

Certainty and Doubt
in Academic Discourse:
Epistemic Modality Markers
in English and Polish Linguistics Articles

Krystyna Warchał



WYDAWNICTWO
UNIwersytetu ŚLĄSKIEGO
KATOWICE 2015

Certainty and doubt in academic discourse:

Epistemic modality markers in English and Polish linguistics articles

For Hania and Jasio



NR 3375

Certainty and doubt in academic discourse:

Epistemic modality markers
in English and Polish linguistics articles

Krystyna Warchał

Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego • Katowice 2015

[Kup książkę](#)

Editor of the series: Językoznawstwo Neofilologiczne
Maria Wysocka

Referee
Piotr Mamet

Contents

Introduction	7
1. Academic discourse and its rhetoric	11
1.1 Academic discourse community: its genres and values	15
1.2 The cultural factor in academic communication.	18
1.3 English academic discourse: Previous studies.	22
1.3.1 Academic register(s)	22
1.3.2 Academic genres.	26
1.3.3 Principal themes.	32
1.3.4 English as an academic lingua franca.	41
1.4 Polish academic discourse: Previous studies	44
1.5 Concluding remarks	50
2. Linguistic modality	53
2.1 Approaches and concepts	53
2.1.1 Sentential, sub-sentential and discourse modality	54
2.1.2 Modality and mood	55
2.1.3 Modality and the propositional content	57
2.1.4 Modality and subjectivity.	59
2.1.5 Modality and the realis/irrealis distinction	63
2.1.6 Modality and relevance	67
2.2 Modal meanings and values.	71
2.2.1 The epistemic/deontic distinction and related modal subdomains.	71
2.2.2 The root/epistemic distinction	74
2.2.3 Epistemicity, speaker-orientedness, and agent-orientedness	79
2.2.4 Epistemicity and evidentiality	83
2.2.5 Modal scales	88
2.3 Epistemic modality markers.	92
2.3.1 Epistemic markers in English	92

2.3.2 Epistemic markers in Polish	99
2.4 Modality in academic discourse: Previous studies	111
2.5 Concluding remarks	120
3. The project	123
3.1 Aims	123
3.2 Corpus description	125
3.3 The analysis	127
4. Markers of (un)certainty in English and Polish linguistics articles	133
4.1 High-value markers	133
4.1.1 English	133
4.1.2 Polish	149
4.1.3 Discussion	160
4.2 Middle-value markers	166
4.2.1 English	166
4.2.2 Polish	187
4.2.3 Discussion	205
4.3 Low-value markers	213
4.3.1 English	213
4.3.2 Polish	233
4.3.3 Discussion	246
5. Conclusions	255
References	265
Index of names	291
Index of modality markers	297
Streszczenie	301
Zusammenfassung	303
List of tables	305
List of figures	309

Introduction

When people say that they know something, they have their reasons to feel certain that something is the case. Scientific knowledge requires that these reasons be of a specific kind, that they be backed by data collected in the course of observation and systematic experimentation. Moreover, as the developments brought by social constructionism have shown, the status of these data as the empirical basis of knowledge is sanctioned by the particular social context where knowledge is generated, as is the value of observation and experiment as legitimate scientific procedures (Berger and Luckmann, 1967). In this perspective, knowledge is relative to the communities which produce it and emerges in a complex process of negotiating a shared vision of the world and a shared understanding of what constitutes an appropriate object of scientific inquiry, a valid scientific method, and a meaningful academic contribution. Thus, rather than a faithful representation of an objectively given reality, scientific knowledge can be viewed as a product of society, created according to the principles a particular community judges appropriate and aiming to explain this reality which is available to and agreed upon by this particular group. It is then to a large extent a matter of social consensus.

The consensual nature of scientific knowledge and the fact that it is generated in interaction between community members implies that signals of epistemic stance in academic discourse will reflect not only the degree of the author's personal commitment to the truth of a proposition, but also the author's awareness of other members of the discourse community, of the state of the art in the discipline, and of the established patterns of interaction with others. For example, an expression of certainty may convey information about the author's commitment deriving from the amount, distribution, and consistency of the data gathered, thus being a direct claim to expertise; it may indicate that the information presented has already been accepted by the discourse

community as a fact and granted the status of knowledge; or it may emphasise the rigour and cogency of argumentation by showing that the author (with the readers) has reached an undeniable conclusion which deserves promotion to the status of fact. And conversely, an expression which limits or qualifies the author's commitment to the proposition may reflect the author's lack of certainty, possibly related to the type of evidence insufficient to sustain the claim; it may signal that the proposition is a new claim offered for evaluation by the discourse community and awaiting the community's approval rather than part of the already established consensus over what is known; or it may convey the author's awareness of the norms and values professed by the community, such as accepted ways of showing respect for and disagreeing with other authors and the preferable degree of autonomy left to the readers. In this perspective, a study of epistemic markers in academic texts originating in a particular community may provide some insight into its academic practices: the specific mechanisms of knowledge generation and sharing which function within this community.

Possible differences in academic practices may be related to various community-defining elements, of which language is perhaps the most salient. Languages have developed their own rhetorical patterns, which reflect their internal organisation, the responsibilities of and the preferred degree of solidarity between interactants, and the intellectual tradition in which they grow and to which they contribute (Kaplan, 1987; Connor and Kaplan, 1987; Connor, 1996). These culture-specific features will contribute to the ways in which members of communities talk about, generate and disseminate knowledge. Another important element which defines a particular scientific community is the discipline. Disciplines have given rise to text types and evolved stylistic features which best correspond to their specific needs, including recognisable argumentation patterns and expected degree of interpersonal involvement (Melander et al., 1997; Hyland, 1999a, 2000, 2008a; Dahl, 2004; Hyland and Bondi, 2006; Fløttum et al., 2006a; Vold, 2006a; Yakhontova, 2006). These discipline-related characteristics will be responsible for much of the variation observed in the area of academic communication. As powerful factors influencing communication patterns on various levels — from the choice of genre, through the degree of dialogicality, to phraseological decisions — both cultural and disciplinary background may also influence the ways in which signals of epistemic evaluation are used in the text: their frequency, the degrees of commitment which tend to be marked more often than others, and the part of text in which they tend to appear. This book is concerned with potential differences related to the first of these two factors.

This book examines the use of epistemic modality markers in two sets of peer-reviewed journal articles in the field of linguistics published in the years 2001-2006. The first set comprises two hundred articles written in English and drawn from five international linguistics journals: *Journal of Pragmatics*, *Language and Communication*, *Language Sciences*, *Lingua*, and *Linguistics and Philosophy*. The second set consists of two hundred articles written in Polish and published in eight Polish journals, all of which were included in the 2003 list of recognised scientific journals released by the Polish Committee for Scientific Research. The analysis seeks answers to the following questions:

- Is the epistemic evaluation marked with the same frequency in English and Polish linguistics articles?
- Are high, middle and low degrees of confidence marked with a similar frequency?
- What categories of markers prevail as exponents of particular modal value in the two sets of texts?
- Do epistemic markers tend to cluster in particular article sections? Are there any differences in their distribution that might be related to the value of the marker?
- Is there any indication of potential differences in what tends to be epistemically qualified in these two sets of texts?

I hope that the data presented here may be of interest to scholars who study culture-based and discipline-based argumentation patterns in academic discourse, including those concerned with the use of English as an Additional Language and English as a Lingua Franca, and to researchers who investigate epistemic modality and evidentiality in cross-linguistic and cross-cultural perspective. They might also be of some value to scholars who are concerned with how language reflects the community-based mechanisms of knowledge generation and sharing.

Chapter 1 discusses the internal variation of academic discourse resulting from disciplinary divisions, the complex system of genres, multiple audiences, and cultural diversity, provides a short overview of the main lines of research that have been undertaken into academic communication, and reports on the existing research into Polish academic discourse. Chapter 2 is devoted to linguistic modality and outlines the main approaches to the concept, discusses modality types and values, and focuses of epistemicity to present its markers in English and in Polish. The chapter closes with an overview of previous research into modality in academic discourse. Chapter 3 describes in more detail the aims of the present study, introduces the corpus which is the source of data, and explains the procedures applied in the analysis. Chapter 4 presents

and discusses the collected data in three main sections, each of which is devoted to one modal value — high, middle and low — and its representation in the English and Polish part of the corpus and closes with a discussion summarizing the information for both languages. Chapter 5 offers some concluding remarks.

Index of names

- Abbamonte, Lucia 32, 265
Ädel, Annelie 35–36, 51, 265
Adnan, Zifirdaus 18, 265
Ahmad, Ummul K. 285
Aijmer, Karin 34, 51, 265
Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 86–87, 265
Allison, Desmond 289
Ammon, Ulrich 41, 265
Ananiadou, Sophia 286
Ángeles Alcaraz Ariza, María 283
Arabski, Janusz 25, 265, 273, 278, 287
Arnaudet, Martin L. 23, 28, 265
Artiga León, María Rosario 114, 265
Asher, R. E. 273
Auwera, Johan van der 56, 67, 70, 80–82, 84, 87, 90, 265, 270, 280–281, 283, 307
Avram, Larisa 67, 289
- B**
Bachtin, Michail 266
Bailey, Stephen 23, 266
Bakhtin, Mikhail 13, 26, 266
Bamford, Julia 32, 34, 266
Barbieri, Federica 23, 25, 267
Barbiers, Sjef 57, 70, 266
Barrett, Mary E. 23, 28, 265
Bartholomae, David 11, 266
Bazerman, Charles 27–28, 266
Beck, Silvia C. 279
- Bell, Roger T. 27, 266
Belotti, Ulisse 14, 29, 266
Benson, James D. 277–278
Berbeira Gardón, José L. 67, 69, 266, 303
Berger, Peter L. 7, 266
Bergs, Alexander 57, 266
Beukema, Frits 266
Bhatia, Vijay K. 27, 266
Biber, Douglas 22–25, 32, 34, 39–40, 46, 59, 111–114, 127, 134, 266–267, 269, 276
Bielska, Joanna 30, 267
Bielski, Marek 30, 267
Bloor, Thomas 29, 267
Bondi, Marina 8, 14, 25, 30, 34, 267, 271, 275, 279, 284, 286–287
Borchert, Donald M. 271
Boye, Kasper 76, 267
Bralczyk, Jerzy 108–109, 127, 267
Brantjes, Jenneke 67, 267
Brown, E. K. 273
Bruce, Ian 28, 267
Brutt-Griffler, Janina 41, 267
Bunton, David 31, 35–36, 267
Burgess, Sally 17, 30, 265, 267, 272, 276–280, 287
Burrough-Boenisch, Joy 33, 267
Busuttil, Pierre 283

- Butler, Jonny 64, 267
 Bybee, Joan 56, 58, 70, 75, 79–82, 268,
 273, 278, 280, 283, 307
- Canagarajah, Suresh 16, 268
 Canale, Michael 27, 268
 Candlin, Christopher N. 275
 Cargill, Margaret 28, 268
 Carter-Thomas, Shirley 14, 33, 268
 Cava, Amelia M. 30, 34, 268
 Chafe, Wallace 63, 85, 268
 Chang, Yu-Ying 285
 Chavez, Daniel 285
 Chen, Qi 25, 268
 Chomsky, Noam 38
 Chung, Sandra 56–57, 268
 Clyne, Michael 17–20, 37, 46, 268
 Čmejrková, Světlá 18, 20–21, 46, 51,
 268–269
 Coates, Jennifer 60–61, 63, 68, 72, 74,
 78, 90–97, 127, 134–135, 166–167,
 213–214, 217, 269
 Collins, Peter 92–97, 134, 167, 269
 Connor, Ulla 8, 18, 27, 32, 269, 274,
 276
 Conrad, Susan 22, 34, 39, 112, 267,
 269
 Cortes, Viviana 14, 269
 Cotterill, Janet 288
 Coulthard, Malcolm 274, 288
 Coupland, Nikolas 265
 Coxhead, Averil 25, 269
 Crawford Camiciottoli, Belinda 32,
 40, 115, 269
 Crismore, Avon 35, 38, 269
 Crompton, Peter 37, 111, 269
 Crystal, David 41–42, 269
 Czaplewicz, Eugeniusz 266
- D'Angelo, Larissa 31, 270
 Dahl, Trine 8, 14, 29–30, 35, 51, 269–
 271
 Daneš, František 18, 20, 46, 269
- Dedaić, Mirjana N. 59, 270
 Del Lungo Camiciotti, Gabriella 265–
 266, 272, 274, 281, 283–284, 286
 DeLancey, Scott 86, 270
 Dendale, Patrick 83, 270, 280–281
 Dervin, Fred 270, 273, 276, 280
 Dewey, Martin 41, 270
 Diani, Giuliana 31, 34, 270, 280
 Diewald, Gabriele 67, 87, 270
 Divasson, Lourdes 34, 277
 Dobrzyńska, Teresa 281
 Dossena, Marina 59, 273
 Dressen, Dacia F. 285
 Dudley-Evans, Tony 274
 Duszak, Anna 12–14, 18, 20, 26, 28,
 37, 46–51, 269–271, 277, 279, 286–
 287
 Dwyer, Sharon 285
- Eikmeyer, Hans-Jurgen 277
 ElMalik, Abdullahi T. 14, 271
 Espinoza, Ana María 33, 271
 Evans, Virginia 28, 271
- Facchinetti, Roberta 213, 269–271,
 276–278, 280–282
 Fant, Lars 54, 271
 Feak, Christine B. 23, 28, 285
 Ferguson, Gibson R. 265, 282
 Fernández Polo, Francisco Javier 31,
 271
 Fillmore, Charles J. 57, 271
 Finegan, Edward 34, 111, 127, 267
 Fintel, Kai von 70, 73, 98, 271
 Fitneva, Stanka A. 86, 271
 Fleischman, Suzanne 58, 268, 273,
 278, 280, 283
 Fløttum, Kjersti 8, 14, 23–24, 29, 35–
 36, 38, 51, 271, 275, 279
 Flower, Linda 21, 272
 Flowerdew, John 11, 13, 33, 42, 269,
 272, 282, 289
 Fok, Angela C.Y.Y. 284

- Forey, Gail 31, 274
Fortanet Gómez, Inmaculada 32, 34, 38, 272, 282
Frawley, William 273, 281, 286
Freddi, Maria 14, 32, 34, 272
Fredrickson, Kirstin M. 279
Freedman, Aviva 282
- G**
Gabrielatos, Costas 287
Gabryś-Barker, Danuta 287
Gajda, Stanisław 44, 47, 272, 289
Galtung, Johan 45, 272
Gavins, Joanna 97–98, 127, 272
Ge, Guang-chun 25, 268
Gillaerts, Paul 37, 272
Gillette, Susan 285
Giner, Diana 118, 287
Gledhill, Chris 14, 272
Goffman, Erving 263, 272
Golebiowski, Zofia 33, 48–49, 51, 272–273
Gotti, Maurizio 59, 273
Graff Fara, Delia 282
Grajewski, Wincenty 266
Gravett, Sarah 11, 273
Gray, Bethany 46, 267
Greaves, William S. 277–278
Green, M.S. 58, 273
Greenbaum, Sidney 282
Groefsema, Marjolein 67–69, 95, 273, 303
Groom, Nicholas 23–24, 273
Grunwell, Pamela 284
Grzegorzczkova, Renata 99–100, 107, 127, 273
Gumul, Ewa 265
Günthner, Susanne 26, 273
- H**
Haan, Ferdinand de 74, 55, 65, 74, 273
Halliday, Michael A.K. 22, 26, 60, 82–83, 88–91, 273, 307
Hamp-Lyons, Liz 11, 14, 275
Hansen, Björn 67, 273
Harres, Annette 37, 277
Hassan, Ruqaiya 22, 273
Heine, Bernd 67, 273
Heine, Lena 57, 266
Heltoft, Lars 55, 273
Hentschel, Gerd 288
Herslund, Michael 62, 273
Hewings, Ann 29, 34, 273–274
Hewings, Martin 34, 273–274
Hidalgo Downing, Laura 278
Hinds, John 17, 19, 21, 45–46, 274
Hinkel, Eli 115–116, 274
Hoey, Michael 38, 274
Hollett, Vicki 28, 274
Holmes, Richard 28, 274
Hood, Susan 31, 274
Hoye, Leo 38, 57, 61, 63, 93, 98–99, 127, 140, 143, 217, 274
Huckin, Thomas 30, 274
Huddleston, Rodney D. 92–93, 274
Hunston, Susan 17–18, 34, 51, 263, 269, 274, 278, 285
Hyland, Ken 8, 11–14, 17–18, 22–25, 27, 29–39, 51, 98, 114–118, 127, 263, 267, 270–271, 274–275, 280, 284, 286–287
- I**
Icke, Vincent 285
Ineichen, Gustav 288
- J**
Janik, Christina 40, 119, 276
Jędrzejko, Ewa 101, 276
Jenkins, Jennifer 41, 270
John, Suganthi 38, 285
Johns, Ann M. 15–16, 27, 31, 276
Jordan, R.R. 23, 28, 276
- K**
Kachru, Braj 41, 276
Kachru, Yamuna 46, 276
Kakietek, Piotr 100, 276
Kaplan, Robert B. 8, 18, 269, 274, 276
Kasperski, Edward 266

- Keck, Casey M 40, 59, 113–114, 134, 276
- Kerz, Elma 33, 276
- Kettemann, Bernhard 286
- Kiefer, Ferenc 63, 70, 75, 77–78, 276, 307
- Kinn, Torodd 271
- Klinge, Alex 67–68, 76, 271, 273, 276, 280–281
- Knoblauch, Hubert 26, 273
- Koutsantoni, Dimitra 38, 276
- Kowalski, Grzegorz 50, 276
- Kratzer, Angelika 63–69, 73–74, 89, 276–277
- Kreutz, Heinz 37, 277
- Krug, Manfred 271, 277, 280–281
- Krzyżyk, Danuta 108–110, 127, 277
- Kuo, Chih-Hua 38, 277
- Kuteeva, Maria 288
- Kuźniak, Marek 288
- Lafuente Millán, Enrique 29, 40, 118, 277
- Larreya, Paul 66, 277
- Lazard, Gilbert 86, 277
- Leckie-Tarry, Helen 22, 277
- Lee, Y. P. 284
- Leech, Geoffrey 282
- Lemke, Jay L. 22, 277
- León, Isabel K. 34, 277
- Lewin, Beverly A. 37, 277
- Lewkowicz, Jo 14, 271
- Ligara, Bronisława 67, 99–109, 127, 150, 277
- Lillis, Theresa 274
- Lord, Robert 284
- Lorés Sanz, Rosa 23–24, 30, 267, 277
- Low, Graham 284
- Luckmann, Thomas 7, 266
- Lunn, Patricia V. 66, 278
- Luukka, Minna-Riitta 37, 278
- Łyda, Andrzej 18, 33, 40, 50, 114, 265, 271, 276, 278, 280, 287–288
- Lyons, John 11, 59–62, 65, 70–74, 99, 278, 307
- Marín-Arrese, Juana I. 59, 278
- Markkanen, Raija 37, 269, 278, 281
- Marko, Georg 286
- Martin, J.R. 26–27, 34, 263, 278–279
- Martínez, Iliana A. 25, 279
- Martín-Martín, Pedro 17, 30, 265, 267, 272, 276–280, 287
- Martins, Helder F. 288
- Mason, Ian 22, 273
- Matthews, Richard 54, 67, 279
- Mauranen, Anna 19–21, 32–36, 43–44, 51, 267–269, 279, 285
- Maynard, Senko K. 54, 279
- McCarthy, Michael 25, 279
- McEnery, Tony 125, 279
- McNaught, John 286
- Medway, Peter 282
- Melander, Björn 8, 14, 30, 279
- Merlini Barbaresi, Lavinia 38, 279
- Miko, František 45
- Mikołajczak, Stanisław 47, 279
- Miller, Carolyn R. 26, 279
- Milton, John 98, 115–116, 127, 275
- Mitchell, Keith 61, 280
- Mithun, Marianne 63, 65, 280
- Molina Plaza, Silvia 278
- Molino, Alessandra 38, 51, 280
- Montemagni, Simonetta 286
- Moore, Sarah 28, 280
- Morell, Teresa 31, 280
- Moreno, Ana I. 34, 36, 280
- Morton, Janne 32, 280
- Motapanyane, Virginia 67, 280
- Müller, Henrik H. 67, 271, 273, 280–281
- Mur Dueñas, Pilar 14, 29, 38, 51, 280
- Murray, Rowena 28, 280
- Myers, Greg 14, 17–18, 28, 37, 111, 280–281

- Namsaraev, Vasili 14, 37, 281
Narrog, Heiko 56–58, 63, 66–67, 70, 74, 281
Nation, Paul 25, 269
Nesi, Hilary 14, 271
Nichols, Johanna 268
Nuyts, Jan 53, 61–62, 74, 77–78, 82, 86, 91, 281
- O'Connor, Patrick 28, 268
O'Dell, Felicity 25, 279
Oakey, David 14, 281
Okamura, Akiko 14, 281
Oliveira, Fátima 67, 281
Omoniyi, Tope 270
Ostaszewska, Danuta 48, 281
- Pagliuca, William 268
Palmer, Frank R. 56–59, 63–74, 83–84, 89–97, 127, 269, 270–271, 282, 307
Palmer-Silveira, Juan C. 282
Paltridge, Brian 11, 27–28, 282
Panza, Carolina B. 279
Papafragou, Anna 58–62, 66–70, 76–78, 93, 282, 303, 307
Paré, Anthony 26, 282
Peacock, Matthew 11, 42, 269, 272, 282, 289
Pérez-Llantada, Carmen 36, 38, 99, 119, 127, 265, 282
Perkins, Revere 268
Petersen, Eva B. 12, 17, 282
Petersen, Nadine 11, 273
Pho, Phuong Dzung 30, 282
Plungian, Vladimir A. 56, 70–71, 80–87, 90, 265, 282, 307
Pohl, Alek 288
Polański, Kazimierz 55, 282
Portner, Paul 54–55, 59, 98, 282
Prior, Paul 266
Pullum, Geoffrey K. 93, 274
- Quirk, Randolph 96–98, 127, 282
- Ransom, Evelyn N. 57, 282
Recanati, François 67, 282
Rezzano, Norma S. 40, 112–113, 282–283
Rieser, Hannes 277
Rock, Frances 288
Römer, Ute 31, 34, 38, 283
Rothstein, Björn 266, 285
Rowley-Jolivet, Elizabeth 14, 31, 33, 268, 283
Rozwadowska, Bożena 288
Ruiz-Garrido, Miguel F. 282
Rundblad, Gabriella 14, 33, 283
Russell, Gillian 282
Rytel, Danuta 99–102, 108–109, 127, 283
- Saeed, John I. 59, 283
Sala, Michele 14, 283
Salager-Meyer, Françoise 18, 37, 51, 116–117, 283
Salkie, Raphael 70–71, 91–92, 120, 283
Saloni, Zygmunt 104, 106, 283
Samraj, B. 14, 18, 28, 283
Saxena, Mukul 270
Schröder, Hartmut 37, 278, 281
Scott, Michael 127, 283
Seymour, Ruth 285
Sharifian, Farzad 41, 283
Shaw, Philip 18, 51, 283
Shopen, Timothy 268
Siepmann, Dirk 46, 283
Silva-Corvalán, Carmen 67, 283
Silver, Marc 34, 39, 284
Simpson, J. M. Y. 273
Simpson, Paul 59, 74, 97–98, 127, 284
Simpson-Vlach, Rita C. 23, 284
Skelton, John 37, 116, 284
Sławkowa, Ewa 48, 281
Slessor, Richard 287

- Smart, Graham 26, 282
 Smirnova, Elena 87, 270
 Smith, Larry E. 18, 41, 268, 276, 284
 Soler, Viviana 38, 284
 Sperber, Dan 67, 69, 284
 Steffensen, Margaret S. 269
 Stotesbury, Hillka 30, 34, 284
 Strevens, Peter 19, 41, 284
 Suárez-Tejerina, Lorena 30, 34, 280, 284
 Suomela-Salmi, Eija 270, 273, 276, 280
 Svartvik, Jan 282
 Swain, Merrill 27, 268, 284
 Swales, John M. 11–18, 23, 27–33, 42–43, 49, 111, 264, 276, 279, 285–286
 Sweetser, Eve E. 68, 70, 74–78, 93, 285
- Talmy, Leonard 75–76, 285
 Tang, Ramona 38, 285
 Tarone, Elaine 33, 285
 Tasmowski, Liliane 83, 270
 Taylor, Charles 12, 285
 Tessuto, Girolamo 14, 29, 285
 Thieroff, Rolf 55, 266, 285
 Thompson, Geoff 34, 51, 263, 269, 274, 278, 285
 Thompson, Paul 23, 31–32, 40, 111–112, 286
 Thompson, Susan E. 36, 286
 Timberlake, Alan 56–57, 268
 Tognini-Bonelli, Elena 265–266, 272, 274, 281, 283–284, 286
 Traugott, Elizabeth C. 70, 75, 286
 Tse, Polly 25, 31, 275, 286
 Tutak, Kinga 108–109, 127, 286
- Ulicka, Danuta 266
 Unger, J.W. 287
 Uysal, Hacer Hande 22, 286
- Van Bonn, Sarah 30, 286
- Van de Velde, Freek 37, 272
 Vande Kopple, William J. 35, 38, 286
 Vassileva, Irena 37–39, 51, 286
 Vázquez Orta, Ignacio 39, 51, 118–119, 287
 Ventola, Eija 40, 267–268, 285, 287
 Venturi, Giulia 286
 Venuti, Marco 30, 34, 268
 Verstraete, Jean-Christophe 61, 63, 287
 Vladimirov, Dimitra 39, 274, 287
 Vold, Eva T. 8, 14, 23–24, 37, 40, 51, 117–118, 121, 130, 287
- Walton, Douglas 12, 19, 287
 Warchał, Krystyna 16, 18, 27, 33, 38, 40, 50, 113–114, 119, 126, 263, 265, 271, 276, 278, 280, 287–288
 Wårnsby, Anna 67, 288
 Weiss, Daniel 100, 105, 288
 Westney, Paul 62, 66, 94, 97, 127, 288
 White, Peter R.R. 13, 34, 39, 124, 279, 288–289
 Wiemer, Björn 100, 108–110, 131, 289
 Willett, Thomas 84–86, 289
 Williams, Ian A. 14, 289
 Williams, Joseph M. 23, 35, 289
 Wilson, Andrew 125, 279
 Wilson, Deirdre 67, 69, 284
 Wojtak, Maria 37, 47, 289
 Wojtaszek, Adam 278
 Wood, Alistair 13, 289
 Wurff, Wim van der 266
- Yakhontova, Tatyana 8, 14, 289
 Yang, Ruiying 14, 28, 289
 Yiyun, Ye 34, 285
- Zambrano, Nahirana 283
 Żabowska, Magdalena 107, 127, 289
 Żydek-Bednarczuk, Urszula 47, 289

Index of modality markers

English

- alleged 73
- allegedly 97, 128, 131, 220–224
- apparent 131
- apparently 98, 115, 131
- appear 99, 115–118, 130–131, 177, 179, 183–186, 208–211, 215–217, 251
- arguably 128, 171–175
- assume 25, 99, 117–118, 130, 179–186, 211
- be able to 91, 168, 216
- be bound to 93, 96–97, 127, 134–139
- be going to 62, 93, 97, 127, 134, 136, 139
- be supposed to 62, 85, 88, 93, 97, 128, 166–170
- believe 99, 117, 130, 179–186
- by no means 128, 140–144
- can 68–70, 73–76, 80–81, 91, 112–115, 119, 141–143, 147, 173–174, 180–183, 221–224, 230–231
- can't 59, 92–93, 96, 98, 127, 134, 136–138, 163, 173
- certain 88–89, 98, 129, 146–148
- certainly 38, 85, 89, 97–99, 128, 140–144, 163, 170, 183, 185, 215–218
- conceivable 129, 225–229
- conceivably 97, 128, 215–217, 220–224, 228
- conclude 99
- convinced 98, 129, 146–148
- could 25, 79, 90–93, 112–114, 117–118, 128, 141–142, 165, 168, 172–174, 180–183, 213–224
- couldn't 127, 134–136, 139–140, 165
- definitely 97, 128, 140–141, 144
- doubt 129–130, 225–232
- doubtful 98, 129, 225–227, 229
- doubtless 128, 140–144
- evidently 97
- expect 130, 179, 181, 184, 186
- feeling 129, 176–178
- for certain 128, 140
- for sure 128, 142–144
- guess 114, 130, 228–232
- had better 61, 65
- have (got) to 75, 81, 93, 96–97, 114, 127, 134–139, 173–174, 180, 182, 216
- imagine 89, 130, 179, 181, 184–186
- imply 99, 117, 217
- impossible 129, 176–178, 217
- impression 129, 176–178, 217
- in all likelihood 98, 128, 171–175
- in fact 131
- inconceivable 129

- incontestably 128, 140
 incontrovertibly 128, 142, 144
 indeed 98, 131, 215–216
 indisputably 128, 140
 indubitably 128, 142, 144
 infer 99, 131
 likelihood 129, 176–178
 likely 60, 65, 89, 98, 117, 128–129, 168, 171–178
 little doubt 98, 129, 147–148
 may 25, 54, 56, 58, 64–65, 68–93, 99, 112–119, 128, 141–144, 173, 180–183, 213–224, 230–231, 249–251
 maybe 54, 88, 97, 128, 219–224
 might 61, 90–93, 112, 114, 118, 128, 141, 180–184, 211–224, 230–232, 249–252
 must 40, 59–61, 64, 68–75, 79–84, 87–97, 112–114, 127, 134–143, 172–175, 180, 221, 227–228
 need 75, 92–93, 96–97, 127, 134, 137, 139
 need to 79, 93, 96–97, 127, 134, 137, 139, 216
 no doubt 98, 128–129, 140–148
 not likely 129, 225–229
 not possible 129
 obviously 38, 97–98, 131
 of course 38, 97–98, 131, 137, 165, 215–216
 on no account 128, 140
 ought to 62, 75, 90–97, 128, 141, 166–170
 perhaps 54, 97–98, 115, 118, 128, 137, 215–216, 219–224, 249–250
 plausible 129, 176–178, 180, 211
 possibility 65, 93, 129, 224–229
 possible 54–55, 88–91, 115, 117, 129, 141, 168, 216, 224–229, 252
 possibly 89, 97–99, 128, 136, 139–140, 215–224, 251
 presumably 128, 165, 168, 171–175, 211
 presume 130, 179–181, 185–186
 probable 61, 129, 176–178
 probably 60, 85, 89, 97, 117, 128, 168–175, 180, 211
 purportedly 128, 220–224
 reportedly 131
 seem 25, 85, 114, 117–118, 130–131, 146–148, 169, 177–186, 208–209, 215–218, 227, 251–252
 should 40, 60, 62, 65–70, 79–80, 90–97, 112–114, 117, 128, 141–143, 166–175, 181–183, 211, 221
 speculate 130, 228–232
 suppose 85, 117, 130, 179–183, 186, 221
 supposedly 128, 171–175
 sure 89, 98, 129, 146–148
 surely 128, 137–144, 147, 164
 suspect 117, 130, 228–232, 252
 think 60, 85, 89–91, 99, 114, 130, 179, 182–186, 208–211
 unarguably 128, 140
 uncertain 98, 129
 undeniable 129, 146–148
 undeniably 97, 128, 142–144
 undoubtedly 128, 140–144
 unlikely 88, 129, 225–229
 unquestionably 128, 140–144
 will 62, 69, 73, 84, 89–98, 106–107, 112–119, 127, 131, 134–144, 149, 160, 163, 165, 172–174, 209, 221–222
 without doubt 98, 142–144
 would 90–95, 112–117, 128, 141–144, 166–174, 181–183, 209–211, 221–222, 230–231
- Polish**
- bez wątpliwości ‘without doubt’ 128
 bez wątpienia ‘without doubt’ 107–108, 128, 154–158, 164

- być może 'perhaps' 108, 128, 189, 238–240, 245
 chyba 'probably' 107–108, 128, 152, 192–197, 208–211
 domniemywać 'speculate' 130, 243–246
 domyslać się 'guess' 110, 130, 243–246
 future tense 106–107, 151–154, 163
 jakoby 'purportedly' 100, 108, 128, 131, 188–190, 237–240
 mało prawdopodobne 'unlikely' 129, 241–244
 mieć 'is to' 'purportedly' 105, 128, 189–191, 105, 191
 mniemać 'guess' 130, 243–246
 może 'perhaps' 100, 107–108, 128, 236–240, 250, 252
 możliwe 'possible' 109, 129, 209, 241–243
 możliwość 'possibility' 109, 129, 242–243, 252
 móc 'may' 100–102, 107, 128, 131, 156, 194, 201, 203, 209–211, 233–236, 242, 245, 250–252, 305, 309
 musieć 'must' 100–103, 107, 127, 131, 150–156, 194–195
 myśleć 'think' 110, 130, 199–204
 na pewno 'for sure' 100, 104, 108, 128, 155–158
 najpewniej 'in all likelihood' 128, 192–197
 najprawdopodobniej 'in all probability' 108, 128, 154, 192–194, 197
 najwidoczniej 'apparently' 131
 naturalnie 'naturally' 131
 nie (jest) możliwe 'not possible' 129, 209
 nie do pomyslenia 'inconceivable' 129
 nie móc 'can't' 163, 127, 150–154
 niechybnie 'undoubtedly' 108, 128
 niemożliwe 'impossible' 129
 niewątpliwie 'undoubtedly' 100, 107–108, 128, 154–158, 164
 niewyklucone 'not impossible' 109, 129, 241–243
 niezawodnie 'undoubtedly' 108, 128
 oczywiście 'obviously' 100, 107, 131
 pewne 'certain' 109, 129, 158–159
 pewnie 'in all likelihood' 100, 105, 108, 128, 192, 194, 197
 pewno 'in all likelihood' 108, 128
 pewność 'certainty' 109–110, 129
 pewny 'sure' 129
 podejrzenia 'doubts' 129, 242–243
 podejrzewać 'suspect' 130, 243–246
 podobno 'reportedly' 100, 108, 131
 ponad wszelką wątpliwość 'without doubt' 108, 128
 powinien 'should' 100, 110, 103–104, 107, 128, 131, 187–191, 194
 prawdopodobieństwo 'probability' 109–110, 128–129, 192–199
 prawdopodobne 'likely' 109, 129, 187, 197–199, 211
 prawdopodobnie 'probably' 100, 108, 128, 192–197
 przecucie 'feeling' 109–110, 129
 przekonanie 'conviction' 108, 129, 191
 przekonany 'convinced' 109, 129, 158–159
 przeświadczenie 'conviction' 129
 przeświadczony 'certain' 109, 129
 przypuszczać 'suppose' 108, 110, 130, 199–205
 przypuszczalnie 'probably' 107–108, 128, 192, 195–197
 rzeczywiście 'indeed' 100
 rzekomo 'allegedly' 100, 108–109, 128, 237–240
 sądzić 'think' 110, 130, 199–205, 208–211
 spodziewać się 'expect' 110, 130, 199–204
 tak naprawdę 'in fact' 131
 uważać 'believe' 110, 130, 199–204

- w żadnym razie 'on no account' 128, 155–158
- w żadnym wypadku 'on no account' 128
- wątpić 'doubt' 110, 130, 243–246
- wątpliwe 'doubtful' 129, 242–243
- wątpliwie 'doubtfully' 108, 128
- wątpliwość 'doubt' 109, 129, 158–159, 165, 234, 241–243
- widocznie 'apparently' 100, 108–109, 131
- wrażenie 'impression' 109–110, 129, 197–199
- wydaje się 'it seems' 109–110, 130–131, 197–204, 208–209, 234–235, 242
- wykluczone 'inconceivable' 129
- z dużym prawdopodobieństwem 'with a great deal of probability' 128, 192–197
- z pewnością 'with certainty' 100, 107–108, 128, 154–158, 163
- zapewne 'presumably' 100, 108, 128, 189–197, 211
- zdaje się 'it seems' 109–110, 130–131, 199–204

Krystyna Warchał

**Pewność i wątpliwość w dyskursie akademickim:
Wykładowi modalności epistemicznej w angielsko- i polskojęzycznych
artykułach naukowych z dziedziny językoznawstwa**

Streszczenie

Przedmiotem pracy są językowe wykładowi stopnia pewności sądów w artykułach naukowych z dziedziny językoznawstwa w języku angielskim i polskim. Punktem wyjścia podjętych badań jest przekonanie, że różne tradycje intelektualne, w jakich kształtowała się polska i angielska komunikacja akademicka – tradycje odmiennie postrzegające status wiedzy naukowej i proces jej tworzenia, relację między autorem i czytelnikiem, czy wreszcie sam akt pisania i stopień dialogowości tekstu naukowego – mogą znajdować odzwierciedlenie w różnych przeświadczeniach dotyczących tego, czym jest fakt naukowy, a co pozostaje w sferze hipotez, założeń i propozycji oczekujących na potwierdzenie i akceptację środowiska akademickiego. Różnice te z kolei sugerowałyby, iż autorzy wywodzący się z tych dwóch kręgów kulturowych mogą przywiązywać różną wagę do wyraźnego oznaczania treści hipotetycznych oraz sądów, którym towarzyszy wysoki stopień pewności, oznaczać je w różny sposób, z różną częstotliwością i w różnych miejscach wywodu. Niniejsza praca podejmuje próbę ustalenia, czy różnice takie istnieją i, jeśli tak, których wykładowi modalności epistemicznej dotyczą i jak przebiegają.

Praca zbudowana jest z czterech rozdziałów, z których pierwszy dotyczy badań nad dyskursem akademickim i jego retoryką, drugi poświęcony jest modalności językowej, trzeci opisuje cel pracy, materiał badawczy oraz sposób jego analizowania, czwarty zaś przedstawia i omawia wyniki badania dla trzech wartości modalnych w obu językach. Pracę zamyka zwięzłe podsumowanie.

Angielskojęzyczną część materiału badawczego stanowi 200 artykułów opublikowanych w latach 2001–2006 w naukowych czasopismach językoznawczych o zasięgu międzynarodowym: *Journal of Pragmatics*, *Language and Communication*, *Language Sciences*, *Lingua* i *Linguistics and Philosophy*. Polskojęzyczną część analizy oparto na danych zaczerpniętych z 200 artykułów opublikowanych w tym samym przedziale czasowym w polskich czasopismach językoznawczych, których tytuły znalazły się na liście czasopism punktowanych, opublikowanej w roku 2003 przez Komitet Badań Naukowych: *Acta Baltico-Slavica*, *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego*, *Etnolingwistyka*, *Język a Kultura*, *Onomastica*, *Poradnik Językowy*, *Slavia Meridionalis* oraz *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej*. Obie części składają się na korpus o wielkości ok. trzech milionów słów. Analizę przeprowadzono na materiale zdigitalizowanym i oznaczonym (otagowanym) pod względem segmentów tekstu przy pomocy programu *Oxford WordSmith Tools 5* jako narzędzia wspomagającego. W badaniu

wzięto pod uwagę następujące kategorie wykładników: epistemiczne użycia czasowników modalnych (wraz z epistemicznymi użyciami czasu przyszłego w języku polskim), przysłówki epistemiczne, przymiotniki i rzeczowniki, które niosą znaczenia epistemiczne i wprowadzają zdania podrzędne, oraz epistemiczne czasowniki leksykalne.

Najistotniejsze wyniki badania można streścić w następujących punktach:

- Artykuły anglojęzyczne zawierają prawie dwukrotnie więcej wykładników modalności epistemicznej niż artykuły polskojęzyczne; w tekstach angielskich ponad dwukrotnie częściej spotyka się orientację subiektywną niż obiektywną, w tekstach polskich zaś przeważa orientacja obiektywna.
- W tekstach anglojęzycznych najczęściej spotyka się niskie wartości modalne, drugą pod względem częstości występowania grupę stanowią wartości wysokie, wartości średnie występują zaś najrzadziej. W tekstach polskich autorów najczęściej wyrażane są średnie wartości modalne, najrzadziej natomiast spotyka się wartości wysokie.
- Pod względem kategorii wykładników modalności epistemicznej, w anglojęzycznej części korpusu przeważają czasowniki modalne, w polskiej zaś przysłówki epistemiczne.
- W obu grupach tekstów wykładniki sądów epistemicznych występują częściej w zakończeniu niż w innych segmentach; obserwacja ta dotyczy wszystkich wartości modalnych w języku angielskim oraz niskich i średnich wartości modalnych w języku polskim; wysoki stopień pewności odnotowywany jest w języku polskim z równą (niską) częstotliwością we wstępie i w zakończeniu.

Praca może stanowić głos w dyskusji nad różnicami w stylach argumentacji akademickiej charakterystycznych dla poszczególnych kultur i dyscyplin, wnieść dane do badań porównawczych nad znaczeniami epistemicznymi i ich funkcją w różnych typach dyskursu oraz być punktem odniesienia dla dalszych analiz uwzględniających inne języki, gatunki i dyscypliny.

Krystyna Warchał

Gewissheit und Zweifel im akademischen Diskurs. Anzeichen epistemischer Modalität in englisch- u. polnischsprachigen Zeitungsartikeln auf dem Gebiet der Sprachwissenschaft

Zusammenfassung

Zum Gegenstand der Abhandlung werden Anzeichen der Gewissheit in den wissenschaftlichen Artikeln auf dem Gebiet der Sprachwissenschaft im Englischen und Polnischen. Der Ausgangspunkt für vorliegende Studie ist die Überzeugung davon, dass unterschiedliche intellektuelle Traditionen, in denen sich polnische und englische akademische Kommunikation bildeten – Traditionen, die den Status des Wissens und dessen Bildung, die Relation zwischen dem Verfasser und dem Leser und schließlich den Schreibakt selbst und den Dialogcharakter des wissenschaftlichen Textes ganz anders betrachten — können ihre Widerspiegelung finden in unterschiedlicher Beurteilung dessen, was in der Wissenschaft ein Fakt und was lediglich eine Hypothese ist, die von akademischen Kreisen noch bestätigt und akzeptiert werden muss. Diese Unterschiede ließen vermuten, dass die von zwei Kulturkreisen abstammenden Verfasser werden eine andere Meinung davon haben, auf welche Weise, wie oft und an welchen Stellen der Argumentation ganz hypothetische Inhalte und Behauptungen mit hohem Sicherheitsgrad hervorgehoben werden sollten. In vorliegender Abhandlung hat man sich Mühe gegeben, nachzuweisen, ob es diese Unterschiede gibt und wenn ja – welche Anzeichen der epistemischen Modalität sie betreffen und worauf sie beruhen.

Die Arbeit besteht aus vier Kapiteln; das erste von ihnen betrifft die Forschungen über den akademischen Diskurs und dessen Rhetorik, das zweite ist der Sprachmodalität gewidmet, das dritte erläutert das Ziel der Abhandlung, das Forschungsmaterial und dessen Beurteilung und das vierte Kapitel präsentiert und analysiert die Forschungsergebnisse für drei Modalwerten in beiden Sprachen. Am Ende der Arbeit befindet sich ein knappes Resümee.

Den englischsprachigen Teil des Forschungsmaterials bilden 200 Artikel, die in den Jahren 2001–2006 in sprachwissenschaftlichen Zeitschriften von weltweiter Bedeutung: *Journal of Pragmatics*, *Language and Communication*, *Language Sciences*, *Lingua* und *Linguistic and Philosophy* veröffentlicht wurden. Polnischsprachiger Teil der Analyse basierte auf den in demselben Zeitraum veröffentlichten 200 polnischen sprachwissenschaftlichen Artikeln, deren Titel auf die im Jahre 2003 von dem Komitee für Wissenschaftliche Forschungen veröffentlichten Liste der anerkannten Zeitschriften kamen: *Acta Baltico-Slavica*, *Poradnik Językowy*, *Slavia Meridionalis* und *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej*. Beide Teile bilden das Korpus von ca. drei Millionen Wörtern. Analysiert wurden Texte, die digitalisiert und mit Tags hinsichtlich der Textsegmente mittels des Programms *Oxford WordSmith Tools 5* ausgezeichnet wur-

den. In der Forschung berücksichtigte man folgende Kategorien der Anzeichen: den epistemischen Gebrauch von Modalverben (samt epistemischem Gebrauch des Futurs im Polnischen), epistemische Adverbien, die die Nebensätze einleitenden Adjektive und Substantive mit epistemischer Bedeutung und epistemische lexikale Verben.

Die wichtigsten Forschungsergebnisse lassen sich in folgenden Punkten zusammenfassen:

- Englischsprachige Artikel beinhalten fast doppelt so viel Anzeichen der epistemischen Modalität als polnische Artikel; in englischen Texten ist die subjektive Orientierung fast doppelt so häufig als die objektive, in polnischen Texten dagegen überwiegt die objektive Orientierung
- In englischen Texten treten am häufigsten niedrige Modalwerte auf, zweithäufigste Gruppe bilden hohe Werte und Mittelwerte kommen am seltensten vor
- Hinsichtlich der Kategorie der epistemischen Modalität überwiegen im englischen Teil des Korpus Modalverben und im polnischen dagegen epistemische Adverbien
- In beiden Textgruppen kommen die Anzeichen der epistemischen Urteile häufiger im Schlussteil als in anderen Segmenten vor. Diese Bemerkung betrifft alle Modalwerte im Englischen und niedrige und mittlere Modalwerte im Polnischen; ein hoher Sicherheitsgrad wird im Polnischen genauso selten in der Einleitung und im Abschluss festgestellt.

Die Arbeit kann zur Diskussion über unterschiedliche Stile der für die einzelnen Kulturen und Disziplinen charakteristischen akademischen Argumentation beitragen und zum Bezugspunkt für weitere Analysen in Bezug auf andere Sprachen, Gattungen und Disziplinen werden.

List of tables

Table 2.1 Semantics of selected modal verbs according to Groefsema (1995: 62)	68
Table 2.2 Semantics of selected modal verbs according to Berbeira Gardón (1998: 15–16)	69
Table 2.3 Semantics of selected modal verbs according to Papafragou (1998: 14)	70
Table 3.1 Epistemic markers used as search words	127
Table 4.1 High-value epistemic markers in ELA: An overview of categories	134
Table 4.2 High-value epistemic markers in ELA: Modal and quasi-modal verbs	136
Table 4.3 Distribution of high-value epistemic modality markers in ELA: Modal and quasi-modal verbs	139
Table 4.4 High-value epistemic markers in ELA: Modal modifiers.	141
Table 4.5 Distribution of high-value epistemic modality markers in ELA: Modal modifiers	144
Table 4.6 High-value epistemic markers in ELA: Adjectives and nouns	147
Table 4.7 Distribution of high-value epistemic modality markers in ELA: Adjectives and nouns.	148
Table 4.8 High-value epistemic markers in PLA: An overview of categories	150
Table 4.9 High-value epistemic markers in PLA: Modal verbs and forms of the future	151
Table 4.10 Distribution of high-value epistemic modality markers in PLA: Modal verbs and forms of the future.	154
Table 4.11 High-value epistemic markers in PLA: Modal modifiers	156
Table 4.12 Distribution of high-value epistemic modality markers in PLA: Modal modifiers	158
Table 4.13 High-value epistemic markers in PLA: Adjectives and nouns.	158
Table 4.14 Distribution of high-value epistemic modality markers in PLA: Adjectives and nouns.	159

Table 4.15 Distribution of high-value epistemic modality markers by categories in ELA and PLA	162
Table 4.16 Distribution of negative certainty in ELA and PLA	164
Table 4.17 Middle-value epistemic markers in ELA: An overview of categories	166
Table 4.18 Middle-value epistemic markers in ELA: Modal and quasi-modal verbs	168
Table 4.19 Distribution of middle-value epistemic modality markers in ELA: Modal and quasi-modal verbs.	170
Table 4.20 Middle-value epistemic markers in ELA: Modal modifiers	173
Table 4.21 Distribution of middle-value epistemic modality markers in ELA: Modal modifiers	175
Table 4.22 Middle-value epistemic markers in ELA: Adjectives and nouns	177
Table 4.23 Distribution of middle-value epistemic modality markers in ELA: Adjectives and nouns.	178
Table 4.24 Middle-value epistemic markers in ELA: Lexical verbs	180
Table 4.25 Distribution of middle-value epistemic modality markers in ELA: Lexical verbs.	186
Table 4.26 Middle-value epistemic markers in PLA: An overview of categories	187
Table 4.27 Middle-value epistemic markers in PLA: Modal verbs	189
Table 4.28 Distribution of middle-value epistemic modality markers in PLA: Modal verbs	191
Table 4.29 Middle-value epistemic markers in PLA: Modal modifiers	194
Table 4.30 Distribution of middle-value epistemic modality markers in PLA: Modal modifiers	197
Table 4.31 Middle-value epistemic markers in PLA: Adjectives and nouns	198
Table 4.32 Distribution of middle-value epistemic modality markers in PLA: Adjectives and nouns.	199
Table 4.33 Middle-value epistemic markers in PLA: Lexical verbs	200
Table 4.34 Distribution of middle-value epistemic modality markers in PLA: Lexical verbs.	204
Table 4.35 Distribution of middle-value epistemic modality markers by categories in ELA and PLA	209
Table 4.36 Distribution of negative probability in ELA and PLA	210
Table 4.37 Low-value epistemic markers in ELA: An overview of categories	213
Table 4.38 Low-value epistemic markers in ELA: Modal verbs	215
Table 4.39 Distribution of low-value epistemic modality markers in ELA: Modal verbs	219
Table 4.40 Low-value epistemic markers in ELA: Modal modifiers	221
Table 4.41 Distribution of low-value epistemic modality markers in ELA: Modal modifiers	224

Table 4.42 Low-value epistemic markers in ELA: Adjectives and nouns . . .	227
Table 4.43 Distribution of low-value epistemic modality markers in ELA: Adjectives and nouns.	229
Table 4.44 Low-value epistemic markers in ELA: Lexical verbs	230
Table 4.45 Distribution of low-value epistemic modality markers in ELA: Lexical verbs	232
Table 4.46 Low-value epistemic markers in PLA: An overview of categories .	233
Table 4.47 Low-value epistemic markers in PLA: Modal verb <i>móc</i>	234
Table 4.48 Low-value epistemic markers in PLA: Modal modifiers	238
Table 4.49 Low-value epistemic markers in PLA: Adjectives and nouns . . .	242
Table 4.50 Distribution of low-value epistemic modality markers in PLA: Adjectives and nouns.	243
Table 4.51 Low-value epistemic markers in PLA: Lexical verbs	244
Table 4.52 Distribution of low-value epistemic modality markers in PLA: Lexical verbs	246
Table 4.53 Distribution of low-value epistemic modality markers by categories in ELA and PLA	250
Table 4.54 Distribution of negative possibility in ELA and PLA.	251
Table 5.1 Frequency of epistemic markers in Introduction, Main Body and Conclusion: ELA and PLA	259

List of figures

Fig. 2.1 Modal subdomains based on Lyons (1977) and Palmer (1979, 1986, 2001)	74
Fig. 2.2 Modal subdomains based on Sweetser (1990), Kiefer (1997), and Papafragou (2000)	78
Fig. 2.3 Modal subdomains according to Bybee et al. (1994).	80
Fig. 2.4 Modal subdomains according to van der Auwera and Plungian (1998)	82
Fig. 2.5 Evidentiality within the epistemic modal system – an inclusion/ overlap view	84
Fig. 2.6 Scale of probability: modal values, orientations and realisations (based on Halliday, 1994).	89
Fig. 2.7 Scale of obligation: modal values, orientations and realisations (based on Halliday, 1994).	90
Fig. 2.8 The epistemic modality system in English: modal auxiliaries and quasi-modals	93
Fig. 2.9 Epistemic true modal verbs in Polish	100
Fig. 4.1 Modal and quasi-modal verbs as high-value epistemic markers in ELA.	134
Fig. 4.2 Selected syntactic features of high-value epistemic modal verbs in ELA.	135
Fig. 4.3 High-value epistemic modal and quasi-modal verbs in article sections (ELA)	139
Fig. 4.4 Modal modifiers as high-value epistemic markers in ELA	140
Fig. 4.5 Selected syntactic features of high-value modal modifiers in ELA	141
Fig. 4.6 High-value modal modifiers in article sections (ELA)	145
Fig. 4.7 High-value modal modifiers at I in article sections (ELA).	145
Fig. 4.8 Adjectives as high-value epistemic markers in ELA	146
Fig. 4.9 Nouns as high-value epistemic markers in ELA	146

Fig. 4.10 Objective and subjective orientation in article sections: High-value modal adjectives and nouns (ELA)	149
Fig. 4.11 Modal verbs and forms of the future as high-value epistemic markers in PLA	150
Fig. 4.12 Selected syntactic features of high-value epistemic modal verbs and future forms in PLA	151
Fig. 4.13 High-value epistemic modal verbs and forms of the future in article sections (PLA)	153
Fig. 4.14 Modal modifiers as high-value epistemic markers in PLA	155
Fig. 4.15 Selected syntactic features of high-value modal modifiers in PLA.	155
Fig. 4.16 High-value modal modifiers in article sections (PLA).	158
Fig. 4.17 Categories of high-value epistemic markers in ELA and PLA	161
Fig. 4.18 High-value modal verbs, modal modifiers, and modal adjectives and nouns in ELA and PLA	161
Fig. 4.19 Distribution of high-value modality markers in article sections in ELA and PLA	162
Fig. 4.20 Modal and quasi-modal verbs as middle-value epistemic markers in ELA.	167
Fig. 4.21 Selected syntactic features of middle-value epistemic modal verbs in ELA.	169
Fig. 4.22 Middle-value epistemic modal and quasi-modal verbs in article sections (ELA)	171
Fig. 4.23 Modal modifiers as middle-value epistemic markers in ELA	172
Fig. 4.24 Selected syntactic features of middle-value modal modifiers in ELA	172
Fig. 4.25 Middle-value modal modifiers in article sections (ELA)	176
Fig. 4.26 Adjectives and nouns as middle-value epistemic markers in ELA	176
Fig. 4.27 Lexical verbs as middle-value epistemic markers in ELA	179
Fig. 4.28 Subjective and objective orientation in article sections: Middle-value lexical verbs (ELA)	186
Fig. 4.29 Modal verbs as middle-value epistemic markers in PLA	187
Fig. 4.30 Selected syntactic features of middle-value epistemic modal verbs in PLA.	188
Fig. 4.31 Middle-value epistemic modal verbs in article sections (PLA)	190
Fig. 4.32 Modal modifiers as middle-value epistemic markers in PLA	192
Fig. 4.33 Selected syntactic features of middle-value modal modifiers in PLA.	192
Fig. 4.34 Middle-value modal modifiers in article sections (PLA)	196
Fig. 4.35 Lexical verbs as middle-value epistemic markers in PLA	199
Fig. 4.36 Subjective and objective orientation in article sections: Middle-value lexical verbs (PLA)	205
Fig. 4.37 Categories of middle-value epistemic markers in ELA and PLA	206
Fig. 4.38 Middle value modal verbs, modifiers, adjectives and nouns, and lexical verbs in ELA and PLA	207

Fig. 4.39 Middle-value modal meanings in ELA and PLA: explicit and implicit; subjective and objective	207
Fig. 4.40 Distribution of middle-value modality markers in article sections in ELA and PLA	208
Fig. 4.41 Modal verbs as low-value epistemic markers in ELA	214
Fig. 4.42 Selected syntactic features of low-value epistemic modal verbs in ELA.	215
Fig. 4.43 Low-value epistemic modal verbs in article sections (ELA)	219
Fig. 4.44 Modal modifiers as low-value epistemic markers in ELA.	220
Fig. 4.45 Selected syntactic features of low-value modal modifiers in ELA	220
Fig. 4.46 Low-value modal modifiers in article sections (ELA)	225
Fig. 4.47 Low-value modal modifiers at I and iM in article sections (ELA)	225
Fig. 4.48 Adjectives and nouns as low-value epistemic markers in ELA	226
Fig. 4.49 Lexical verbs as low-value epistemic markers in ELA	228
Fig. 4.50 Subjective and objective orientation in article sections: Low-value lexical verbs (ELA)	233
Fig. 4.51 Low-value epistemic modal verb <i>móc</i> in article sections (PLA).	236
Fig. 4.52 Modal modifiers as low-value epistemic markers in PLA.	237
Fig. 4.53 Selected syntactic features of low-value modal modifiers in PLA	237
Fig. 4.54 Low-value modal modifiers in article sections (PLA)	241
Fig. 4.55 Low-value modal modifiers at I in article sections (PLA).	241
Fig. 4.56 Lexical verbs as low-value epistemic markers in PLA	243
Fig. 4.57 Categories of low-value epistemic markers in ELA and PLA	247
Fig. 4.58 Low-value modal verbs, modifiers, adjectives and nouns, and lexical verbs in ELA and PLA	248
Fig. 4.59 Low-value modal meanings in ELA and PLA: explicit and implicit; subjective and objective	248
Fig. 4.60 Distribution of low-value modality markers in article sections in ELA and PLA	249
Fig. 5.1 Epistemic markers in ELA and PLA	256
Fig. 5.2 Epistemic modal values in ELA and PLA	256
Fig. 5.3 Proportion of high, middle and low epistemic values in ELA and PLA	256
Fig. 5.4 Categories of epistemic markers in ELA and PLA.	257
Fig. 5.5 Distribution of epistemic modality markers in ELA and PLA: Introduction, Main Body and Conclusion.	258
Fig. 5.6 Realisation and orientation of epistemic values in ELA and PLA: explicit and implicit; objective and subjective	260
Fig. 5.7 Subjective and objective orientation for particular epistemic values in ELA and PLA	260

Copy editor
Michał Pelczar

Cover design
Agata Augustynik

Technical editor
Małgorzata Pleśniar

Proofreader
Danuta Stencel

Typesetting
Hanna Olsza

Copyright © 2015 by
Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego
Wszelkie prawa zastrzeżone

ISSN 0208-6336
ISBN 978-83-8012-455-4
(print edition)
ISBN 978-83-8012-456-1
(digital edition)

Publisher
Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego
ul. Bankowa 12B, 40-007 Katowice
www.wydawnictwo.us.edu.pl
e-mail: wydawus@us.edu.pl

First impression. Printed sheets 19,5. Publishing sheets 21,5.

Offset paper grade III 90 g

Price 40 zł (+ VAT)

Printing and binding: EXPOL, P. Rybiński, J. Dąbek, Spółka Jawna
ul. Brzeska 4, 87-800 Włocławek

Certainty and Doubt in Academic Discourse:
Epistemic Modality Markers in English and Polish Linguistics Articles

Krzyszyna Warchał



Więcej o książce



CENA 40 ZŁ
(+ VAT)

ISSN 0208-6336
ISBN 978-83-8012-456-1

[Kup książkę](#)