features of evidential markers more precisely. For instance, the factivity value of the Spanish verb *parecer* 'seem' subordinating *que* 'that' complement clause is mainly motivated by the intersubjectivity of the marker (Cornillie 2007, 123). Moreover, the accessibility of evidence can shed light on the reliability of evidence (Cornillie 2009, 58).

The distribution of evidential markers has also received considerable attention in discourse studies. Pursuing Bakhtin's dialogical view of language, Martin and White (2005, 92) maintain that evidential and epistemic markers construe the author's stance towards the reader and can be effective means of creating the author's superiority or openness to other points of view. They serve as means of author and reader interaction. In the recent decade there have appeared cross-disciplinary and cross-linguistic studies dealing with evidential markers in academic discourse (Hyland 2006, 2008; Malmström 2007; Grossmann, Wirth 2008; Grossmann, Tutin 2010; Tien 2011, 2012).

The theoretical background of the thesis also gives an overview of the research on morphological and non-morphological means of evidentiality. Means of bound morphology such as suffixes, prefixes and various clitics that convey evidential meanings are typically found in Amerindian languages, in the languages of the Caucasus and the Tibeto-Burman family (Aikhenvald 2004, 17). The evidential semantics of morphological markers and grammaticalized evidential systems are reported and analysed in Chafe, Nichols (1986), Willett (1988), de Haan (2001), Faller (2002) and Aikhenvald (2003, 2004).

In European languages, except for Georgian, Turkish and Estonian, there are no means of bound morphology that convey evidential meanings (Wiemer 2010c, 67668). In European languages, the verbal categories of TAM (Tense-Aspect-Modality) may serve as formal variants of evidential markers. For instance, in Romance and Germanic languages the conditional/subjunctive mood may acquire evidential extensions (Squartini 2001, 2008; Diewald, Smirnova 2010b; Wiemer 2010c), whereas in Balkan (Bulgarian, Macedonian) languages, Baltic (Latvian, Lithuanian) languages and Estonian, evidential meanings are encoded by the forms of perfect tenses. Functional extensions of TAM have been regarded as *evidentiality strategies* (Aikhenvald 2004) rather than means of evidentiality proper.

Similarly to Latvian and Estonian, in Lithuanian there are participial forms that convey evidential meanings. However, differently from the former languages, in Lithuanian the expression of morphological evidentiality is more complicated and less grammaticalized (Plungian 2011). In Lithuanian, there are two evidential participial constructions, namely constructions based on active participles, e.g. *Čia vabalų esą* ‘They say there are beetles here’ (Ambrazas 2006b, 391; 146) and constructions based on passive participles, e.g. *Čia turbūt ir grybų esama* ‘Evidently there must be mushrooms’ (Ambrazas 2006a, 324). The distinctive feature of these constructions is the omission of the copula verb *būti* ‘to be’ and the syntactic replacement of the finite form of the verb by the non-finite (participial) form (Holvoet 2004, 1196120). The evidential constructions based on passive participles are marked by the intransitive verbs that make up these constructions and the expression of the agent (animate, inanimate) in the genitive case and thematic position (Holvoet 2004, 1186119; Lavine 2006, 46). Moreover, the formal features of such constructions can be the non-finite copula in composite periphrastic tenses, e.g. *būta išeita* ‘must have gone’ or if the participle is negated, e.g. *Ji (dar) neperskaičiusi laišką* ‘She is said to (yet) not have read the letter.’ (Wiemer 2006a, 38639). Although the participial constructions may be formally marked, their evidential meanings still depend on the context (Wiemer 2006a, 38) and the constructions are closely tied with perfect tenses and the passive. The research into the evidential participial constructions in Lithuanian has resulted in clarifying their treatment in Lithuanian grammars (Gronemeyer 1997; Holvoet 2004, 2007; Wiemer 2006a; Lavine

2006). These constructions cannot be viewed within the category of the mood or the passive because paradigmatically they do not fit these categories (Holvoet 2004, 2007).

Although in European languages morphological marking of evidentiality can be attested, a more common way of encoding evidential meanings are various lexical realizations (verbs, adjectives, sentence adverbs, particles). Evidential adjectives and adverbs have been mainly researched in Germanic (Chafe 1986; Biber *et al.* 1999; Nuyts 2001b; Wierzbicka 2006; Mortensen 2006; Simon-Vandenberg, Aijmer 2007; Lampert, Lampert 2010), Romance (Hidalgo 2006; Pietrandrea 2007; Marín-Arrese 2007, 2009a, 2009b; Squartini 2008; Celle 2009; Cornillie 2010) and Slavic languages (Tutak 2003; Wiemer 2006b; abowska 2008; Letuchiy 2010; Wiemer, Kampf 2012). In Baltic languages they have been investigated in Latvian (Chojnicka 2012). They have been classified as a subgroup of epistemic markers (Quirk *et. al* 1985; Hoyer 1997; Biber *et al.* 1999; Huddleston *et al.* 2002; Tutak 2003; Wierzbicka 2006) or as markers of an autonomous category of evidentiality (Wiemer 2006b; Wiemer, Kampf 2012). The adjectives and/or the adverbs that display evidential epistemic syncretism have been categorised as *epistential* (Pietrandrea 2007, 52655; Chojnicka 2012, 139). Evidential adjectives and adverbs have also been analysed along the parameters of subjectivity/intersubjectivity (Nuyts 2001a, 2001b; Marín-Arrese 2007, 2009a, 2009b) and diachronically (Ocampo 2006; Simon-Vandenberg, Aijmer 2007; Shindo 2009). It has been shown that these markers are multifunctional (Cuenca, Marín 2012; Simon-Vandenberg, Aijmer 2007; Cornillie 2010).

In Lithuanian linguistics, the non-agreeing adjectives and the adverbs under study have been also considered within other categories. The non-agreeing adjectives *akivaizdu* 'evident $\emptyset$ , *aišku* 'clear $\emptyset$  and *panašu* 'likely $\emptyset$  used as CTPs with *kad/jog* 'that $\emptyset$  complement clauses (Tekorien 1990) or used parenthetically (Akelaitis 1992, 2001, 2002) have been regarded as markers of epistemic modality or pragmatic markers. The question of the evidential adverbs has not been raised at all since it has been maintained in Lithuanian grammars and other studies that such adverbs as *aiškiai* 'clearly $\emptyset$  modify the predicate (Ambrazas 2006a; Ulvydas 2000). In the latest research on modality and evidentiality in Lithuanian, it is suggested that parenthetically used adjectives and adverbs should be considered as sentence adverbials that express the author $\emptyset$  stance (Smetona, Usonien 2012). The peculiarity of adverbialization in Lithuanian is that

adverbials derive from a number of word classes such as verbs, adjectives, nouns, impersonal participles (Usonien 2012). This phenomenon can be explained by the fact that conversely to Germanic languages in Lithuanian there are few morphological adverbs that function as sentence modifiers.

In contemporary Lithuanian linguistics the verbs of perception (*matyti* ‘see’) and seeming (*atrodyti* ‘seem’) as well as the particles *matyt* ‘evidently, obviously’, *girdi* ‘hear’, *esą* ‘they say, supposedly’, *neva/lyg/tarsi/tarytum/tartum/atseit* ‘as if’ have been considered as evidential (Usonien 1999, 2000, 2001a, 2001b, 2002, 2003; Wiemer 2007, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c; Petit 2008; Tynk nien 2011, 2012). Moreover, the questions of the evidential epistemic syncretism of the markers, their syntactic status and parallels with other languages have been addressed (Usonien 2001; Tynk nien 2011, 2012; Wiemer 2007, 2010a, 2010b).

To sum up, the realizations of non-morphological evidentiality is a topical question and needs thorough investigation. The exploration of the non-agreeing adjectives and the adverbs will complement the inventory of the expressions of the author stance in Lithuanian and clarify their syntactic status and semantic functional distribution.

## METHODS AND DATA

The study is corpus-driven and combines qualitative and quantitative methods of analysis. Corpus-driven methodology has been very effective in the studies on evidentiality and modality in Germanic and Romance languages since it has disclosed how evidential and/or epistemic markers are distributed in different discourse types (Nuyts 2001b; Paradis 2003; Biber *et al.* 1999; Biber 2006; Simon-Vandenberg, Aijmer 2007; Aijmer 2008; Grossmann, Wirth 2007; Cornillie 2007, 2010; Malmström 2007; Capelli 2007; Grossmann, Tutin 2010; Whitt 2010). This methodology has also been successfully applied in exploring these categories in Lithuanian (Usonien, Töblen 2010; Usonien, Jasionyt 2010; Tynk nien 2011; Tynk nien 2012; Jasionyt 2012; Töblen 2012; Smetona, Usonien 2012; Ruskan 2012).

The data have been obtained from the Corpus of the Contemporary Lithuanian Language (<http://donelaitis.vdu.lt>), namely from the sub-corpus of fiction (about 7 mln words), and from the Corpus of Academic Lithuanian (<http://www.coralit.lt/>, about 9

mln words) 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 and the adverbs and their use in citations, the number of the analysed adjectives in fiction and academic discourse equals 4306 and the number of the adverbs is 4584.

The qualitative analysis has been conducted in two stages. During the first stage the morphosyntactic properties of the adjectives and the adverbs have been analysed, namely CTPs with *kad/jog* ‘that’ complement clauses (1), parenthetical CTPs (2) and adverbials (3, 4), e.g.:

- (1) **LT:** *Akivaizdu, kad violetinio fosforo virsmas baltuoju praktiškai nerealizuojamas.* (AD, P<sup>2</sup>)  
**EN:** ‘It is **evident that** the purple phosphorus does not really turn white.’
- (2) **LT:** *O paukščiai, aišku, buvo tie patys <...>.* (F<sup>3</sup>)  
**EN:** ‘And the birds, **clearly/of course**, were the same <...>.’
- (3) **LT:** *Aš taip ryškiai matydavau tavo veidą...* (F)  
**EN:** ‘I saw your face so **distinctly/clearly**.’
- (4) **LT:** *Tačiau su manimi akivaizdžiai kovoja kažkokia vietinė dvasia* (F)  
**EN:** ‘However, some local spirit is **evidently** fighting with me.’

During the second stage of the qualitative analysis the semantic functional features of the CTPs with *kad/jog* ‘that’ complement clauses, parenthetical CTPs and adverbials have been explored. This analysis has been conducted by investigating the syntagmatic environment of the markers: the semantic type of the predicate, the expression of the subject, position and scope of the markers, the use of connectives, positive and negative polarity items in the proposition, argumentative lexis and types of clauses. At this stage double marking of evidentiality has also been considered.

The quantitative analysis provides the normalized frequency per 1000 words of the CTPs with *kad/jog* ‘that’ complement clauses, parenthetical CTPs, manner adverbials, stance and linking adverbials and compares their distribution in fiction and academic discourse. The quantitative results are verified by the log likelihood test (LL), which can

<sup>2</sup> AD, P ó Academic Discourse, Physical sciences

<sup>3</sup> F ó Fiction

be performed by the log likelihood calculator (<http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/llwizard.html>). The quantitative analysis also involves the discussion of the distribution of verb collocations with manner and stance adverbials.

## RESEARCH FINDINGS

**The analysis of the morphosyntactic properties of the non-agreeing adjectives and the adverbs.** When the adjectives *akivaizdu* ‘evident’, *aišku* ‘clear’, *ryšku* ‘clear, visible’, *panašu* ‘likely’ and *natūralu* ‘natural’ subordinate *kad/jog* ‘that’ complement clauses, they usually constitute the main predication and have the status of lexical markers. The meaning of the main predication is created by the syntactic ties of the adjectives with other elements in the clause, for instance, prepositional phrases, adverbial clauses, connectors, the copula verb in the past tense, the semantic experiencer expressed in the dative. The main predication is highlighted in argumentative contexts or when the complement clause is placed in the thematic position. The adjective also clearly receives the focus when the proposition presents old information to the interlocutors. It is important to note that in the past tense contexts and in the contexts where the semantic experiencer is coded by the second or third person pronouns or nouns referring to definite people, the adjectives do not convey the author’s stance towards the proposition but other people’s stance (Nuyts 2001b, 73; 129). Although the adjectives receive propositional interpretation when they constitute the main predication (van Bogaert 2010; Chojnicka 2012), they are considered as markers of the author’s stance because their lexical meaning is connected with stance (Boye, Harder 2007, 576).

The non-agreeing adjectives used as CTPs with *kad/jog* ‘that’ complement clauses lose the meaning of the main predication when they acquire pragmatic functions. However, this use is rather rare and found only in fiction. In academic discourse the pragmaticalization of the adjective-based CTPs with *kad/jog* ‘that’ complement clauses is not prominently marked and the CTPs show indeterminacy between the meaning of the main and secondary predication. Although the adjective-based CTPs may acquire the meaning of the secondary predication, their structural status remains lexical and thus they have been treated separately from the adjective-based CTPs that clearly express the secondary predication.



The syntactic status of the non-agreeing adjectives under study clearly changes when they are used parenthetically and acquire the meaning of the secondary predication. The latter meaning is marked by the syntactic independence from the host clause the adjectives modify (Kaltenböck 2007, 26; Schneider 2007, 239), their non-addressability and adverbial distribution (Boye, Harder 2007, 579). All these features point out the adverbialization of the non-agreeing adjectives. In this thesis the adjectives with a zero complementizer in the initial position have also been treated as parentheticals because similarly to the adjectives in the medial and final position, they display traces of the secondary predication. In fiction they occur in elliptical sentences, emotional contexts, relative clauses, which foreground the meaning of the secondary predication. It has been noted that more ambiguity between the matrix clause and the parenthetical in the initial position is posed by the verbs that tend to parentheticalize. It is claimed that verbs make stronger ties with the complement clause they subordinate or modify than the adjectives and consequently they do not lose their predicative features as easily as the non-agreeing adjectives do. The study also shows that not all non-agreeing adjectives are equally prone to parentheticalization, which can be explained by their lexical properties and semantics of the propositions they modify.

The quantitative analysis of the adjective-based CTPs with *kad/jog*  $\neq$ that $\emptyset$ S complement clauses and parenthetical CTPs shows their different distribution in fiction and academic discourse, as can be seen from Table 1 and Table 2.

**Table 1.** Distribution of CTPs (raw frequency and normalized frequency per 1000 words) in fiction and academic discourse

Adjectives	CTP + <i>kad/jog</i> $\neq$ that $\emptyset$ S			
	Fiction		Academic Discourse	
	raw fr	fr/1000	raw fr	fr/1000
<i>akivaizdu</i> $\neq$ evident $\emptyset$	37	0,00	721	<b>0,08</b>
<i>aišku</i> $\neq$ clear $\emptyset$	297	<b>0,04</b>	245	0,03
<i>natūralu</i> $\neq$ natural $\emptyset$	16	0,00	102	0,01
<i>panāšu</i> $\neq$ likely $\emptyset$	41	0,00	38	0,00
<i>ryšku</i> $\neq$ clear, visible $\emptyset$	0	0	6	0,00
<b>Total</b>	<b>391</b> <b>(14,5 %)</b>	<b>0,04</b>	<b>1112</b> <b>(71 %)</b>	<b>0,12</b>

**Table 2.** Distribution of parenthetically used adjectives (raw frequency and normalized frequency per 1000 words) in fiction and academic discourse

Adjectives	Parenthetical CTPs			
	Fiction		Academic Discourse	
	raw fr	fr/1000	raw fr	fr/1000
<i>akivaizdu</i> ðevidentø	2	0,00	15	0,00
<i>aišku</i> ðclearø	1529	<b>0,23</b>	179	<b>0,02</b>
<i>natūralu</i> ðnaturalø	8	0,00	1	0,00
<i>panāšu</i> ðlikelyø	3	0,00	4	0,00
<i>ryšku</i> ðclear, visibleø	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1542</b>	<b>0,23</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>0,02</b>
	<b>(55 %)</b>		<b>(12 %)</b>	

The CTPs with complementing patterns are more frequently used in academic discourse than in fiction. They make up 71 % of the overall use of the non-agreeing adjectives in academic discourse and only 14,5 % in fiction. On the contrary, the parenthetical CTPs are used more frequently in fiction (55 % of their overall use) than in academic discourse (12 % of their overall use). The quantitative differences are statistically significant and can be motivated by the peculiarities of discourse type. Since academic discourse represents formal written language, it is natural that it is characterized by the dominance of complementing patterns, which are the result of reflected thinking and writing strategies of the author. On the contrary, parentheticals are typically found in discourse that displays traces of spoken language.

The most frequent CTP in the complementing pattern in academic discourse is the adjective *akivaizdu* ðevidentø, which implies that this particular marker suits formal contexts of the author's reasoning. The most frequent parenthetical in fiction is the adjective *aišku* ðclearø. The parentheticalization of the non-agreeing adjectives in fiction is also supported by the fact that they are used more frequently in the medial rather than initial position. As it is claimed in the literature (Schneider 2007, 240; Brinton 2008, 12), the medial and final position are the unambiguous indicators of the parenthetical use of markers.

The main criterion that determines the morphosyntactic properties of the adverbs is the semantic type of the verb the adverbs collocate with. Semantically verbs are

categorized into activities, events and states that denote material, mental, verbal, behavioural, existential and relational processes (Downing, Locke 2002; Hasselgård 2010). The adverbs used as manner adverbials collocate with perception, cognitive, communication verbs, existential and relational evidential verbs *atspindėti* ‘reflect’, *išryškėti* ‘become visible’, *atsiskleisti* ‘be disclosed’ and verbs that denote material processes (*bėgti* ‘run’, *statyti* ‘build’, *įvykti* ‘happen’). The distinctive feature of all these adverb-verb collocations is their reference to objective reality that is not submitted to the author’s evaluation. Stance (evidential) adverbials collocate with existential and relational verbs that may pertain, especially in academic discourse, to the dominance of certain phenomena, mental verbs that describe psychological states, emotions as well as verbs denoting material processes that relate to some changes. If evidential adverbials collocate with communication verbs, there must be some elements of evaluation in the context that point out the wide scope interpretation of the adverbs. Other criteria that add to the distinction between manner and stance (evidential) adverbials are types of modifiers of the adverbs, the presence of other manner or stance adverbials.

It should be noted that neither the criterion of the semantic type of the verb nor the types of modifiers have turned out helpful in determining the morphosyntactic properties of the adverb *panašiai* ‘similarly’. The main criterion that allowed definition of the structural properties of this marker is the criterion of omission. If *panašiai* ‘similarly’ can be omitted from the sentence and the sentence remains grammatically correct, it shows that the marker can be defined as a linking adverbial. If its omission results in an ungrammatical sentence, it is used as a manner adverbial.

Despite the delineation of the criteria that allow differentiation between the manner and stance adverbial use, there are ambiguous cases. Ambiguity arises when the adverbs collocate with the verbs that denote material, communication processes and there are evaluative elements in the context that hint at the use of stance adverbial. Evaluative elements refer to the source of evidence that may serve as the basis of the author’s inference. On the one hand, ambiguity can be a sign of the indeterminate use of the adverbs in Lithuanian, on the other hand, it can be the author’s choice to remain ambiguous. Simon-Vandenberg and Aijmer (2007) explain the ambiguity of the English adverbs *obviously* and *clearly* by the close semantic link between the meanings *in an obvious manner/in a clear manner* and *it is obvious that/it is clear that*.

The quantitative analysis of the morphosyntactic features of the adverbs (Table 3) shows that the adverbs in Lithuanian are used more frequently as predicate (manner adverbials) than sentence modifiers (stance adverbials, linking adverbials). The use of the manner adverbials makes up 65 % of the overall use of the adverbs in fiction and 59 % in academic discourse. Stance and linking adverbials make up 15 % in fiction and 11 % in academic discourse.

**Table 3.** Distribution of adverbs (raw frequency and normalized frequency per 1000 words) in fiction and academic discourse

Adverbs	Fiction					
	Manner adverbials		Stance adverbials, linking adverbials		Ambiguous	
	raw fr	fr/1000	raw fr	fr/1000	raw fr	fr/1000
<i>aiškiai</i> 'clearly'ø	633	<b>0,09</b>	204	<b>0,03</b>	11	0,00
<i>akivaizdžiai</i> 'evidently'ø	41	0,01	58	<b>0,01</b>	3	0,00
<i>ryškiai</i> 'clearly, visibly'ø	105	0,02	1	0,00	7	0,00
<i>natūraliai</i> 'naturally'ø	53	0,01	4	0,00	5	0,00
<i>panašiai</i> 'similarly'ø	335	<b>0,05</b>	8	0,00	6	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>1167</b>	<b>0,18</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>0,04</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>0,00</b>
	<b>65 %</b>		<b>15 %</b>		<b>2 %</b>	
Adverbs	Academic discourse					
	Manner adverbials		Stance adverbials, linking adverbials		Ambiguous	
	raw fr	fr/1000	raw fr	fr/1000	raw fr	fr/1000
<i>aiškiai</i> 'clearly'ø	687	<b>0,08</b>	101	<b>0,01</b>	89	0,01
<i>akivaizdžiai</i> 'evidently'ø	138	0,02	146	<b>0,02</b>	66	0,01
<i>ryškiai</i> 'clearly, visibly'ø	106	0,01	36	0,00	56	0,01
<i>natūraliai</i> 'naturally'ø	131	0,02	8	0,00	49	0,01
<i>panašiai</i> 'similarly'ø	587	<b>0,07</b>	26	0,00	10	0,00
<b>Total</b>	<b>1649</b>	<b>0,2</b>	<b>317</b>	<b>0,03</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>0,04</b>
	<b>59 %</b>		<b>11 %</b>		<b>10 %</b>	

The verification of the frequency of the manner and stance adverbials in fiction and academic discourse by the log likelihood test shows that in neither type of the discourse the manner or stance and linking adverbials are used significantly more frequently.

Comparing the distribution of the non-agreeing adjectives used as CTPs with *kad/jog*  $\neq$ that $\emptyset$  complement clauses or parenthetically and the adverbs used as sentence modifiers, it turns out that the non-agreeing adjectives are used as means of the author $\emptyset$  stance or pragmatic markers more frequently than the adverbs. This comparison confirms the fact that adverbs in Lithuanian mainly function as predicate modifiers.

**Meanings and functions of the non-agreeing adjectives and the adverbs.** The semantic functional analysis of the non-agreeing adjectives and the adverbs (Table 4) shows that they function as evidential, evidential epistemic, evaluative and pragmatic markers.

**Table 4.** Semantic functional distribution of the non-agreeing adjectives and the adverbs in fiction and academic discourse

	Evidential	Evidential epistemic	Evaluative (attitude)	Pragmatic	
				Interpersonal	Metatextual
<i>akivaizdu</i> $\neq$ evident $\emptyset$	+	ó	ó	+	ó
<i>aišku</i> $\neq$ clear $\emptyset$	+	ó	ó	+	+
<i>ryšku</i> $\neq$ clear, visible $\emptyset$	+	ó	ó	ó	ó
<i>panašu</i> $\neq$ likely $\emptyset$	ó	+	ó	ó	ó
<i>natūralu</i> $\neq$ natural $\emptyset$	ó	ó	+	+	ó
<i>akivaizdžiai</i> $\neq$ evidently $\emptyset$	+	ó	ó	ó	ó
<i>aiškiai</i> $\neq$ clearly $\emptyset$	+	ó	ó	ó	ó
<i>ryškiai</i> $\neq$ clearly, visibly $\emptyset$	+	ó	ó	ó	ó
<i>panašiai</i> $\neq$ similarly $\emptyset$	+	+	ó	ó	+
<i>natūraliai</i> $\neq$ naturally $\emptyset$	ó	ó	+	ó	ó

The evidential meanings are typically found with the adjectives and the adverbs that derive from the semantic domain of perception, namely *akivaizdu*  $\neq$ evident $\emptyset$ , *aišku*  $\neq$ clear $\emptyset$ , *ryšku*  $\neq$ clear, visible $\emptyset$ , *akivaizdžiai*  $\neq$ evidently $\emptyset$ , *aiškiai*  $\neq$ clearly $\emptyset$  and *ryškiai*  $\neq$ clearly, visibly $\emptyset$ . When used evidentially they express the author $\emptyset$  inferences based on perceptual and/or conceptual sources of evidence. The adverb *panašiai*  $\neq$ similarly $\emptyset$  functions as a hearsay marker when it is used parenthetically. In fiction the dominant perceptual source of evidence is visual, and occasionally auditory or other source of evidence, which is indicated by the contextual elements. In academic discourse the

perceptual source of evidence is closely entwined with conceptual evidence because there is reference to the data, analysis, formulas that can be seen only indirectly and lead the author to the inference. This source of evidence can be made explicit by prepositional and participial clauses. The conceptual source of evidence refers to the author's knowledge of the world expressed by clauses of reason or indicated in the wider context. In academic discourse the conceptual source varies more than in fiction because the author resorts to other publications, research, concepts, definitions that serve as the basis of the inference.

In fiction and academic discourse the inferences expressed by the non-agreeing adjectives differ along the dimension of subjectivity and intersubjectivity. In fiction the adjectives *akivaizdu* 'evident $\emptyset$  and *aišku* 'clear $\emptyset$  realize subjective inferences, while in academic discourse they are intersubjective, which is explained by the differences between spoken and formal written language. In fiction the subjective nature of the inference can be bleached if the inference is based on report. Contrastively to the non-agreeing adjectives, the adverbs that denote inferences are subjective in both types of discourse.

The evidential adjectives and the adverbs can be used as means of author argumentation in both fiction and academic discourse. It has been noted that in fiction they ground propositions that describe the characters' negative psychological states and emotions or the author's emphatic opinion. In academic discourse the argumentation of the author is also marked by negative polarity items in the proposition, comparison with other studies and adversative connectives. Although the evidential adjectives and the adverbs are not obligatory means of coding the source of information, their elimination from the context could result in pragmatically awkward and categorical utterances.

The evidential epistemic syncretism is displayed by the adjective *panašu* 'likely $\emptyset$  and the adverb *panašiai* 'similarly $\emptyset$  when it is used as a CTP with *kad/jog* 'that $\emptyset$  complement clause. There are contexts of use in which the evidential or epistemic meaning is foregrounded. For instance, the meaning of epistemic doubt is highlighted in first person contexts where the author assumes the total responsibility for the proposition and strengthens its subjective nature as well as in contexts where the adjective *panašu* 'likely $\emptyset$  subordinates the non-finite (infinitive) clause. The evidential meaning is foregrounded when the perceptual or conceptual source of evidence is indicated and

there are no contextual elements boosting the meaning of doubt. However, there are contexts in which both meanings are equally discernible. In such contexts the meaning of doubt is triggered by unreliable or insufficient sources of evidence. The evidential epistemic syncretism of the adjective *panašu* ‘likely’ and the adverb *panašiai* ‘similarly’ can be motivated by the fact that the markers derive from the semantic domain of comparison. Cross-linguistically the semantic cognates of *panašu* ‘likely’ also display the meaning of doubt (Russian *pochože* ‘similar’ Letuchiy 2010) or are used as hearsay markers (Polish *podobno* ‘they say’ Wiemer 2005, 2006b).

The adjective *natūralu* ‘natural’ and the adverb *natūraliai* ‘naturally’ function as markers of the author’s attitude that evaluate the proposition in accordance with norms and expectations. Although the contexts of use of these markers can be tightly connected with the author’s knowledge of the world, they are not considered as evidential because they do not present the contexts where there would be a necessity to assign causes to observed situations. It is argued that the evaluative function of the markers is partly motivated by their lexical meaning. Since they do not derive from the semantic domain of perception but are related to knowledge in general sense, their potential for developing evidential meanings is reduced.

The markers *aišku* ‘clear’ *akivaizdu* ‘evident’ and *panašiai* ‘similarly’ acquire pragmatic functions when they do not refer to the source of information but serve as devices of the author’s interaction with the reader or link units of discourse. Out of the three markers, the adjective *aišku* ‘clear’ displays the greatest variety of pragmatic functions. It is used as a device for emphasizing common ground between the author and the reader, as a response elicitor and a metatextual marker that connects the following proposition with the prior one. In fiction it is used in highly emotional contexts. The adjective *akivaizdu* ‘evident’ is also used in contexts of common knowledge, especially in academic discourse, but this use is closely linked with the evidential semantics of the marker. This can be explained by the lexical property of the adjective *akivaizdu* ‘evident’. Since its lexical meaning is quite specific (it refers to vision), it is not prone to semantic bleaching to the degree the adjective *aišku* ‘clear’ is. The lexical meaning of *aišku* ‘clear’ is more general (it refers to vision, auditory perception and general comprehension). The adverb *panašiai* ‘similarly’ is used as linking adverbial that

connects units of discourse that contain some similarity. On the whole, it should be noted that pragmatic functions are not characteristic of the adverbs in Lithuanian.

Semantic functional analysis of the markers also reveals double marking of evidentiality. The lexical evidential markers *aišku* ‘clear $\emptyset$ , *akivaizdu* ‘evident $\emptyset$  or *aiškiai* ‘clearly $\emptyset$  appear in the proposition where there are evidential participial constructions. The co-occurrence of lexical and grammatical evidential markers can be explained by the fact that the participial constructions indicate the type of evidence (inference, report), while the lexical evidential units specify the source of evidence (visual, auditory, conceptual). There can also be combinations of two lexical evidential markers in the proposition.

## CONCLUSIONS

The findings of the research show that in Lithuanian alongside the evidential participial constructions there are non-morphological realizations of evidentiality that serve as important rhetorical means in various types of discourse. Although these means of expression are not obligatory and make up only evidentiality strategies, functionally they resemble morphological realizations of evidentiality. Depending on their morphosyntactic properties, the evidential adjectives and the adverbs can mark indirect types of evidence and add to the validity of the proposition and the author’s credibility.

Like verbs in Germanic and Romance languages, the non-agreeing adjectives in Lithuanian used as CTPs with *kad/jog* ‘that $\emptyset$  complement clauses may express the main or occasionally secondary predication and have the status of lexical markers. The clear indication of the changed syntactic status of the non-agreeing adjectives is their parenthetical use. The adjectives are used parenthetically when they show syntactic independence from the host clause they modify, adverbial distribution and express the secondary predication. In this pattern of use the non-agreeing adjectives acquire grammatical status and show functional similarity with sentence adverbs.

The quantitative analysis of the morphosyntactic properties of the non-agreeing adjectives shows that the CTPs with *kad/jog* ‘that $\emptyset$  complement clauses are more frequent (71 %) in academic discourse, while the parenthetical CTPs (showing traces of adverbialization) are more frequent (55 %) in fiction. As academic discourse reflects



formal discourse, it is natural that the more complex complementing structures are more frequent. Fiction displays features of spoken language and favours parenthetical CTPs that show spontaneity and direct communication. The adverbialization of the non-agreeing adjectives in fiction is reflected not only by the dominant frequency of their parenthetical use but also by their syntactic mobility or positional variation. In fiction the parenthetical CTPs take not only initial and medial position, but also final. Moreover, the medial position of the parenthetical CTPs in fiction is more dominant (53 %) than in academic discourse (31 %).

The adverbs function as stance adverbials (evidential, evaluative) when they collocate with the verbs that denote relation and existence, psychological states, changes and communication. This use is highlighted by evaluative elements in the context. Stance adverbials expressed by the adverbs are not significantly more frequent either in fiction or academic discourse.

Having explored the morphosyntactic properties of the non-agreeing adjectives and the adverbs in fiction and academic discourse, it has been found out that the non-agreeing adjectives are used more frequently as evidential or other stance or pragmatic markers than the adverbs. This use makes up 69,5 % of the total use of the non-agreeing adjectives in fiction and 83 % in academic discourse. The adverbs used as stance markers make up 15 % of the total use of the adverbs in fiction and 11 % in academic discourse. The adverbs under analysis function more frequently as manner adverbials or show indeterminate use between manner and stance adverbials. The infrequent use of stance markers realized by the adverbs in Lithuanian can be explained by the existence of other forms that realize these meanings and functions. Apart from the non-agreeing adjectives, stance can be conveyed by verb forms and nouns.

A variety of meanings and functions realized by the non-agreeing adjectives and the adverbs is only partially compatible with the meanings and functions disclosed in the previous studies on the subject. This corpus-driven study shows that the non-agreeing adjectives *akivaizdu* 'evident $\emptyset$ , *aišku* 'clear $\emptyset$ , *ryšku* 'clear, visible $\emptyset$  and the adverbs *akivaizdžiai* 'evidently $\emptyset$ , *aiškiai* 'clearly $\emptyset$ , *ryškiai* 'clearly, visibly $\emptyset$  express the author's inference based on perceptual and/or conceptual sources of evidence that can be explicated or implied in the context. Therefore, the adjectives *akivaizdu* 'evident $\emptyset$ , *aišku* 'clear $\emptyset$  and *ryšku* 'clear, visible $\emptyset$  are evidential but not epistemic, as has been claimed in

other studies; the adverbs *akivaizdžiai* ‘evidently’, *aiškiai* ‘clearly’ and *ryškiai* ‘clearly, visibly’ can be used not only as manner adverbials but also as evidential adverbials. It should be noted that lexical meanings of these markers relate to perception, which is the main driving force of evidential meanings (Wiemer, Kampf 2012). The adjective *panašu* ‘likely’ and the adverb *panašiai* ‘similarly’ (used as CTP with *kad/jog* ‘that’ complement clauses) reveal the syncretism of evidential and epistemic meanings. The epistemic meaning of doubt arises due to insufficient or unreliable sources of evidence indicated in the context, morphosyntactic and lexical properties of the markers. The adjective *natūralu* ‘natural’ and occasionally the adverb *natūraliai* ‘naturally’ have been considered as markers of expectation that belong to the category of evaluation. Although these markers relate to the author’s knowledge of the world, they are not regarded as evidential. Their lexical meanings do not pertain to perception, which triggers evidential meanings.

The markers lose their evidential or other stance meanings when they show interaction with the reader or link units of discourse. In such contexts they start functioning as pragmatic markers. The main factors that contribute to the loss of evidential meanings of the markers is the emphasis of a speech act and its participants and contexts of common knowledge. The evidential and pragmatic use of the markers is not always easily distinguished. Wichmann, Simon-Vandenberg and Aijmer (2010, 128) claim that there are no purely propositional (evidential/epistemic) meanings and purely pragmatic meanings. There are approximately propositional and pragmatic meanings.

In contrast to Germanic, Romance and Slavic languages, in Lithuanian, pragmatic functions are typically realized by the non-agreeing adjectives rather than the adverbs. The adverbs do not show a great functional variation. Their functions are more specific since they vary between manner and evidential adverbials. The distinctive feature of the adverb-based sentence modifiers is subjectivity.

The evidential adjectives and the adverbs reveal some usage differences that relate to discourse type. In fiction they denote subjective authorial inferences based most frequently on perceptual sources of evidence, while in academic discourse they express intersubjective (except for the adverbs) inferences most frequently based on conceptual sources of evidence. In two types of discourse the inferences strengthen the author’s

argumentation. Morphological evidential markers are an essential component of successful communication in languages where evidentiality is an obligatory grammatical category. Similarly, non-morphological evidential markers are an important part of the author's rhetoric in languages where marking of evidentiality is optional.

In Lithuanian, like in Bulgarian and Estonian, lexical evidential markers may interact with grammatical ones. The most frequent co-occurrences are evidential participial (passive) constructions that indicate the type of evidence (inference) and the evidential adjectives (*akivaizdu* 'evident', *aišku* 'clear') or adverbs (*akivaizdžiai* 'evidently', *aiškiai* 'clearly') that specify the type of inference (perceptual, conceptual). There also appear combinations of two lexical evidential markers. It has been proved that evidentiality can be marked twice. Harmonious combinations of grammatical and lexical or two lexical evidential markers show that the category of evidentiality should not be limited to the analysis of morphological evidentiality. For better comprehension of the category various means of its expression should be explored.

The current study complements the inventory of evidential, epistemic and other stance markers in Lithuanian. It discloses the morphosyntactic properties and multifunctionality of these markers and partially contributes to the studies on non-morphological realizations of evidentiality in European languages.

# NEMORFOLOGINIO EVIDENCIALUMO RAIŠKA IR TURINYS LIETUVIŲ KALBOJE: BEVARDĖS GIMINĖS BŪDVARDŽIAI IR PRIEVEIKSMIAI

## Reziumė

**Tyrimo objektas.** Disertacijos objektą sudaro bevardės giminės (nederinamieji) būdvardžiai *akivaizdu, aišku, ryšku, panašu, natūralu* irrieveiksmiai *akivaizdžiai, aiškiai, ryškiai, panašiai* ir *natūraliai*. Pasirinkti kaip tikrinamieji semantikos būdvardžiai irrieveiksmiai, nes jie leksiniškai reikšmės atspindi semantinius laukus, kurie turi potencialų būti flinai –altinai. Būdvardžiai *akivaizdu, aišku, ryšku* ir atitinkamairieveiksmiai *akivaizdžiai, aiškiai, ryškiai* leksiniškai reikšmės susijusi su vizualine arba girdimajapercepcija, *natūralu / natūraliai* leksiniškai reikšmės implikuoja špagal gamtos dėsnius, tikra, nederbtinao ir atspindi flinėjimą, o *panašu / panašiai* leksiniškai reikšmės susijusi su palyginimu (DLKfi<sub>e</sub>).

## Tyrimo tikslai

1. Remiantis tekstų metodologija, i–analizuoti nemorfologinio evidencialumo raišką ir turinį, realizuojamus nederinamaisiais būdvardžiais irrieveiksmiais grofinis literatūros tekstuose ir lietuvių mokslo kalboje. Nustatyti nagrinjamieji būdvardžiai irrieveiksmiai vartosenos sąsajas su diskurso specifika.
2. Papildyti autoriaus pozicijos raišką ir adverbializacijos tyrimus lietuvių kalboje ir aptarti analizuojamą raišką priemonių semantinę funkciją susipynim (evidencin episteminę, evidencin pragmatinę).

## Darbo uždaviniai

1. I–analizuoti lietuvių kalbos būdvardžiai *akivaizdu, aišku, ryšku, panašu, natūralu* irrieveiksmiai *akivaizdžiai, aiškiai, ryškiai, panašiai* morfosintaksines ypatybes (komplementiniai predikatai, adverbialai), nustatyti jų reikšmes, funkcijas ir kiekybinius rodiklius.
2. Pagal flinai –altinio tipo, subjektyvumo / intersubjektyvumo ir argumentacinio konteksto parametrus aptarti nagrinjamieji būdvardžiai irrieveiksmiai evidencin reikšmės ir funkcijų distribucijų grofinis literatūros tekstuose ir mokslo kalboje.

3. I-nalizuoti sintaksin ir semantin nagrin jam flymikli kontekst , kuris lemia evidencines reik-mes ir funkcijas, ir i-tirti konteksto rodiklius, lemian ius evidencini reik-mi ir funkcij i-nykim .
4. Aptarti b dvardffi ir prieveiksmi evidencines ir kitas reik-mes bei funkcijas paradigminiu lygmeniu.
5. I-nagrin ti dvigub flini -altinio flym jim : gramatini ir leksini bei dviej leksini evidencialumo flymikli s veik .

**Darbo naujumas, aktualumas ir pritaikymas.** Nemorfologinio evidencialumo rai-ka ir turinys Europos kalbose ó pla iai nagrin jama tema. Gaus s pastarojo de-imtme io tyrimai atskleid nemorfologini evidencialumo rai-kos priemoni inventori angl , vokie i , oland , ital , pranc z , ispan , rus , lenk , bulgar , latvi , est bei kitose kalbose ir prisid jo prie evidencialumo ir episteminio modalumo kategorij rib ir s saj paai-kinimo (Wiemer 2005, 2006b, 2008; Cornillie 2007, 2010; de Haan 2007; Dendale, van Bogaert 2007; Squartini 2008; Kehayov 2008; Letuchiy 2010; Grochowski 2008; St pie 2008; abowska 2008; Chojnicka 2010, 2012; Diewald, Smirnova 2010a, 2010b; Rossari 2012; Wiemer, Kampf 2012). Analizuojami ir evidencialumo flymikli reik-m s kitimo klausimai, susij su universaliais gramatikalizacijos, leksikalizacijos, pragmatikalizacijos ir adverbializacijos rei-kiniais (Aijmer 1996; Brinton, Traugott 2005; Boye, Harder 2007; Brinton 2008; van Bogaert 2010). Jie rodo -i flymikli diachronin raid ir paai-kina nauj funkcij egzistavim sinchroniniu poffi riu. Palie iama svarbi morfologini ir nemorfologini evidencialumo rai-kos priemoni s veika (Kehayov 2008; Makartsev 2012) ir kuriama evidencialumo flymikli Europos kalbose duomen baz , kurioje pagal nustatytus kriterijus apra-omi vairi Europos kalb evidencialumo vienetai (Wiemer, Stathi 2010).

Nemorfologinio evidencialumo rai-ka lietuvi kalboje, kaip ir kitose Europos kalbose, tapo svarbiu tyrimo objektu. Esama nuodugni tyrim , kuri objektas ó percepcijos ir atrodymo veiksmaflodffiai (Usonien 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002a, 2002b, 2003) bei dalelyt s (Wiemer 2007, 2010a, 2010b) groffin s literat ros tekstuose ir fliniasklaidos kalboje. Nagrin tas evidencinis episteminis flymikli sinkreti-kumas (Tynk nien 2011, 2012) bei adverbializacijos proceso aprai-kos lietuvi mokslo kalboje (Smetona, Usonien 2012; Usonien 2012). Nepaisant -i domi studij , nemorfologin

evidencialumo rai-ka dar n ra pakankamai i-tirta, nes tr ksta studij , atskleidffian i b dvardffi ir prieveiksmi evidencialumo reik-mes, j morfosintaksines ypatybes ir s sajas su episteminio modalumo bei kitomis reik-m mis. Be to, tr ksta tekstyn metodika pagr st b dvardffi ir prieveiksmi tyrim , kurie sugretint evidencini b dvardffi ir prieveiksmi distribucij vairiuose diskursuose (groffin s literat ros tekstuose ir mokslo kalboje). Naudojant tekstyn metodik , atsiranda galimyb taikyti statistinius darbo metodus, leidffian ius daryti pagr stas i-vadas ir vertinti evidencini b dvardffi bei prieveiksmi semantin potencial ir morfosintaksines ypatybes.

Evidencini b dvardffi ir prieveiksmi nagrin jimas remiantis reprezentatyvia tekstyno medffiaga papildo morfologini ir nemorfologini evidencialumo rai-kos priemoni tyrim bei inventori lietuvi kalboje. Atkreipiamas d mesys skirtingos evidencialumo rai-kos (morfologin s ir nemorfologin s) priemoni s veik . <sup>TM</sup>o darbo rezultatai gal t b ti pritaikyti leksikografijoje, lietuvi kalbos gramatikos apra-uose, atliekant kontrastyvinius ir tipologinius tyrimus. Kadangi -iame darbe atskleidffiama nagrin jam b dvardffi ir prieveiksmi distribucija groffin s literat ros tekstuose ir mokslo kalboje, -is darbas gali b ti vertingas besimokantiems lietuvi kalbos kaip antrosios, vert jams, bakalauro ir magistro darb ra-antiems studentams.

### **Ginamieji teiginiai**

1. Parenteti-kai vartojami nederinamieji b dvardffiai rodo adverbializacijos poffymius: sintaksin mobilum , antrin s predikacijos reik-m ir pakitusias funkcijas. Plat janti parenteti-kai vartojam b dvardffi apr ptis leidffia juos gretinti su sakinio prieveiksmiais ir kalb ti apie j gramatin status .
2. Prieveiksmiais i-reik-t autoriaus pozicijos adverbial funkcijos priklauso nuo kolokacijas su prieveiksmiais sudaran i veiksmaffodffi semantikos ir vertinam j element , esan i kontekste.
3. Sugretinus nederinam j b dvardffi ir prieveiksmi morfosintaksines ypatybes groffin s literat ros tekstuose ir mokslo kalboje, nustatyta, kad lietuvi kalboje b dvardffiai daffniau negu prieveiksmiai vartojami kaip evidencialumo arba kitos autoriaus pozicijos rai-kos priemon s. Prieveiksmiai funkcionuoja daffniau kaip b do adverbialai, modifikuojantys predikatus kokybiniu poffi riu.
4. Semantin funkcin nederinam j b dvardffi ir prieveiksmi analiz rodo, kad nagrin jami vienetai gali b ti vartojami kaip evidenciniai, evidenciniai episteminiai,

vertinimo ir pragmatiniai flymikliai, ir j vartosena gali varijuoti priklausomai nuo diskurso.

5. Pragmatini flymikli vartosena atspindi evidencini reik-mi ir funkcij i-nykim : pabr fiamas -nekos aktas ir jo dalyviai, o ne propozicijos vertinimas. flymikli pragmati-k jimas ir daugiafunkci-kumas koreliuoja su j adverbializacijos poflymiais.

**Tyrimo metodai ir medžiaga.** Tyje disertacijoje atliekamas tyrimas naudojant tekstyn metodologij . Tyrimo medfiaga surinkta i- groflin s literat ros patekstynio, esan io šDabartin s lietuvi kalbos tekстыneō (<http://donelaitis.vdu.lt>), ir šLietuvi mokslo kalbos tekстыnoō (*Corpus Academicum Lithuanicum* ó CorALit, <http://www.coralit.lt/>).

Ty tekstyn pagrindu tiriami kokybiniai bei kiekybiniai b dvardffi *akivaizdu, aišku, ryšku, panašu, natūralu* irrieveiksmai *akivaizdziai, aiškiai, ryškiai, panašiai, natūraliai* rai-kos ir turinio parametrai. Kokybin analiz sudaro du tyrimo etapai. Per pirm j kokybin s analiz s etap aptariami nagrin jam flymikli morfosintaksiniai bruoflai, per antr j ó j semantin s funkcin s ypatyb s. Semantin s ir funkcin s -i flymikli ypatyb s nustatomos ir analizuojamos pagal sintagmin j aplink , kuri sudaro semantinis predikato tipas, subjekto rai-ka (pirmojo / antrojo / tre iojo asmens subjektas), konektoriai, modifikatoriai, sakini tipai (teigiamieji, klausiamieji, liepiamieji, -aukiamieji), propozicijos teigiamas / neigiamas poliari-kumas ir argumentacija, kuriami tam tikros leksikos. Atlikus kokybin b dvardffi irrieveiksmai morfosintaksini bruofl analiz , pateikiami kiekybiniai aptariam bruofl rodikliai: analizuojamas normalizuotas -i bruofl dafnis groflin s literat ros tekstuose ir mokslo kalboje. Kadangi tekstynai n ra vienodo dydfflio, nagrin jam rai-kos priemoni dafnis normalizuojamas 1000 flodffi imtyje. Atsiffvelgiama ir statistinio reik-mingumo rodiklius, apskai iuojamus logaritmin s tikimyb s testu (angl. *log likelihood test*).

**Disertacijos struktūra.** Disertacij sudaro vadas, dvi teorin s dalys, tyrimo metod ir medfiagos skyrius, dvi tiriamosios dalys, i-vados ir literat ros s ra-as. Teorin s dalys pristato evidencialumo kategorijos apibr ftis, reik-mi taksonomijas, s sajas su kitomis kategorijomis, morfologini ir nemorfologini evidencialumo rai-kos priemoni i-tirtum ufsienio ir lietuvi kalbotyroje. Pirmoji tiriamoji dalis skirta nederinam j b dvardffi irrieveiksmai morfosintaksiniams bruoflams aptarti:

analizuojami j kokybiniai ir kiekybiniai rodikliai. Antroji tiriamoji dalis pristato semantin funkcin b dvardfii ir prieveiksmi distribucij .

**Tyrimo rezultatai ir išvados.** Tyto tyrimo rezultatai rodo, kad lietuvi kalboje greta dalyvi morfologija paremt evidencini konstrukcij bei evidencini veiksmafldffii yra b dvardffiai ir prieveiksmiai, flymintys autoriaus flini –altin ir kuriantys vairi diskurs retorik . Nors –ios rai–kos priemon s n ra privalomos ir gal t sudaryti tik evidencialumo strategijas, j semantiniai funkciniai ypatumai yra pana– s kaip morfologini evidencialumo rai–kos priemoni . Priklausomai nuo morfosintaksini ypatybi evidenciniai b dvardffiai ir prieveiksmiai perteikia netiesioginio flini –altinio reik–mes ir kuria autoriaus pasakymo validum ir uftikrintum .

Pana–iai kaip german ir roman kalb veiksmafldffiai, taip ir lietuvi kalbos nederinamieji b dvardffiai, vartojami kaip KP su *kad / jog* komplemento sakiniu, flymi pagrindin arba antrin predikacij priklausomai nuo to, ar pabr fliama nauja ar flinoma informacija diskurse, ir turi leksini flymikli status . Akivaizdus nederinam j b dvardfii sintaksinio statuso kaitos rodiklis yra parentetin j vartosena, kuri pasiflymi sintaksine nepriklausomybe nuo modifikuojamo sakinio, adverbialine distribucija ir antrin s predikacijos reik–me. Atsifvelgiant –iuos poffymius, si loma parenteti–kai vartojamus nederinamuosius b dvardffius laikyti sakinio prieveiksmiais, nes –i vartosena n ra tapati KP su *kad / jog* komplemento sakiniu vartosenai. Parenteti–kai vartojami nederinamieji b dvardffiai gyja gramatini flymikli status .

Nederinam j b dvardfii morfosintaksini ypatybi kiekybiniai rodikliai skiriasi groffin je literat roje ir mokslo kalboje. Groffin s literat ros tekstuose dafnesni parenteti–kai vartojami KP (55 proc.), o mokslo kalboje dafnesni KP su *kad / jog* komplemento sakiniu (71 proc.). Tai ai–kintina nagrin jam strukt r ir diskurso tipo s sajomis. Kadangi mokslo kalba atspindi formal j diskurs , nat ralu, kad –iame diskurse dafnesn s sud tingesn s sintaksin s strukt ros, realizuojamos KP su *kad / jog* komplemento sakiniu. Tuo tarpu groffin s literat ros tekstuose, turin iuose sakytin s kalbos bruoffi , dafnesni parentetiniai KP, rei–kiantys spontani–kum ir betarpi–k bendravim . Nagrin t b dvardfii adverbiali–kumo aprai–kos groffin s literat ros tekstuose pagr stos ne tik dafniu, bet ir sintaksiniu mobilumu arba poziciniu varianti–kumu. Skirtingai negu mokslo kalboje, groffin s literat ros tekstuose parentetiniai b dvardffiai atsiduria ne tik inicial s ir medial s, bet ir final s pozicijose.



Be to, groflin s literat ros tekstuose medial s pozicija, kuri yra neabejotinas adverbiali-kumo rodiklis, sudaro didesn parenteti-kai vartojam b dvardffi dal (53 proc.) negu mokslo kalboje (31 proc.).

Nagrin jami prieveiksmiai vartojami kaip autoriaus pozicijos adverbialai (evidenciniai, vertinamieji) kontekstuose, kuriuose sudaro kolokacijas su veiksmaflodffiais, rei-kian iais santyk ir egzistencij , psichologines b senas, poky ius ir komunikacij . TŲ vartosena pabr fliama vertinam j element , esan i kontekste. Autoriaus pozicijos adverbialai, rei-kiami prieveiksmiais, n ra reik-mingai daflnesni, nei groflin s literat ros tekstuose nei mokslo kalboje.

Sugretinus nederinam j b dvardffi ir prieveiksmi morfosintaksini ypatybi distribucij groflin je literat roje ir mokslo kalboje, nustatyta, kad nederinamieji b dvardffiai daflniau ufl prieveiksnius vartojami kaip evidencialumo arba kitos autoriaus pozicijos rai-kos priemon s. TŲ vartosena sudaro 69,5 proc. visos b dvardffi vartosenos groflin je literat roje ir 83 proc. mokslo kalboje. Prieveiksmiai, vartojami kaip autoriaus pozicijos adverbialai, sudaro 15 proc. visos prieveiksmi vartosenos groflin je literat roje ir 11 proc. mokslo kalboje. Nagrin jami prieveiksmiai daflniau atlieka b do adverbialo funkcijas arba rodo dviprasm b do ir autoriaus pozicijos adverbial vartosen . Nefflymi autoriaus pozicijos flymikli , rei-kiam prieveiksmiais, vartosena lietuvi kalboje gal t b ti ai-kinama kitomis rai-kos priemon mis, kurioms b dingos -ios reik-m s ir funkcijos. Be min t nederinam j b dvardffi alternatyvias autoriaus pozicijos rai-kos priemones sudaro dalyviai, asmenuojamosios veiksmaflodffi formos, daiktavardffiai.

Nederinam j b dvardffi ir prieveiksmi semantin funkcin vairov , atskleidffliama -iame tyrime, tik i-dalies sutampa su nagrin jam flymikli semantin mis funkcin mis ypatyb mis, pateikiamomis ankstesniuose tyrimuose ir lietuvi kalbos gramatikos apra-uose. Remiantis tekstyno metodika nustatyta, kad b dvardffiai *akivaizdu*, *aišku*, *ryšku* ir atitinkami prieveiksmiai *akivaizdziai*, *aiškiai*, *ryškiai* flymi autoriaus numanym , pagr st percepcija arba konceptualiuoju flini -altiniu, kurie gali b ti eksplikuojami arba implikuojami -i flymikli kontekste. Taigi *akivaizdu* ir *aišku*, kaip ir *ryšku*, priklauso evidencini , bet ne episteminio modalumo flymikli grupei, kaip teigta kituose tyrimuose; prieveiksmiai *akivaizdziai*, *aiškiai* ir *ryškiai* gali b ti vartojami kaip evidencialumo, o ne vien kaip b do adverbialai. Atkreiptinas d mesys, kad -i

flymikli leksin s reik–m s susijusios su percepcija, o tai ó vienas i– veiksnis , skatinan i evidencini reik–mi atsiradim (Wiemer, Kampf 2012). S saja su episteminiu modalumu i–ry–k ja tik i– b dvardflio *panašu* ir prieveiksmio *panašiai* (KP su *kad/jog* komplemento sakiniu) vartosenos: juos vartojant numanymo (evidencialumo) ir abejon s (episteminio modalumo) reik–m s susipynusios. Evidencini ir episteminis reik–mi sinkreti–kumas ai–kintinas flini –altinio nepakankamumu, skatinan iu epistemin s abejon s atsiradim , flymikli morfosintaksin mis ir leksin mis ypatyb mis.

*Natūralu*, retsykais ir *natūraliai*, laikomi vertinimo flymikliais, kurie rodo, kiek propozicijoje rei–kiama informacija atitinka tam tikras normas arba yra tik tina. Tame darbe pabr fiamos –i flymikli s sajos su flinojimu, evidencialumo kategorijos dimensija, ta iau teigiama, kad ne kiekviena tokia s saja b tinai kvalifikuojama kaip evidencin . Be to, beveik nerasta kontekst , kuriuose *natūralu*, *natūraliai* tur t s saj su percepcija, kuri yra vienas pagrindini evidencini reik–mi atsiradimo veiksnis .

Nagrin jami flymikliai praranda evidencialumo arba kitas autoriaus pozicijos reik–mes ir funkcijas, kai pradeda flym ti interaktyvum su skaitytoju arba sieti diskurs ir tampa pragmatiniais flymikliais. Pagrindiniai veiksniai, motyvuojantys evidencialumo reik–mi ir funkcij i–nykim , yra –nekos akto ir jo dalyvi pabr flimas bei negin ijam , savaiame suprantam ties modifikacija. I–skyrus atvejus, kai nagrin jami nederinamieji b dvardfliai akivaizdfliai pradeda modifikuoti ne propozicij o –nekos akt , pragmatin s ir evidencialumo reik–m s ir funkcijos gali b ti susipynusios, tad ne visada manoma nustatyti ai–ki rib tarp j . Tokiu atveju reik t pritarti Wichmann, Simon-Vandenberg, Aijmer (2010, 128) nuomonei, kad n ra grynai propozicini (evidencialumo / episteminio) modalumo reik–mi ir grynai pragmatini , nes jos yra tik apytiksliai propozicin s arba apytiksliai pragmatin s.

Skirtingai negu german , roman ir slav kalbose, lietuvi kalboje pragmatin vartoseną, sietina su evidencini reik–mi i–nykimu, labiau b dinga nederinamiesiems b dvardfliams, vartojamiems kaip sakinio adverbialai, bet ne prieveiksmiams. Kadangi prieveiksmiai kaip sakinio adverbialai lietuvi kalboje vartojami re iau negu atitinkami b dvardfliai, jie nerodo semantin s funkcin s vairov s. J reik–m s yra daugiau specifin s, tarp b do ir evidencialumo adverbial , j skiriamasis bruoflas ó subjektyvumas.

Semantinė funkcija nagrinėjama nederinamąjį būdvardžių ir prieveiksmių analizė taip pat atskleidė jų vartosenos skirtumus atsižvelgiant į diskurso ypatumus, ypač kai jie vartojami kaip numanymo žymekliai. Grofinis literatūros tekstuose jie žymi subjektyvų autoriaus numanymą, dažniausiai paremtą percepcija, o mokslo kalboje (išskyrus prieveiksmius) – intersubjektyvų numanymą, dažniausiai paremtą conceptualiuoju žiniatinkliu. Abiejų tipų diskursuose numanymo žymekliai atlieka svarbų argumentacinį vaidmenį: grofinis literatūros tekstuose suteikia autoriaus pasakymui validumą, be kurio – išskyrus kategorikas ir nepagrįstas, mokslo kalboje kuria vairialypų autoriaus argumentacijos retoriką. Kaip morfologinis evidencialumo raiškos priemonė yra esminiais kmingos komunikacijos komponentai kalbose, kuriose evidencialumas yra privaloma gramatinė kategorija, taip nemorfologinis evidencialumo raiškos priemonė sudaro svarbų aspektą kuriant vairius diskursus kalbose, kuriose –i kategorija nėra raiškijama sietinomis morfologijos priemonėmis.

Lietuvių kalboje, panašiai kaip bulgarų ir estų, galima išvėgti gramatini ir leksini evidencialumo raiškos priemones veik. Dažniausios kombinacijos yra evidencinės konstrukcijos, paremtos neveikiamąjį dalyvi formomis, kurios žymi žiniatinklio gavimo būdą (numanymą), ir evidenciniai būdvardžiai (*akivaizdu, aišku*) arba prieveiksmiai (*akivaizdžiai, aiškiai*), kurie specifikuoja numanymo tipą, t. y. žymi konkretų žiniatinklį. Pastebimos ir dvi leksini evidencialumo žymeklių kombinacijos, kuriose vienas žymi numanymą, o kitas specifikuoja numanymo pagrindą. Iš tiesų rodoma, kad evidencialumas propozicijoje gali būti žymtas du kartus. Harmoningos gramatinės ir leksinės arba dvi leksinės evidencialumo raiškos priemonės kombinacijos rodo, kad evidencialumo kategorijos raiška negali būti ribojama vien morfologinėmis priemonėmis. Geriau –i kategorijai imanyti manoma tik tiriant vairius –ios kategorijos raišką.

Tyrimo rezultatai papildė evidencialumo, episteminio modalumo ir kitų autoriaus pozicijos bei pragmatinių žymeklių inventorių lietuvių kalboje, atskleidė jų morfosintaksinius ypatumus bei daugiafunkciškumą ir praplečia nemorfologinio evidencialumo raiškos bei turinio tyrimus Europos kalbose.

## LIST OF PUBLICATIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF DISSERTATION

1. Ruskan, Anna. 2010. Evidencialumo raiškos priemonės lietuvių kalboje. *Lietuvių kalba* (4). (<http://www.lietuviu.kalba>).
2. Ruskan, Anna. 2012. Evidential adjectives in Lithuanian academic discourse. *Kalbotyra* 64 (3), 103-123.

## CONFERENCE AND SEMINAR PRESENTATIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF THE DISSERTATION

1. *The evidential markers **evidently** and **akivaizdžiai** from a cross-linguistic perspective*. International conference „Kalbos ir filmonės: dialogai ir kontaktai“, Vilnius University (Lithuania), 23-24 September, 2010.
2. *Evidential adjectives in Lithuanian academic discourse*. International conference „National Languages in Academic Research and Higher Education“, Tallinn University (Estonia), 29-30 August, 2011.
3. *Markers of evidentiality in Lithuanian academic discourse: neuter adjectives and adverbs*. International conference „Modality, Corpus, Discourse“, Lund University (Sweden), 7-8 June, 2012.
4. *Expressing evidentiality in Lithuanian: the case of neuter adjectives*. 45-th international conference of Societas Linguistica Europea, Stockholm University (Sweden), 29 August - 1 September, 2012.
5. *The Epistemicity of English **likely**, Lithuanian **panašu** and Polish **podobno***. 11th conference of the European Society for the Study of English, Bogazici University, (Turkey), 4-8 September, 2012.
6. *Nemorfologinio evidencialumo raiška lietuvių kalboje: bevardės giminės būdvardžiai*. Seminar at the Department of Baltic languages, Adam Mickiewicz University (Poland), 12 December, 2012.
7. *Nemorfologinio evidencialumo raiška lietuvių kalboje: prieveiksmiai*. Seminar at the Department of Baltic languages, Adam Mickiewicz University (Poland), 22 May, 2013.

Anna Ruskan 2002 m. baigė Anglų filologijos bakalauro studijas ir 2004 m. Anglų filologijos magistro studijas Lietuvos edukologijos universitete (Vilniaus pedagoginis universitetas). Nuo 2008 m. dirba Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos fakulteto Anglų filologijos katedroje.

2009 m. pradėjo Vilniaus universiteto humanitarini mokslų doktorantūros studijas. Jų metu dalyvavo tarptautiniuose moksliniuose konferencijose ir seminaruose, parengė dvi publikacijas. 2012 m. gavo apdovanojimą „Geriausi pranešimai konkurse“ 45-oje tarptautinėje Europos lingvistų asociacijos konferencijoje *Societas Linguistica Europea* Stokholmo universitete. 2010 m. buvo išvykusi Lingvistinės tipologijos vasaros mokyklai, Evoliucinės antropologijos Makso Planko institute Leipcige bei 2011 m. vasaros mokyklai Leveno Katalikiškame universitete Belgijoje. 2011 m. buvo išvykusi trumpalaikiai stažuotei Adomo Mickevičiaus universitete Poznanėje (Kalbotyros institutas, Baltų kalbų katedra). 2012–2013 m. gavusi „Vietimo mainų ir paramos fondo stipendiją“ buvo išvykusi moksliniam stažuotui Adomo Mickevičiaus universitete Poznanėje (Kalbotyros institutas, Baltų kalbų katedra).

Anna Ruskan graduated from Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences (Vilnius Pedagogical University) and received a BA degree (2002) and an MA degree (2004) in English Philology. Since 2008 she has been working at the Department of English Philology of the Faculty of Philology in Vilnius University.

In 2009 Anna Ruskan started her PhD studies in Vilnius University. During the studies she participated in international conferences and seminars and published two research articles. In 2012 she received an award for Best PhD presentations at the 45th Annual Meeting of *Societas Linguistica Europea*, Stockholm University. In 2010 she attended *Summer School on Linguistic Typology* in Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology in Leipzig and in 2011 she was at *LOT Summer School* in the University of Leuven. In 2011 she was on a short research visit in Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań (Institute of Linguistics, Department of Baltic Languages). Receiving a grant from the Education Exchange Fund of Lithuania, in 2012–2013 she was on a research stay in Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań (Institute of Linguistics, Department of Baltic Languages).