

Online ISSN 2335-2388



mokslo darbai transactions

RESPECTUS PHILOLOGICUS

2013 Nr. 24 (29)

RESPECTUS PHILOLOGICUS Nr. 24 (29)

MOKSLINIS TĖSTINIS LEIDINYS

Leidžia Vilniaus universiteto Kauno humanitarinis fakultetas ir Jano Kochanovskio universiteto Humanitarinis fakultetas Kielcuose du kartus per metus (balandžio 25 d. ir spalio 25 d.).

Mokslo kryptis: filologija (04H). Mokslo sritys: gramatika, semantika, semiotika, sintaksė (H 352), bendroji ir lyginamoji literatūra, literatūros kritika, literatūros teorija (H 390).

Pagrindinės kalbos: lietuvių, lenkų, anglų, rusų.

CZASOPISMO NAUKOWE

Wydawcy: Uniwersytet Wileński – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kownie oraz Uniwersytet Jana Kochanowskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kielcach. Ukazuje się dwa razy w roku: 25 kwietnia i 25 października.

Kierunek naukowy: filologia (04H). Dyscypliny naukowe: gramatyka, semiotyka, semantyka, syntaktyka (H 352), literatura ogólna i porównawcza, krytyka literacka, teoria literatury (H 390).

Podstawowe języki: polski, litewski, angielski i rosyjski.

ONGOING ACADEMIC PUBLICATION

Published twice a year (April 25, October 25) by Vilnius University Kaunas Faculty of Humanities and The Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce Faculty of Humanities.

Scientific field: philology (04H). Research areas: grammar, semantics, semiotics, syntax (H 352), general and comparative literature, literary criticism, literary theory (H 390).

The journal accepts articles and correspondence written in English, Lithuanian, Polish, and Russian.

DUOMENŲ BAZĖS / BAZY DANYCH / ABSTRACTING AND INDEXING

Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek (2002) Arianta (2002)	Frei zugängliche E-Journals Universitätsbibliothek Regensburg Naukowe i branżowe polskie czasopisma elektroniczne Biblioteka Uniwersytetu Śląskiego
Balcan Rusistics (2004)	Russian Language, Literature and Cultural Studies
C.E.E.O.L. (2005)	Central and Eastern European Online Library DFG Nationallizenzen
EBSCO (2006)	Humanities International Complete Humanities Source Current Abstracts Humanities International Index TOC Premier
MLA (2007)	Modern Language Association International Bibliography
Index Copernicus (2008)	Index Copernicus International Journal Master List
Lituanistika (2011)	The database of the humanities and social sciences in Lithuania
Linguistic Bibliography Online (2012)	Brill Leiden, Netherlands
Ulrichs (2013)	Ulrich's Periodicals

PATIKRA / WERYFIKACJA / VERIFICATION



Redakcijos adresas / Adres redakcji / Address of the editorial board

Žurnalas „Respectus Philologicus“
Vilniaus universitetas
Kauno humanitarinis fakultetas
Muitinės g. 8, LT-44280 Kaunas, Lietuva

Respectus Philologicus
Vilnius University
Kaunas Faculty of Humanities
Muitines 8, Kaunas 44280, Lithuania

Tel. +370 37 750 536

El. paštas / E-mail respectus@gmail.com

Interneto svetainė / Strona internetowa / Homepage <http://filologija.vukhf.lt>

Moksliniai ir kalbos redaktoriai / Redakcja naukowa i językowa / Proof-readers

Gabija Bankauskaitė-Sereikienė (lietuvių kalba / język litewski / Lithuanian language)
Kazimierz Luciński, Beata Piasecka (lenkų kalba / język polski / Polish language)
Algis Braun (anglų kalba / język angielski / English language)
Eleonora Lassan, Viktorija Makarova (rusų kalba / język rosyjski / Russian language)

Vertimas / Tłumaczenie / Translation

Beata Piasecka, Živilė Nemickienė

Pagrindinė redaktorė / Redaktor prowadzący / Publishing editor

Viktorija Makarova

Print ISSN 1392-8295, Online ISSN 2335-2388

© Vilniaus universiteto Kauno humanitarinis fakultetas, 2013

© Uniwersytet Jana Kochanowskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kielcach, 2013

REDAKTORIŲ KOLEGIJA — KOLEGIUM REDAKCYJNE

- Eleonora Lissan** VU KHF profesorė, habil. dr. (04H), Lietuva, *vyriausioji redaktorė*
 Profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kownie, dr hab. (04H), Litwa, *redaktor naczelny*
- Kazimierz Luciński** Jano Kochanovskio universiteto Kielcuose profesorius, habil. dr. (04H), Lenkija, *vyriausiosios redaktorės pavaduotojas*
 Profesor Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach, dr hab. (04H), Polska, *zastępcza redaktora naczelnego*
- Irina Oukhvanova-Shmygova** Baltarusijos valstybinio universiteto profesorė, dr. (04H), Baltarusija, *vyriausiosios redaktorės pavaduotoja*
 Profesor Białoruskiego Uniwersytetu Państwowego, dr (04H), Białoruś, *zastępcza redaktora naczelnego*
- Gabija Bankauskaitė-Sereikienė** VU KHF profesorė, dr. (04H), Lietuva, *atsakingoji sekretorė*
 Profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kownie, dr (04H), Litwa, *sekretarz kolegium*
- Daiva Aliūkaitė** VU KHF docentė, dr. (04H), Lietuva
 Docent Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kownie, dr (04H), Litwa
- Danutė Balšaitytė** VU Užsienio kalbų instituto profesorė, dr. (04H), Lietuva
 Profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego – Instytut Języków Obcych, dr (04H), Litwa
- Wiesław Caban** Jano Kochanovskio universiteto Kielcuose profesorius, habil. dr. (05H), Lenkija
 Profesor Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach, dr hab. (05H), Polska
- Renato Corsetti** Romos universiteto „La Sapienza“ profesorius, habil. dr. (04H), Italija
 Profesor Uniwersytetu Rzymskiego „La Sapienza“, dr hab. (04H), Włochy
- Anatolij Chudinov** Uralo valstybinio pedagoginio universiteto profesorius, dr. (04H), Rusija
 Profesor Uralskiego Państwowego Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego, dr (04H), Rosja
- Hans-Jürgen Diller** Bochumo Ruhro universiteto profesorius, habil. dr. (04H), Vokietija
 Profesor Uniwersytetu Ruhry w Bochum, dr hab. (04H), Niemcy
- Aloyzas Gudavičius** Šiaulių universiteto profesorius, habil. dr. (04H), Lietuva
 Profesor Uniwersytetu w Šiauliai, dr hab. (04H), Litwa

- Laima Kalėdienė** Lietuvių kalbos instituto vyriausioji mokslo darbuotoja, profesorė, dr. (04H), Lietuva
Starys pracownik naukowy, profesor w Instytucie Języka Litewskiego, dr (04H), Litwa
- Juris Kastinš** Latvijos universiteto profesorius, habil. dr. (04H), Latvija
Profesor Uniwersytetu Łotewskiego w Rydze, dr hab. (04H), Łotwa
- Asta Kazlauskienė** Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto profesorė, dr. (04H), Lietuva
Profesor Uniwersytetu Witolda Wielkiego, dr (04H), Litwa
- Jurij Kleiner** Sankt Peterburgo universiteto profesorius, habil. dr. (04H), Rusija
Profesor Uniwersytetu w Sankt Petersburgu, dr hab. (04H), Rosja
- Aleksandras Krasnovas** VU KHF profesorius, dr. (04H), Lietuva
Profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kownie, dr (04H), Litwa
- Jadvyga Krūminienė** VU KHF profesorė, dr. (04H), Lietuva
Profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kownie, dr (04H), Litwa
- Jurgita Mikelionienė** Kauno technologijos universiteto docentė, dr. (04H), Lietuva
Docent Uniwersytetu Technologicznego w Kownie, dr (04H), Litwa
- Gerald E. Mikkelson** Kanzaso universiteto profesorius, dr. (04H), JAV
Profesor Uniwersytetu w Kansas, dr (04H), USA
- Olegas Poliakovas** VU KHF profesorius, habil. dr. (04H), Lietuva
Profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kownie, dr hab. (04H), Litwa
- Marek Ruszkowski** Jano Kochanovskio universiteto Kielcuose profesorius, habil. dr. (04H), Lenkija
Profesor Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach, dr hab. (04H), Polska
- Yuri Stulov** Minsko valstybinio lingvistikos universiteto profesorius, dr. (04H), Europos „Amerikos studijų asociacijos“ Baltarusijos filialo prezidentas, Baltarusija
Profesor Państwowego Uniwersytetu Lingwistycznego w Mińsku, dr (04H), prezes białoruskiej filii Europejskiego Stowarzyszenia Studiów Amerykanistycznych, Białoruś
- Leona Tokor** Jeruzalės Žydų universiteto profesorė, habil. dr. (04H), Izraelis
Profesor Uniwersytetu Hebrajskiego w Jerozolimie, dr hab. (04H), Izrael

EDITORIAL BOARD

Eleonora Lissan	Professor (04H), Vilnius University (Kaunas Faculty of Humanities), Lithuania, <i>editor-in-chief</i>
Kazimierz Luciński	Professor (04H), The Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce, Poland, <i>deputy editor-in-chief</i>
Irina Oukhvanova-Shmygova	Professor (04H), Belarusian State University, Belarus, <i>deputy editor-in-chief</i>
Gabija Bankauskaitė-Sereikienė	Professor (04H), Vilnius University (Kaunas Faculty of Humanities), Lithuania, <i>managing secretary</i>
Daiva Aliūkaitė	Associate Professor (04H), Vilnius University (Kaunas Faculty of Humanities), Lithuania
Danutė Balšaitytė	Professor (04H), Vilnius University (Institute of Foreign Languages), Lithuania
Wiesław Caban	Professor (05H), The Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce, Poland
Renato Corsetti	Professor (04H), Sapienza University of Rome, Italy
Anatolij Chudinov	Professor (04H), Ural State Pedagogical University, Russia
Hans-Jürgen Diller	Professor (04H), Ruhr University Bochum, Germany
Aloyzas Gudavičius	Professor (04H), Šiauliai University, Lithuania
Laima Kalėdienė	Professor (04H), Senior Researcher, Institute of the Lithuanian Language, Lithuania
Juris Kastinš	Professor (04H), University of Latvia, Latvia
Asta Kazlauskienė	Professor (04H), Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania
Jurij Kleiner	Professor (04H), St. Petersburg State University, Russia
Aleksandras Krasnovas	Professor (04H), Vilnius University (Kaunas Faculty of Humanities), Lithuania
Jadvyga Krūminienė	Professor (04H), Vilnius University (Kaunas Faculty of Humanities), Lithuania
Jurgita Mikelionienė	Associate Professor (04H), Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania
Gerald E. Mikkelsen	Professor (04H), The University of Kansas, USA

Olegas Poliakovas	Professor (04H), Vilnius University (Kaunas Faculty of Humanities), Lithuania
Marek Ruskowski	Professor (04H), The Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce, Poland
Yuri Stulov	Professor (04H), Minsk State Linguistic University, President of European Association for American Studies in Belarus, Belarus
Leona Toker	Professor (04H), The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Izrael

TURINYS / SPIS TREŚCI

I. PROBLEMOS IR SPRENDIMAI / PROBLEMY I ICH ROZWIĄZANIA

- Aleksandras Krasnovas** (Lietuva / Litwa). Individuali ir bendruomeninė tapatybė bei jų sąveika grožinėje literatūroje..... 11
- Oleg Leszczak** (Lenkija / Polska). Społeczny i empiryczny charakter transcendentального antropocentryzmu Immanuela Kanta: problem istoty człowieczeństwa 21
- Bernard Sypniewski, M. Frankel Sypniewski** (JAV / USA). Patterns of Thought..... 36
- Наталья Клушина** (Rusija / Rosja). Интенциональный аспект современной стилистики..... 50

II. FAKTAI IR APMASTYMAI / FAKTY I ROZWAŻANIA

- Yuri Stulov** (Baltarusija / Białoruś). The Cityscape in the Contemporary African-American Urban Novel 65
- Анна Дашенко** (Ukraina / Ukraina). Личностное измерение стиля И-ань: ценностные установки Ли Цинчжао 72
- Gintarė Aleknavičiūtė** (Lietuva / Litwa). Domestication in the Translation of D. Brown's *The Da Vinci Code*..... 87
- Anna Wzorek** (Lenkija / Polska). Olgi Tokarczuk gra z regułami powieści kryminalnej (na podstawie *Prowadź swój plug przez kości umarłych*) 98
- Simona Amankevičiūtė** (Lietuva / Litwa). Kognityvusis požiūris į stereotipinius moters įvaizdžius vizualiojoje reklamos erdvėje..... 108
- Елена Казимянец** (Lietuva / Litwa). *Снег* в русской языковой картине мира 121
- Oskar Gawlik** (Lenkija / Polska). On *If* and *Whether* Complement Clauses of *See*, *Wonder*, and *Know* in Contemporary Spoken Academic American English: A Corpus-Based Study..... 131
- Евгений Зубков** (Lenkija / Polska). Словоупотребления *ксива* и *малява* в русском уголовном дискурсе..... 142
- Mihaela Culea** (Rumunija / Rumunia). “Middle Ground,” “Duality,” and “Diversimilarity” as Responses to Postcolonial and Global Challenges in Chinua Achebe's *The Education of a British-Protected Child* and *No Longer at Ease* 151
- Malgorzata Krzysztofik** (Lenkija / Polska). *Recepta duszna i cielesna przeciw powietrzu morowemu* ks. Hieronima Powodowskiego (XVI w.) – antropologiczny model lektury..... 162
- Malgorzata Przeniosło** (Lenkija / Polska). Nauczyciele akademicy na Uniwersytecie Stefana Batorego w Wilnie w okresie międzywojennym..... 176

III. NUOMONĖ / OPINIE I POGLĄDY

- Элеонора Лассан** (Lietuva / Litwa). О причинах вечности сказочных сюжетов
(на материале сказки «Мальчик с пальчик»)..... 194

IV. KONFERENCIJŲ MEDŽIAGA / MATERIAŁY KONFERENCYJNE

- Leszek Szymbański** (Lenkija / Polska). Language Awareness in an Internet Chat Room 203

V. SKAUDŪS KLAUSIMAI / DRAŹLIWE KWESTIE

- Viktorija Makarova** (Lietuva / Litwa). Priešo įvaizdžio formavimas Lietuvos žiniasklaidos
priemonėse: lenkų klausimas..... 213

VI. MOKSLINIO GYVENIMO KRONIKA / KRONIKA ŻYCIA NAUKOWEGO

Konferencijų apžvalgos / Konferencje

- Jurgita Astrauskienė** (Lietuva / Litwa). Tarptautinės mokslinės konferencijos „Tarp eilučių:
lingvistikos, literatūrologijos, medijų erdvė“ *TELL ME 2013* apžvalga 222

- Tatiana Larina** (Russia). Searching for Understanding in Cross-Cultural Communication.... 225

Knygų recenzijos / Recenzje książek

- Лара Синельникова** (Ukraina / Ukraina). ЧЕРВИНСКИЙ, П., 2012. *Язык советской
действительности: Семантика позитива в обозначении лиц*..... 230

- Michał Mazurkiewicz** (Lenkija / Polska). *Sport w sztuce. Sport in Art.* 2012.
M. KOZIOŁ, D. PIEKARSKA, M. A. POTOCKA (eds.)..... 237

- Anonsai / Zapowiedzi** 239

VII. REIKALAVIMAI STRAIPSNIAMS /

- ZASADY OPRACOWYWANIA PUBLIKACJI** 240

- VIII. MŪSŲ AUTORIAI / NASI AUTORZY** 248

CONTENTS

I. PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

Aleksandras Krasnovas (Lithuania). The Interaction of Personal and Communal Identities in Literature	11
Oleg Leszczak (Poland). On the Social and Empirical Nature of Kant's Transcendental Anthropocentrism: The Problem of Human Nature	21
Bernard Sypniewski, M. Frankel Sypniewski (USA). Patterns of Thought.....	36
Natalia Klushina (Russia). The Intentional Aspect of Modern Stylistics	50

II. FACTS AND REFLECTIONS

Yuri Stulov (Belarus). The Cityscape in the Contemporary African-American Urban Novel ...	65
Ganna Dashchenko (Ukraine). The Identity Dimension of the <i>Yi-An</i> Style: The Value System of Li Qingzhao.....	72
Gintarė Aleknavičiūtė (Lithuania). Domestication in the Translation of D. Brown's <i>The Da Vinci Code</i>	87
Anna Wzorek (Poland). Olga Tokarczuk's Game with the Rules of Criminal Novels: The Case of <i>Plough Through the Bones of the Dead</i>	98
Simona Amankevičiūtė (Lithuania). Cognitive Approach to the Stereotypical Placement of Women in Visual Advertising Space	108
Jelena Kazimianec (Lithuania). Snow in the Russian Language Picture of the World.....	121
Oskar Gawlik (Poland). On <i>If</i> and <i>Whether</i> Complement Clauses of <i>See</i> , <i>Wonder</i> , and <i>Know</i> in Contemporary Spoken Academic American English: A Corpus-Based Study.....	131
Eugene Zubkov (Poland). Word Usage of <i>Ксива</i> and <i>Малыва</i> in Russian Criminal Discourse	142
Mihaela Culea (Romania). "Middle Ground," "Duality," and "Diversimilarity" as Responses to Postcolonial and Global Challenges in Chinua Achebe's <i>The Education of a British-Protected Child</i> and <i>No Longer at Ease</i>	151
Malgorzata Krzysztofik (Poland). The Anthropological Model of Reading "Prescription for Soul and Body Against Epidemic Air" by 16 th Century Priest Hieronim Powodowski	162
Malgorzata Przenioslo (Poland). The Academics at Stefan Batory University in Vilnius During the Interwar Period.....	176

III. OPINION

- Eleonora Lassar** (Lithuania). On the Imperishable Reasons of Fairy-Tale Plots:
The Case of *Tom Thumb* 194

IV. CONFERENCE MATERIAL

- Leszek Szymański** (Poland). Language Awareness in an Internet Chat Room 203

V. SENSITIVE ISSUES

- Viktorija Makarova** (Lithuania). The Formation of the Image of the Enemy
in Lithuanian Media Outlets: The Polish Question 213

VI. SCIENTIFIC LIFE CHRONICLE**C o n f e r e n c e s**

- Jurgita Astrauskienė** (Lithuania). Review of the International Scientific Conference
“Thought Elaboration: Linguistics, Literature, Media Expression” (TELL ME 2013) 222

- Tatiana Larina** (Russia). Searching for Understanding in Cross-Cultural Communication.... 225

B o o k r e v i e w s

- Lara Sinelnikova** (Ukraine). CZERWINSKI, P., 2012. *The Language of Soviet Reality: The Semantics of Positive Personal Evaluations* / ЧЕРВИНСКИЙ, П., 2012. *Язык советской действительности: Семантика позитива в обозначении лиц* 230

- Michał Mazurkiewicz** (Poland). *Sport w sztuce. Sport in Art*. 2012.
M. KOZIÓŁ, D. PIEKARSKA, M. A. POTOCKA (eds.)..... 237

- A n n o u n c e m e n t s** 239

- VII. REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLICATION** 240

- VIII. OUR AUTHORS** 248

Oskar Gawlik

The Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce

Department of Foreign Languages

ul. Kościuszki 13, 25-310 Kielce, Poland

E-mail: oskargawlik@vp.pl

Research interests: spoken and written academic discourse, semantics, syntax, pragmatics, systemic-functional linguistics, (cognitive) corpus analysis

ON IF AND WHETHER COMPLEMENT CLAUSES OF SEE, WONDER, AND KNOW IN CONTEMPORARY SPOKEN ACADEMIC AMERICAN ENGLISH: A CORPUS-BASED STUDY

The main goal of this article is to investigate the distribution of two apparently vying finite complementation patterns—if- and whether-clauses—accompanying three mental verbs (see, wonder, and know) in the MICASE corpus of spoken academic American English. The default introspective theoretical assumption that the two investigated complementizers are in a free distribution was not corroborated by the empirical inquiry. The three verbs do evince linguistic preferences regarding complementation, preferences which depend on a number of factors: the valency pattern of a given verb, co(n)text, sub-genre, and the like. Moreover, the investigation also appears to have demonstrated that, in respect to the complementation of see, wonder, and know, spoken academic English bears a greater resemblance to everyday conversation than to written academic English, thus corroborating the contention that field prevails over mode (to employ Hallidayan parlance). Furthermore, the inquiry into the semantics of the three mental verbs investigated indicates that their meanings are affected by the genre, inasmuch as the verbs investigated tend to depart from their default dictionary definitions by conveying less-prototypical meanings. This finding, in turn, provides a rationale for probing into the pragmatics and functions of the three verbs. It must be stressed that the results should not be generalized due to the relatively small corpus size, which implies that further research is indicated.

KEY WORDS: see, wonder, know, if and whether complement clauses, complementation, spoken academic discourse.

On selected previous inquiries into academic discourse and complementation

The investigation of academic discourse has, until relatively recently, gravitated towards linguistic inquiries into its written mode, spawning a plethora of studies, including, *inter alia*, the following: genre analysis (Swales 1990), hedging (Varttala 2003), grammatical metaphor (Halliday

2004), metadiscourse (Hyland and Tse 2004; Hyland 2005), and changing conventions in academic discourse (Duszak 2005). However, attempts to redress the balance have resulted in the compilation of corpora of spoken academic English, such as MICASE—the Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (Simpson et al. 2002)—creating an outpouring of linguistic inquiries into various aspects of spoken academic discourse, among them

the following: evaluation (Mauranen 2002), formulaic expressions (Simpson 2004), concession (Łyda 2007), and *verba dicendi* (Gawlik 2011)¹.

Complementation patterns have been the object of study of a number of scholars who have investigated alternative and emerging complementation patterns, particularly with a view to tracing linguistic change (cf., e.g., Rudanko 1999, 2000, 2011; Mindt 2011; Leech et al. 2012). Still, for all this panoply of linguistic pursuits, a large number of linguistic inquiries into spoken academic English still appear to remain in *statu nascendi*, at least as far as the present author is aware, with *if* and *whether* complement clauses constituting a case in point. Consequently, it needs to be stressed in no uncertain terms that without the cachet of a definitive or conclusive analysis, the major goal of this study is to occupy the apparent niche by contributing to the repertoire of linguistic knowledge concerning the (dis)preferred complementation patterns of three mental verbs: *see*, *wonder*, and *know*. All three verbs exhibit a relatively large degree of lability, vacillating between *if* and *whether* complement clauses. The rationale behind the choice of these three verbs was couched in the following tenet postulated by Biber et al. (1999: 691):

There is a clear stylistic difference between interrogative *if*-clauses, which are strongly favored in the more colloquial style of conversation and fiction, and interrogative *whether*-clauses, which are more neutral in their stylistic range. The three verbs that are very frequent with *if*-clauses—*see*, *wonder*, and *know*—are used most commonly in conversation and fiction.

Consequently, given the alternative ways of complementing *see*, *wonder*, and *know*, it was of interest to investigate which complementation pattern (*if*- or *whether*-clauses) is more popular in spoken academic discourse, with a view to shedding some light on how the mode of communication (i.e., written versus spoken) affects the choice of clausal complementizers. With this in mind, a number of major research questions were formulated: first, in respect of the employment of *if* and *whether* complement clauses accompanying *see*, *wonder*, and *know*, does academic discourse, presumably employing the less colloquial style, conform to the aforementioned claims by exhibiting a preference for *whether*-clauses? Second, how does the mode of academic discourse affect the complementation patterns of the three verbs investigated, and, to employ Hallidayan parlance, does mode prevail over field or vice versa?

The methodological basis for the linguistic inquiry is empirically oriented, employing corpus linguistic methodology in a bottom-up, inductive approach to investigating the structure of language, followed by functional explanations and supplemented by introspective judgments, an approach advocated by a number of scholars (e.g., Rusiecki 2006). Of course, corpus-based investigations, as formally opposed to corpus-driven approaches (cf. Tognini-Bonelli 2001), do not preclude serendipity, as was also the case in this inquiry. The corpus linguistic study was conducted on the MICASE corpus, and it consisted of a number of stages. At the outset, all lemmas of the verbs were gleaned from the corpus, for it is not tagged for grammatical categories, which necessitated the elimination of irrelevant tokens (e.g., *if* functioning as a subordinator in conditional sentences). Subsequently, the

¹ For a comprehensive list of publications, visit the website: <http://micase.elicorpora.info/micase-publications-and-presentations>.

absolute occurrences were normalized to their relative occurrences per one million words for ease of comparison. This quantitatively-oriented investigation constituted the point of departure for a more fine-grained qualitative inquiry, which was meant to lay bare the linguistic (dis)preferences for *if* and *whether* complementation patterns.

Quantitative results and discussion

As discussed above, the three mental verbs—*see*, *wonder*, and *know*—can be complemented by both *if*- and *whether*-clauses. Still, their frequency of occurrence in the corpus is dramatically different, as illustrated in Tables 1 and 2, below.

The p-value is below 0.0001, which means that the results are statistically significant. The occurrence of *if* and *whether* complement clauses is not random, and there exist linguistic preferences for the employment of one complementation pat-

tern over the other. As illustrated in Tables 1 and 2, *if* complement clauses considerably outnumber *whether* complement clauses, with the occurrence of the former being in the region of 90% of the clausal complementation patterns of *see*, *wonder*, and *know*, as exemplified below:

- (1) i think that's a good theory. and i don't know i'm gonna **see if** if we go on when we get into emotions if that holds out. um okay a well, if if we're gonna **see if** that holds out or not (...) (SGR999MX115)
- (2) now, did you wanna ask me something? um, i seem to have uh lost my syllabus and i **wonder if** i could pick up oh. another one. (LES605SU080)
- (3) (...) we don't know what they offer us, we don't **know if** they're going to be effective or not from from programs that have been proven to work. (SEM340JG072)

Table 1. *See*, *wonder*, and *know* with *if*-clauses in the MICASE corpus

Verb	Raw occurrences	Irrelevant tokens	Occurrences after eliminating irrelevant tokens	Occurrences per million words	Percentage of <i>if</i> -clauses
<i>see</i>	214	18	196	115	91%
<i>wonder</i>	93	0	93	54	90%
<i>know</i>	498	152	346	204	84%

Table 2. *See*, *wonder*, and *know* with *whether*-clauses in the MICASE corpus

Verb	Raw occurrences	Irrelevant tokens	Occurrences after eliminating irrelevant tokens	Occurrences per million words	Percentage of <i>whether</i> -clauses
<i>see</i>	21	0	21	12	9%
<i>wonder</i>	11	0	11	6	10%
<i>know</i>	64	0	64	38	16%

By implication, *whether*-clauses constitute approximately 10% of the complements of the three verbs investigated, as exemplified below:

- (4) (...) it'll also be interesting to **see whether** things have changed, since our, earlier vishi- uh visit seven weeks ago. (LAB175SU032)
- (5) i know you were wha- by the bra- just the straight brain theory. i'm **wondering whether** there could be a comeback for the brain theory against this (...) (SEM475JU084)
- (6) (...) it's an unusual move and you don't **know whether** he's trying to, to finesse the whole question yeah at the end or whether he's um, whether he's gone in an opposite dire- (...) (OFC300JU149)

As illustrated in Tables 1 and 2, of the three verbs investigated, *know* is the most frequently complemented verb by both *if*- and *whether*-complement clauses, followed by *see* and *wonder*: 242 occurrences, 127 occurrences, and 60 occurrences per million words respectively. Second, and possibly more importantly, *if* complement clauses are significantly more frequent than *whether* complement clauses: 204 occurrences, 115 occurrences, and 54 occurrences complementing *know*, *see*, and *wonder*, respectively. *Whether* complement clauses, by contrast, exhibit drastically lower frequencies of complementation: *know*, *see*, and *wonder* scored a respective 38 occurrences, 12 occurrences, and 6 occurrences per million words. The statistical data may also testify to the overall popularity of the verbs investigated, implying that *know* is the most frequent verb of the three verbs investigated, followed by *see* and *wonder*. To a certain degree, this finding appears to

be at odds with what is claimed by Biber et al. (1999: 368–369): in their corpus *see* and *know* are the two most frequent mental verbs, scoring over 1,000 and 500 occurrences per million words respectively. By contrast, *wonder* takes the 38th position, with fewer than 200 occurrences in written academic English. This discrepancy might be attributable to a number of factors. First, they investigated a different variety of English, i.e., British English. Second, the academic English they investigated was mainly written, rather than spoken, which is the object of the present investigation. Finally, the verb *see* might have (also) been used in its default meaning of perceiving with the eye in Biber et al.'s (1999) corpus, which is not the case in the MICASE corpus, as will be demonstrated below.

Selected aspects of the semantics and pragmatics of the three mental verbs investigated

In terms of its semantics, the verb *see* has a number of senses, the default being “[t]o perceive (light, colour, external objects and their movements) with the eyes, or by the sense of which the eye is the specific organ” (OED, sense 1a). However, what is of particular interest here is the fact that the manual corpus investigation of the co-text of the verb *see* and its lemmas revealed that not one of the 196 occurrences of *see* complemented by *if*-clauses and the 21 occurrences of *see* followed by *whether*-clauses embodied the default meaning of *see*, but rather the sense of “[t]o observe, find” (OED, sense 10b), hereinafter referred to as *find-out see* for ease of reference. This finding should not be surprising, however, given the fact that one of the hallmarks of academic discourse is finding out, discover-

ing, or drawing conclusions. Consequently, the employment of *see* in its find-out sense in spoken academic English has at least two repercussions: first, it appears to corroborate the notion that spoken academic discourse employs *see* in its less prototypical meaning, thus possibly differently from other genres. Second, the employment of find-out *see* might be indicative of the fact that it is a style marker of spoken academic discourse. It needs to be added that find-out *see* was particularly frequently employed in the phrase *let's see if*, whose occurrences amounted to 37 hits out of the total 196 occurrences of *see + if*, which, in turn, translates into the fact that *let's see if* constitutes approximately 19% of the total occurrences of the verb *see* complemented by *if*-clauses. Alternatively speaking, virtually every fifth occurrence of *see if* was employed in the phrase *let's see if*, as illustrated below:

- (7) i just searched, i was gonna look for m- water purifiers, okay hold on **let's see if** we can find density of, see if we can find density of yeast. <LAUGH> what? (SGR195SU127)

The relative popularity of the phrase *let's see if* might give grounds to the claim that it is (becoming) a fixed expression which performs a number of pragmatic functions, the most predominant of which appears to be that of exhibiting awareness of the listeners and drawing them into the discourse by employing the first person plural pronoun *us* in its contracted form. This theory is supported by the employment of the first person plural *we* immediately following *let's see if*, as was the case in 16 occurrences of *let's see if*, or 43% of the total. By contrast, *let's see whether*, which is the apparent counterpart of *let's see if*, scored only one occurrence, a finding which testifies to the unpopularity

of this expression in spoken academic English.

Regarding *wonder*, it needs to be spelled out that the meanings of *wonder* and its lemmas, as employed in the corpus, do not appear to depart from the default meaning of this verb, i.e., “To ask oneself in wonderment; to feel some doubt or curiosity (*how, whether, why*, etc.); to be desirous to know or learn” (OED, sense 2). Additionally, the relative unpopularity of this verb, being the least frequent of the three mental verbs investigated, precluded any qualitative investigation.

By comparison, the most frequently occurring verb, *know*, deserves a deeper investigation. The meaning drawn on in the corpus is defined in the following way: “To be acquainted with (a thing, place, or person); to be familiar with by experience; to have learned of by report or through the acquisition of information; (also) to have or gain such familiarity with (something) as gives understanding or insight” (OED, sense 6a). By far its most frequent occurrence was in *I don't know if* (256 occurrences) with the default semantics of *know*, as epitomized below:

- (8) no i'm really like dinosaurs like fascinate me like that stuff fascinates me but **i don't know if** that's like a career choice yet but i, was looking through the course book and i know they offer like a w- half a term class or something, one of those that if i had space ... (ADV700JU023)

This finding tallies with what is claimed by Biber et al. (1999: 691), according to whom “[o]ne of the most common verbs taking *whether/if*-clauses is *know*, which also occurs predominantly in the negative.” This is also the case of spoken academic

discourse employing *know* in the negative, predominantly used with the argument of the first-person singular, *I*, as was the case in all 256 occurrences of *I don't know* found in the corpus. Such a high frequency of occurrence of *I don't know*, primarily when followed by *if*, may be attributable to a number of pragmatic factors, such as hedging or politeness when attempting to invalidate other claims (cf. Aijmer et al. 2004).

By the same token, the relatively high frequency of *I don't know* renders it a lexical bundle (cf. Biber et al. 1999: 994), and what appears even more interesting is the fact that *I don't know* is regarded as the most common lexical bundle in conversation, scoring a frequency of over 1,000 occurrences per million words (ibid.: 994). Consequently, the popularity of *I don't know* in conversation, rather than written academic English, gives some grounds to claim that spoken academic English evinces more points of convergence with everyday conversation than with written academic discourse, at least as far as the employment of *I don't know* is concerned. This finding, in turn, might run counter to our introspective judgements regarding the fact that field prevails over tenor; this may not necessarily be the case in spoken academic English, where tenor appears to prevail over field as in the case of *I don't know* in spoken academic English in the MICASE corpus.

Further investigation of the occurrences of *know* as complemented by either *if*- or *whether*-clauses revealed that the apparently more formal equivalents of *I don't know if*—i.e., *I don't know whether* and *I do not know whether*—scored as few as 22 occurrences and 1 occurrence respectively. This relative unpopularity of the apparently formal equivalents of *I don't know if* appears to validate the notion that language is highly

formulaic, preferring some patterns over others and giving rise to the emergence of lexical bundles, with *I don't know* constituting a case in point. Curiously, there is not a single occurrence of *I do not know if* in the corpus—the uncontracted and therefore, apparently, less-informal equivalent of *I don't know if*, a finding that might indicate that spoken academic discourse exhibits a preference for drawing on the less formal alternatives and/or more fossilized linguistic alternatives, such as lexical bundles.

The high occurrence of *know* followed by *if*-clauses prompted the present investigator to check whether its overall deployment throughout the corpus reflected its usage in the prototypical academic sub-genre, i.e., small and large lectures, with a view to casting some light on how (in) formal prototypical spoken academic English is in respect of the employment of *if* versus *whether* complement clauses. This was motivated by the fact that the MICASE compilers define academic English as any discourse produced on the university campus, thus regarding such events as service encounters or tours as academic discourse on a par with small and large lectures. However, due to the fact that these more peripheral genres may affect, to the point of skewing, the overall results, it seemed imperative to probe into the occurrences of *I don't know if* in small and large lectures, spoken academic genres *par excellence*. This inquiry yielded the results illustrated in Table 3.

The p-value is lower than 0.001, indicating that the results are statistically significant. As Table 3 shows, *I don't know if* scored 97 occurrences per million words in small and large lectures. By comparison, the number of occurrences of *I don't know if* in the remaining speech event types was

Table 3. Occurrences of *I don't know if* and *I don't know whether* in lectures vs. the remaining speech event types in the MICASE corpus: raw number of occurrences and normalized occurrences per million words

Expression	Small and large lectures	The remaining speech event types
<i>I don't know if</i>	57/97	199/179
<i>I don't know whether</i>	6/10	16/14

almost double, or 179 occurrences per million words. This finding speaks volumes for the fact that the popularity of *if*-clauses complementing *know* is particularly attributable to its high frequency of occurrence in the less prototypical sub-genres of spoken academic English. Interestingly, *whether* complement clauses evince a relatively different pattern of distribution: 10 occurrences and 14 occurrences per million words in lectures and the remaining speech event types respectively. One common denominator regarding the occurrence of *whether* complement clauses is the fact that they are not particularly popular in either sub-genre, which precludes a more fine-grained analysis.

In sum, the study appears to have disclosed that even the prototypical spoken academic sub-genre, small and large lectures, draws heavily on the less-formal alternative, *if* complement clauses. By implication, *whether* complement clauses are relatively unpopular in both the prototypical and more peripheral speech event types in spoken academic discourse. Nevertheless,

as was already mentioned, the *if* complement clauses are considerably more popular in the less prototypical sub-genres of spoken academic English, which was partially predictable given that the *if* complement clauses considerably outweigh their allegedly more formal counterparts, the *whether* complement clauses. These observations appear to corroborate Biber et al.'s (1999) findings, whereby *see*, *wonder*, and *know* are most commonly complemented by *if*-clauses. This being the case in spoken academic English, it was interesting to compare the results obtained for spoken academic English with the results of Biber et al. (1999: 692–693) obtained for conversation and written academic English. It needs to be elucidated that Biber et al.'s (1999) results are approximate, as the number of occurrences is rounded to 5, meaning that the occurrence amounting to 0 does not necessarily mean that there were absolutely no occurrences of a particular complement type. The comparison of the results is included in Tables 4 and 5, below.

The p-value is lower than 0.0001, which testifies to the statistical significance of the

Table 4. Frequencies of *see*, *wonder*, and *know* with a complement *if*-clause, by register; occurrences per million words

Verb	Spoken academic English (MICASE)	Written academic English	Conversation
<i>see</i>	115	10	135
<i>wonder</i>	54	0	55
<i>know</i>	204	0	90

Table 5. Frequencies of *see*, *wonder*, and *know* with a complement *whether*-clause, by register; occurrences per million words

Verb	Spoken academic English	Written academic English	Conversation
<i>see</i>	12	10	5
<i>wonder</i>	6	0	10
<i>know</i>	38	10	85

results. As regards *if* complement clauses, the uses of *see* and *wonder* in spoken academic English exhibit strikingly greater similarities to conversation than to written academic English: 115 occurrences of *see* were complemented by *if*-clauses in spoken academic English, and 135 in conversation. *Wonder*, by comparison, scored a similar number of occurrences in both the two genres investigated: 54 versus 55 occurrences per million words respectively. Interestingly, *know* appears to exhibit a marginally divergent tendency: it was more frequently complemented by *if*-clauses in spoken academic English than in conversation: 204 versus 90 occurrences per million words respectively. In conversation, *know* failed to demonstrate any preference for either type of complementation, be it *if* or *whether* complementation clauses, scoring 90 and 85 occurrences respectively. By extension, the low incidence of *whether*-complement clauses, complementing *see* and *wonder*, precludes any fine-grained analysis. In the light of the results obtained, mode appears to prevail over field, to employ Hallidayan parlance, at least as regards the *if* and *whether* clausal complementation of *see* and *wonder* in spoken academic English.

Conclusions

It is frequently claimed that corpus-based approaches that search for linguistic patterns in data can produce insights not available to armchair grammarians. The present investigation appears to corroborate

this claim, inasmuch as the apparently alternative complementation patterns of *if* and *whether* complement clauses exhibit drastically divergent preferences for the complementation of the three mental verbs investigated—*see*, *wonder*, and *know*. This is a finding which would likely have yielded inaccurate results had only introspective judgements been drawn on. This implies that having recourse to a corpus-based analysis has provided us with information concerning the (dis)preferred complementation patterns of *see*, *wonder*, and *know* with *if*- and *whether*-clauses. The results are statistically significant ($p < 0.0001$), and hopefully demonstrate that *if* complement clauses predominate, as their occurrences significantly outnumber *whether* complement clauses. This finding, in turn, produces a number of repercussions: first, in respect of the clausal complementation of *see*, *wonder*, and *know*, spoken academic English tends to adhere to the less-formal alternative, i.e., *if*-clauses. Second, the preference for *if* complement clauses appears to demonstrate that spoken academic English evinces more points of convergence with everyday conversation than with written academic English, thus possibly corroborating the notion that mode prevails over field. Furthermore, this inquiry is believed to have demonstrated that spoken academic English is formulaic inasmuch as, given alternatives, there exist strong preferences for one type of complementation pattern over another. This finding, in turn, suggests that spoken

academic discourse, with its preference for *if* complement clauses, can be likened more to everyday conversation than written academic discourse, at least as far as the complementation of *see* and *wonder* is concerned. Semantically and pragmatically, the inquiry has demonstrated that all the occurrences of *see* and its lemmas employed the sense of find-out *see*, rather than the default sense of perceiving with the eye.

This also appears to tally with the field of academic discourse, which is one of inferring, discovering, and drawing conclusions. By comparison, the employment of *know*, particularly frequent in the phrase *I don't know if*, indicates that it performs the pragmatic and rhetorical function of hedging, by withdrawing full commitment to the propositions made and expressing modesty—thus possibly constituting a face-saving act.

References

- AIJMER, K., STENSTROM, A. B. (eds.), 2004. *Discourse Patterns in Spoken and Written Corpora*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- BIBER, D., JOHANSSON, S., LEECH, G., CONRAD, S., FINEGAN, E., 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. England: Longman.
- DUSZAK, A., 2005. Between Styles and Values: An Academic Community in Transition. In: G. CORTESE & A. DUSZAK (eds.). *Identity, Community, Discourse*. Bern: Peter Lang, 69–94.
- GAWLIK, O., 2011. *Basic Verba Dicendi in Academic Spoken English. The Syntax, Semantics, Pragmatics and Functions of Communication Verbs: Say, Talk, Tell and Speak*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- HALLIDAY, M. A. K., 2004. *The Language of Science*. London/New York: Continuum.
- HYLAND, K., TSE, P., 2004. Metadiscourse in Academic Writing: A Reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 156–177.
- HYLAND, K., 2005. *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London: Continuum.
- LEECH, G., HUNDT, M., MAIR, C., SMITH, N., 2012. *Change in Contemporary English. A Grammatical Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LYDA, A., 2007. *Concessive Relation in Spoken Discourse*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- MAURANEN, A., 2002. A Good Question: Expressing Evaluation in Academic Speech. In: G. CORTESE & P. RILEY (eds.). *Domain-Specific English: Textual Practices across Communities and Classrooms*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 115–140.
- MINDT, I., 2011. *Adjective Complementation. An Empirical Study of Adjectives Followed by that-Clauses*. The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- The Oxford English Dictionary Online*, 2012. Available through www.oed.com.
- RUDANKO, J., 1999. *Diachronic Studies of English Complementation Patterns*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- RUDANKO, J., 2000. *Corpora and Complementation*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- RUDANKO, J., 2011. *Changes in Complementation in British and American English*. England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- RUSIECKI, J., 2006. Badania korpusowe a “lingwistyka gabinetowa”: czy te dwa podejścia kiedyś się spotkają? In: A. DUSZAK, E. GAJEK, & U. OKULSKA (eds.). *Korpusy w angielsko-polskim językoznawstwie kontrastywnym*. Kraków: UNIVERSITAS, 17–29.
- SIMPSON, R. C., BRIGGS, S. L., OVENS, J., SWALES, J. M., 2002. *The Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English*. Ann Arbor, MI: The Regents of the University of Michigan.
- SIMPSON, R. C., 2004. Stylistic Features of Spoken Academic Discourse: The Role of Formulaic Expressions. In: U. CONNOR & T. UPTON (eds.). *Discourse in the Professions: Perspectives from Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 37–64.

SWALES, J. M., 1990. *Genre Analysis. English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

TOGNINI-BONELLI, E., 2001. *Corpus Linguistics at Work*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Oskar Gawlik

Jano Kochanovskio universitetas Kielcuose, Lenkija

Moksliniai interesai: žodinis ir rašytinis akademinis diskursas, semantika, sintaksė, pragmatika, sisteminė funkcinė lingvistika, (kognityvinė) tekstyno analizė

APIE *SEE*, *WONDER* IR *KNOW* VEIKSMAŽODŽIUS *IF*- IR *WHETHER*- PAPILDINIUS SAJYGOS SAKINIUSE ŠIUOLAIKINĖJE ŠNEKAMOJOJE AKADEMINĖJE AMERIKOS ANGLŲ KALBOJE: TEKSTYNU PAGRĮSTAS TYRIMAS

Santrauka

Straipsnio tikslas – remiantis MICASA tekstynu, iširti sakytinėje akademineje amerikiečių anglų kalboje dvejų akivaizdžiai besivaržančių baigtinių papildinio struktūrų *if* ir *whether*; papildytų trimis mentaliniais veiksmažodžiais (*see*, *wonder* ir *know*), paskirstymą. Introspektyvi teorinė prielaida, pagal nutylėjimą teigianti, kad du šalutinio sakinio jungtukai turi laisvą distribuciją, nebuvo patvirtina empiriniais tyrimais, nes trys veiksmažodžiai nerodo lingvistinės pirmenybės papildinyje, pirmenybės, kuri priklauso nuo daugelio veiksnių: tam tikro veiksmažodžio junglumo modelio, konteksto, sub-žanro ir pan. Tyrimas parodė, kad papildinių *see*, *wonder* ir *know* vartojimas šnekamojoje akademineje anglų kalboje labiau panašėja į kasdienę šnekamąją, o ne rašytinę akademinę anglų kalbą. Taip patvirtintas teiginys, Halliday žodžiais, kad vartojimo laukas svarbesnis už būdą. Tiriant trijų mentalinių veiksmažodžių semantiką, nustatytas faktas, kad šių veiksmažodžių prasmė žanras veikia tiek, kad jie nukrypsta nuo savo įprastinės žodyno reikšmės ir įgauna ne tokias prototipines reikšmes. Tyrimo rezultatai, savo ruožtu, suteikia pagrindą pragmatiniams ir funkciniam trijų veiksmažodžių

VARTTALA, T. A., 2003. *Hedging in Scientifically Oriented Discourse. Exploring Variation according to Discipline and Intended Audience*. Electronic PhD dissertation 138. University of Tampereen.

Oskar Gawlik

Uniwersytet Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach, Polska

Zainteresowania naukowe: mówiony i pisany dyskurs naukowy, semantyka, składnia, pragmatyka, lingwistyka systemowo-funkcjonalna, (kognitywna) analiza korpusowa

KILKA SŁÓW NA TEMAT ZDAŃ DOPEŁNIENIOWYCH Z *IF* I *WHETHER* CZASOWNIKÓW *SEE*, *WONDER* I *KNOW* WE WSPÓLCZESNEJ MÓWIONEJ AMERYKAŃSKIEJ ANGIELSZCZYŹNIE AKADEMICKIEJ: BADANIE KORPUSOWE

Streszczenie

Niniejszy artykuł stanowi przyczynek do badań współczesnej mówionej angielszczyzny akademickiej. Nadrzędnym celem artykułu była analiza korpusowa trzech czasowników – *see*, *wonder* oraz *know* – i ich komplementacja za pomocą zdań podrzędnych z *if* i *whether*, co z kolei miało odpowiedzieć na pytanie, które z dopełnień preferują badane czasowniki ogólnie oraz w zależności od przyjętych parametrów badawczych, jak na przykład prototypowy i peryferyjny mówiony dyskurs akademicki. Analiza ilościowa stanowiła punkt odniesienia dla analizy jakościowej, której wyniki wskazują, że w aspekcie komplementacji badanych czasowników mówiony dyskurs akademicki jest podobny do codziennego języka mówionego, ponieważ badane czasowniki preferują komplementację ze zdaniami podrzędnymi z *if*. Te wstępne wyniki badań empirycznych mogą z kolei przeczyć pewnym założeniom teoretycznym, które wynikają, na przykład, z introspekcji badacza, często dającej podstawy założenia a priori, że mówiony dyskurs akademicki jest podobny do pisanego dyskursu akademickiego, co w aspekcie trzech badanych czasowników nie zostało potwier-

tyrinėjimui. Reikia pabrėžti, kad remiantis šiais rezultatais, nederėtų daryti galutinių apibendrinimų. Mokslinis tyrimas turi būti pratęstas.

REIKŠMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: veiksmažodžiai *see*, *wonder*; *know*; papildinio sakiniai *if* ir *whether*; papildymas, šnekamasis akademinis diskursas.

dzone badaniami korpusowymi (por. Biber *i in.* 1999). Badanie komplementacji czasowników *see*, *wonder* oraz *know* stanowiło także próbę określenia ich znaczenia semantycznego, pragmatycznego oraz funkcji, jakie pełnią w mówionym dyskursie akademickim w korpusie MICASE. W powyższej analizie wykorzystano metodologię językoznawstwa korpusowego. Wyniki badań mogą mieć zastosowanie w glottodydaktyce oraz leksykografii. Artykuł może także stanowić inspirację do dalszych badań komplementacji czasowników.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: zdania podrzędne z *if* i *whether*, czasowniki *see*, *wonder*, *know*, komplementacja czasownika, mówiony dyskurs akademicki.

Gauta 2013 04 01

Priimta publikuoti 2013 07 15