

Lithuanian discourse markers *na* and *nu* ‘well’: a glimpse at parallel corpus data

Audronė Šolienė

Department of English Philology

Vilnius University

Universiteto st. 5

LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania

Email: audrone.soliene@gmail.com

Abstract

The focus of the present corpus-based study is on the quantitative and qualitative distribution of the Lithuanian discourse markers *na* and *nu* ‘well’. The aim of the paper is to establish the translational correspondences of *na* and *nu* in English and to reveal their functional versatility in fiction and spoken discourse. The research method is a quantitative and qualitative contrastive analysis based on the data extracted from a self-compiled bidirectional parallel corpus of fiction texts and the spoken sub-corpus of the Corpus of the Contemporary Lithuanian Language. The quantitative results show that *nu*, due to its greater degree of informality than *na*, is extremely frequent in spoken discourse. The qualitative findings witness an array of different functions the two discourse markers can perform both in responsive and non-responsive environments as well as inner dialogue.

Key words: discourse marker(s), multifunctionality, corpus-based analysis, frequency, contrastive analysis, translational correspondence

1. Introduction

Research on discourse markers (DMs) has been substantially increasing over the past few decades and resulted in a considerable body of studies (see Fraser 1999; Schiffrin 2008; Urgelles-Coll 2010; Amador-Moreno *et al.* 2015; Auer & Maschler 2016; Brinton 2017; Fedriani & Sansó 2017, *inter alia*). DMs have also achieved a great deal of scholarly attention in a contrastive perspective (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenberg 2003; Lewis 2006; Johansson 2007; Degand 2009; Beeching & Detges 2014; Furkó 2014). In Lithuanian, DMs (sometimes referred to as ‘discourse particles’) have been sporadically analysed in terms of their functional classes (Ambrazas 2006b), lexical sources and categorial status (Holvoet & Pajėdienė 2005) as well as diachronic development (Ambrazas 2006a; Nau & Ostrowski 2010). However, contrastive corpus-based Lithuanian-English studies of DMs drawing on large-scale empirical data from parallel corpora are rather innovative and rare.

This cross-linguistic corpus-based study sets out to describe the quantitative and qualitative distribution of the Lithuanian DMs *na* and *nu* ‘well’, to determine their translational correspondences (TCs) in English, as well as to reveal their functional diversity in responsive and non-responsive contexts as well as narratives and inner monologues, e.g.¹:

- (1) LT-orig: – *Gerai, gerai. Sakei. Du kartus pasakei.*
– *Na matai, – kiek atlyžo Vaitkus.*
EN-trans: "Well, all right. You have told me that. Twice."
"Well, you see," Vaitkus softened a bit.
- (2) LT-orig: – *Ukrainon einu, meiluti, Ukrainon, – atsako ji jam švelniai.*
– *Nu, nu, prasmek... – nusikeikė riebiai ukrainietis ir nusisuko į šalį, savo sąmoju patenkintas.*
EN-trans: "I'm going to the Ukraine, dearest, to the Ukraine," she tenderly tells him.
"Sure, sure, now fade away..." growls the Ukranian. He struts off, pleased with his wit.

¹ All the examples provided in the paper are taken from ParaCorp_{EN→LT→EN}.

- (3) LT-orig: <...> *ponia Giedraitienė išdidžiai lydi mane ligi durų, leidžiuos laiptais, pagaliau išstrūkstų į orą. Didžioji gatvė čia baigia kilti į viršų, na, kaip nemylėsi Vilniaus, jis toks didelis ir liūdnas, o kartu toks jaukus.*
 EN-trans: <...> *Madam Giedraitienė politely escorts me to the door, I go down the stairs, at last escape into the air. Didžiosios Street finishes rising here, well, how can you not love Vilnius, it's so big and sad, and comfortable at the same time.*

2. Discourse markers in Lithuanian

Though discourse markers are notorious for their elusive nature and a number of definitions given in the literature, this paper utilises the operational definition proposed by Crible (2017), which combines two groups of criteria for an item to qualify as a DM – syntactic (integration and scope) and pragmatic (multifunctionality):

DMs are a grammatically heterogeneous, multifunctional type of pragmatic markers, hence constraining the inferential mechanisms of interpretation. Their specificity as part of the PM category is to function on a metadiscursive level as procedural cues to situate the host unit in a co-built representation of on-going discourse. (Crible 2017: 106)

In Lithuanian, which is a language that still has many uninvestigated linguistic issues, studies on DMs are scarce. In Lithuanian linguistics, the term ‘discourse maker’ is used only in several studies (Masaitienė 2003; Bielinškieienė 2009; Smetona & Usonienė 2012). Most tokens that seem to qualify as DMs have been investigated as parenthetical phenomena or as sentence (rather than text) connectives. Few attempts have been made to identify Lithuanian linguistic expressions that could possibly be ascribed to the category of discourse markers, to compile an exhaustive list of the inventory or to analyze DMs in a cross-linguistic perspective.

This paper seeks to contribute to the cross-linguistic description of the family of discourse markers *na* and *nà* (see Auer & Maschler 2016), their Lithuanian cognates being *na* and *nu*. Auer and Maschler (2016: 2) claim that “[t]hey exist in all modern Germanic and almost all Slavic languages (cf. English *now*, German *nu(n)/na*, Dutch *nu/nou*, Norwegian *nå*, Danish and Swedish *nå*, *nu*, Icelandic *nú*, Yiddish *nu*, etc.; Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian, Czech, Slovak, Serbian, Polish, Ukrainian, Belarusian, Russian *nu/no*), but by no means do they have the same meaning in each of these languages”. The Lithuanian *na* and *nu* seem to have escaped the description, but for Sawicki’s (2012) pioneering paper on responsive DMs in Lithuanian focussing on the turn-opening particles *na* ‘well’ and *kad* ‘but’; however, her research is not based on corpus-derived data but on the analysis of one novel; this by no means diminishes the linguistic insights of the paper.

The etymology of the Lithuanian DMs *na* and *nu* needs a more thorough investigation, but it seems that the origin of *nu* is explained through its ties to the adverbs *nū* and *nūnai* ‘now/today’, still used in present-day Lithuanian, though, according to the corpus data, non-existent in spoken Lithuanian but present in non-fiction texts. So there seems to be a relation between the temporal usage (or even resultative) of the items under study and their later development into DMs (Auer & Maschler 2016: 6). Smoczyński (2007: 429) takes up this line of explanation and derives *nu* from the adverb *nū* ‘Polish *teraz* = now’ as in *nū diena* or *nūdien* ‘Polish *dotąd, do teraz, do dziś* = till this time, till now, till today’. Some scholars tend to link the DM *nà* to the pronominal stem **eno-* ‘that one’ (Auer & Maschler 2016: 7). A similar view as regards the origin of the Lithuanian *na* is expressed in Fraenkel (1962: 477). In his dictionary he gives an entry for *na* presenting it as an interjection and relating it to the demonstrative **ǫnǫ-*, **ěno-* or *anas* ‘German *jener* = that’ or *an(a)* ‘German *siehe da* = look there’. Though Auer and Maschler (2016: 7) maintain that it is rather unlikely that this interpretation may gain ground, since it might be the case that *na* is “a plausible outcome of a grammaticalization chain which starts from a temporal adverb NU” and that it split off from *nu* as a result of the lowering of the back vowel /u/, more investigation is needed.

Another thing to consider is the multifunctionality of the DMs in question. Usually they occur in conversational situations in responsive or non-responsive environments. They may refer to the previous turns of the interlocutors, elucidate or prompt upcoming turns, or serve as cohesive devices within longer passages

produced by the same speaker. To sum up, they may perform the following more fine-grained functions (based on Sawicki (2012, 2016); Auer & Maschler (2016: 11-35)):

- a. acknowledgement of the content of the previous turn;
- b. affirmative response to a question;
- c. dialogue opener or a topic-change device;
- d. (reluctant) agreement;
- e. impatience to an utterance or an action;
- f. hesitant reply to a question;
- g. expressing surprise, amazement or mirativity;
- h. self-urging/correction;
- i. reinforcing commands;
- j. expressing threat, indifference and other emotions in the affect dimension;
- k. cohesive device used in narratives.

Moreover, *na* and *nu* can also be found in passages of inner monologue. But even in these cases the colloquial tenor remains (Sawicki 2012: 172). By no means are these functions distinct on their own; there is always some degree of the overlap, e.g., between urging the interlocutor to add information and a note of impatience or between reinforcing a command and impatience. These functions are discussed in greater detail in Section 4.2.2.

3. Data and methods

The corpus-based approach adopted in this study helps to reveal patterns and meanings of DMs which would be difficult to pin down by studying introspective data. The research method is a quantitative and qualitative contrastive analysis based on the data extracted from a self-compiled bidirectional parallel corpus – ParaCorp_{EN→LT→EN} (Šolienė 2013). The corpus is designed following the model of the English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus (Johansson 2007). The ParaCorp_{EN→LT→EN} was compiled from original English fiction texts and their translations into Lithuanian and original Lithuanian fiction texts and their translations into English. The advantage of such a corpus design is that it allows different directions of comparison and can serve both as a parallel corpus and a comparable corpus (Johansson 2007: 11). The size of the corpus is about 5M words (see Table 1):

	Original	Translation	Total
ParaCorp _{EN→LT}	1, 983, 266	1, 541, 038	3, 524, 304
ParaCorp _{LT→EN}	608, 426	788, 897	1, 397, 323

Table 1. Size of the two sub-corpora ParaCorp_{EN→LT} and ParaCorp_{LT→EN}

A reference has also been made to the Corpus of the Contemporary Lithuanian Language (CCLL) (<http://donelaitis.vdu.lt>), namely the sub-corpus of spoken register (447, 396 tokens).

Frequencies of particular patterns are of paramount importance to this paper, since frequency may be an important factor in specification of meaning. Since the sub-corpora are of different size, the raw frequency numbers have been normalized per 10, 000 words. Moreover, in order to verify whether the similarities and differences in frequency are statistically significant, I have also performed the log-likelihood (LL) test, which is commonly considered to be a more statistically reliable tool than the chi-square test. The higher the LL test value, the more significant is the difference between two frequency scores. A difference in frequency is considered to be statistically significant if the LL test value is 3.84 or higher at the level of $p < 0.05$.

4. Findings

This section presents the quantitative and qualitative findings of the analysis performed. It starts with the analysis of the quantitative distribution of *na* and *nu* in fiction and spoken registers (Subsection 4.1). Subsection 4.2 deals with a qualitative view of the functional diversity of the DMs under study and their TCs.

4.1. A quantitative view of *na* and *nu* in fiction and spoken registers

The first step in the analysis was to look at the frequencies and distribution of the two Lithuanian DMs in fiction and spoken registers. Table 2 presents the quantitative findings in CCLL (spoken sub-corpus) and ParaCorp_{EN→LT→EN} (fiction).

	<i>na</i>		<i>nu</i>	
	raw	f/10, 000	raw	f/10, 000
Fiction	212	3.48	10	0.16
Spoken	878	19.62	7, 986	178.5
Total	1, 090	13.29	7, 990	89.41

Table 2. Frequencies of *na* and *nu* in CCLL and ParaCorp_{EN→LT→EN}

The quantitative results show that *nu* is strikingly frequent in spoken Lithuanian – $f = 178.5$ (f per 10,000 words), in contrast to only 0.16 in fiction. The reason for a rather low frequency of *nu* in fiction must be the fact that *nu* is considered to be sub-standard in Lithuanian and fiction texts are normally edited. The normalized frequency of *na* is 3.48 in fiction and 19.62 in spoken register, respectively. Both DMs are scarcely used in fiction; their prototypical use is in spoken language, which is not surprising since DMs are a ubiquitous feature of oral discourse (Brinton 2017: 3-4). The table below gives the log-likelihood test values of *na* and *nu* in fiction and spoken discourse.

	Fiction	Spoken	LL value
	raw	raw	
<i>na</i>	212	878	-667.43
<i>nu</i>	10	7, 986	-13571.41

Table 3. The log-likelihood test values of *na* and *nu* in CCLL and ParaCorp_{EN→LT→EN}

The log-likelihood scores (–667.43 for *na* and –13571.41 for *nu*) indicate a statistically significant underuse of *na* and *nu* in fiction texts as compared to their frequency in spoken register.

4.2. Functional distribution of *na* and *nu* and their translational paradigms

This section gives an overview of the different types of the TCs of *na* and *nu* as well as draws parallels between the function performed by the DMs and their TCs.

4.2.1. Overview of the translational profile

Translational paradigms, as was indicated in Aijmer and Simon-Vandenberg (2003), Johansson (2007), and Usonienė, Šolienė and Šinkūnienė (2015) (just to name a few), are a useful means for the investigation of multifunctional expressions. Aijmer and Simon-Vandenberg (2006: 5) suggest that employing a parallel corpus allows the establishment of cross-linguistic paradigms by showing how an element in Language A is translated into a variant of Language B. Degand (2009: 174) similarly suggests that translational data allow gaining “insight into the precise meaning of the linguistic items under study”. Thus, the analysis of translational data can contribute to disclosing the functionally-versatile nature of DMs. The analysis of the translations of *na* and *nu* (the latter is very infrequent in fiction (n=10), so the TCs of both DMs are taken together, all in all 222 instances) into English exhibited a great range of their translational correspondences, which may be indicative of their multifunctional nature. Table 4 presents the results obtained from the analysis of the TCs of *na* and *nu* in translated English:

TCs of <i>na/nu</i>	raw	%
<i>well</i>	105	47.3
<i>so</i>	17	7.7
<i>ok, okey, aha, yes, yeah, fine, all right</i>	13	5.9
<i>come on, come now, come on now, go ahead</i>	8	3.6
<i>and, and so, and even, and so what, and what of it</i>	7	3.2
<i>but</i>	4	1.8
<i>now, now look</i>	3	1.4
<i>certainly, naturally</i>	2	0.9
<i>in fact, in other words</i>	2	0.9
<i>anyway, despite all</i>	2	0.9
<i>sure</i>	2	0.9
<i>wow what a..., what a...</i>	2	0.9
<i>uh-uh</i>	1	0.5
<i>like</i>	1	0.5
<i>no</i>	1	0.5
<i>damn</i>	1	0.5
<i>as well as</i>	1	0.5
∅	50	22.5
TOTAL	222	100

Table 4. TCs of *na/nu* in translated English

The analysis of the translational paradigms of the DMs in question has proved that, due to their extreme multifunctionality, non-propositionality, context-dependence and non-referential (interpersonal and textual) function, they exhibit a wide array of different TCs. The DMs *na/nu* are extremely functionally and translationally versatile: their translational profile comprises as many as 34 different TCs. As can be seen from Table 4, the prototypical translational correspondence of *na/nu* in English is *well* (47.3 %). It takes almost a half of all the TCs; however, the other half of the correspondences shows a great versatility in linguistic expression. As is claimed in Aijmer (2007: 34), singleton and infrequent translations may reveal new or emerging developments of a DM.

4.2.2. Correlation between translational correspondences and functions

As regards the correlation between the translational correspondences and the functional diversity of the two Lithuanian DMs under study, their *prima facie* TC *well* appears with the majority of the functional variants. When *na/nu* function as acknowledgement markers of the previous turn, they are usually translated as *well* or *so* into English e.g.:

- (4) LT-orig: – *Darosi vėlu. Ir galva įsiskaudo...*
– *Na, tai aš jau eisiu.*
EN-trans: "It's getting late. And I have a headache...."
"Well, I'm off then."

In such cases, *na/nu* (usually followed by *tai* 'so') convey justifications, explanations, reactions or reasons pertaining to the information conveyed by the previous speaker.

In addition, besides *well*, when *na/nu* are used to encode an affirmative response or agreement, they are translated as *ok, okey, aha, yes, yeah, fine, all right, certainly*, etc.:

- (5) LT-orig: –Aaa... – *lengviau atsiduso Nora.*
 – *O man pasirodė, kad tu norėjai pasakyti visai ką kita... na kad ši suknia stačiai priaugo prie jos...*
 – *Na taip, tą aš ir norėjau pasakyti...*
 EN-trans: "Ahh..." *Nora heaved a sigh of relief.*
"It seemed to me that you wanted to say something else... like, like this dress really grew on her..."
"Yeah, that's exactly what I wanted to say..."

Na/nu may invite the interlocutor to add information and thus hasten the flow of discourse. In this case, the range of TCs encompasses the following items: *ok, go ahead, well*, etc. The urging or prompting a participant in further developing an upcoming action (be it verbal or non-verbal) results in a number of different TCs (e.g.: *come on, go on, ok, so, come now*, etc.). Moreover, sometimes urging converges with a note of impatience on the speaker's side, especially when *na* and *nu* are used to reinforce commands or requests (Auer & Maschler 2016: 14), e.g.:

- (6) LT-orig: *Auklytė visai suirzo, ji labai norėjo grįžusi pasigirti, kokie išmintingi jos grupės vaikai:*
 – *Na, prisiminkit, prisiminkit, apie ką kasdien kalbam. Na, apie ką dažnai šnekam? Ir vakar šnekėjom, dar knygelę skaitėm. Na, kas čia nubėgo? Apie ką kasdien šnekam? Na, kas čia nubėgo?*
 EN-trans: *The teacher's aide got totally annoyed, she really so wanted to brag about her clever group of children when they got back.*
"Come on now, remember, remember, what we talk about every day. So, what do we talk about all the time? We talked about it yesterday, and we read a book too.
So, what ran by us? What do we talk about every day? Come on, what ran by?"

Here the teacher assistant's eagerness to get the right answer is highlighted by the repetition of *na*; however, her effort is also tinted with a shade of impatience and pressure on the addressees.

When *na/nu* figure as tokens marking reluctant agreement or a hesitant reply, their prototypical equivalents in English are *well, well anyway, well yes, in a way you're right*, etc.:

- (7) LT-orig: – *Bet tu turėsi paklausti tėčio, ar mes galime jį laikyti.*
 – *Tėtis leis.*
 – *Kodėl taip manai?*
 – *Na, vis tiek.*
 – *Kas vis tiek?*
 EN-trans: "We'll have to ask Father if we can keep him."
"Father will let me."
"Why do you think so?"
"Well, anyway."
"Well, anyway, what?"

In (7) *na* renders the answer as somewhat reluctant or it seems that the interlocutor wants to withhold the information or hopes to be implored for a more precise response.

The DMs in question may be employed as dialogue openers, usually in sentences containing direct address forms prompting the interlocutor to enter the conversation, or may indicate a change of topic. Again the English TCs are *well, well now* and *so*, e.g.:

- (8) LT-orig: – *Nu, Juozap, – pasakė Bružas. – Einam prie ratų, pasirokuosim.*
 EN-trans: "Well, Juozap," said Bružas. "Let's go to the wagon and talk."
 (9) LT-orig: – *Panele Nora, kiekvienas amatas turi savo paslapčių, – Jozefas priėmė komplimentą kaip savaimę suprantamą. – Na, tai kur tos mūsų siūlės?*

EN-trans: "Every trade has its secrets, Miss Nora," Joseph took the compliment as if it went without saying. "So, where are our seams?"

In sentence (8), the speaker begins a conversation with *na* and encourages the addressee to discuss things, whereas in (9), using *na*, the speaker seems to end up the previous topic of the conversation and switches to a new one.

When the DMs *na/nu* express amazement, surprise and mirativity, they are always accompanied by *ir* 'and' and are rendered into English by exclamatory structures with *what*, e.g.:

- (10) LT-orig: – *Nu ir peilis!* – *žavisi Roza. – Aš jį pasiimsiu, gerai?*
– *Jokiu būdu, – pamokomai dėsto Žilvinas.*
EN-trans: "**Wow, what** a knife," Roza is charmed. "I'll take it, okay?"
"No way," Žilvinas lectures.

The speaker's surprise is even reinforced by the interjection *wow* in the translation.

Besides the listed functions, it seems that the Lithuanian DMs, like Hebrew *nu* (see Maschler & Dori-Hacohen (2012: 432)), colour the utterances they precede with other different shades of emotion ranging from humorous mockery, indifference, reproach and contempt to even threat (in this case usually combined with a pejorative direct address):

- (11) LT-orig: – *Na, na, maitos vaikai, nesivaipykite! Greičiau, driskų išvažos!* – *putoja padūkęs tirolietis Toni Fabro, – nēr čia ko!*
EN-trans: "**Uh-uh**, you sons of bitches. Don't make faces! Why bother? – In a month you'll be the same! Faster, you dogshit!" foams the wild Tyrolian.

For example, often the speaker's indifference is conveyed by a sequence *na ir kas* or *nu ir kas* meaning 'it's not important; I don't care', whose English correspondences usually are *so what* constructions (*so what, and what of it, well so what*):

- (12) LT-orig: – *Tą kalendorių padovanojo mano būsimoji žmona.*
– *Na ir kas, – pasakė mergaitė, vėl įsikniaubdama knygon <...>.*
EN-trans: "That calendar was given to me by my future wife."
"So what," said the girl, burying her head into her book again <...>.

When the DMs in question are used non-responsively, they can be employed in self-repair or correction contexts such as searching for the right word, giving a summary of what was said, explaining or rewording:

- (13) LT-orig: – *Viena mano pažįstama buvo Paryžiuje, – įsiterpia Beta. – Na, žinot, kurios vyras dirba CK. Tai pasakojo, kad visos merginos vaikščioja rudai lakuotais nagais.*
EN-trans: "A friend of mine was in Paris." Beta interjects, "**Well**, you know, the one whose husband works at the Central Committee. She said all the girls were walking around with brown nail polish."

Moreover, in longer passages produced by the same speaker the non-responsive *na/nu* are often used as "non-specific, strictly cohesive intra-textual" devices (Sawicki 2016: 99) introducing narratives of personal experience. They also retain the same function when they are employed in non-dialogic environments, i.e. in passages reproducing inner thought. The author then seems to conduct an inner conversation with himself/herself: elaborating his/her arguments, explaining or adding additional information, retelling events, accounting for consecutive events, e.g.:

- (14) LT-orig: *Papasakodavo ne įskundimo forma, ne pakenkti kam norėdamas, bet iš neišpasakomo savo naivumo, – na, žinoma ir todėl, kad komendantas buvo jam toks didelis autoritetas, tokia įkūnyta kilnybė, kad jis pas jį lyg išpažintį atlikdavo.*

EN-trans: *He wasn't giving him all this information as an informer, or out of malice, but simply because he was incredibly naive – and, of course, because in his eyes the Commandant was such a looming figure of authority, an embodiment of such nobility, that visiting the Commandant was for Klawan like going to confession.*

The TCs of the non-responsive and non-dialogic uses of *na/nu* are especially versatile: *well, and, yes, despite all, in fact, in other words*, etc.

4.2.3. Zero correspondence

Another interesting observation regarding the analysis of the translational paradigms is zero correspondence, or cases of omission. The cases of zero correspondence of *na/nu* in translated English amount to 22.5 % of the whole concordance, e.g.:

- (15) LT-orig: – *Blogai, – sako Konstantinas, – dabar aš mirsiu.*
– *Na, Konstantinai, kad tu taip neprotingai juokauji!*
EN-trans: "*It's bad,*" says Konstantins. "*Now I'm going to die.*"
"*Ø Konstantins, don't be ridiculous!*"

Other parallel-corpus based cross-linguistic studies of DMs show similar results. Aijmer and Simon-Vandenberg's study (2003: 1153) demonstrated that in the English-Swedish translations *well*, which is a *prima facie* equivalent of *na/nu*, is not translated in 21 % of all cases, and in the English-Dutch translations – 7 %, respectively. Similarly, in the study by Bazzanella and Morra (2000), the omission rate of *well* in the English-Italian texts was as high as 39 %. Johansson's (2007: 289) investigation of *well* and its translations into Norwegian accounted for 16 % of zero correspondence.

There might be several reasons why DMs are so frequently not translated. The phenomenon of zero correspondence may speak in favour of the statement made in Aijmer and Altenberg (1996: 32) that the more grammaticalized an item, is the more frequently it is omitted in translation, so zero correspondence may be a result of language-specific conventions or different degree of grammaticalization of DMs. Also, "[e]xpressions that do not contribute to the propositional content are often untranslatable in the sense that an exact equivalent cannot be found in another language" (Aijmer & Altenberg 2001: 32). Another reason can be the notorious multifunctionality of discourse markers and their doubling function, i.e. "cases where the meaning of *well* is supported by other means" (Johansson 2007: 289). Such instances are found in the data of the present study too, e.g.:

- (16) LT-orig: – *Ak, ką tu, ką tu! Aš juk atėjau čia siūlydama savo meilę...*
– *O aš spjoviau tau į veidą ir parodžiau duris!*
– *Na matai, koks tu piktas. Ir visi tokie. Visi.*
EN-trans: "*But, but, I came here, after all, offering my love...*"
"*And I spat in your face and showed you the door.*"
"*Ø Don't you see how mean you are? Everyone is like that. Everyone.*"

Here we have two DMs at work – *na* and *matai* 'you see', and the meaning of the intended reproach is successfully conveyed in the translation by the negative imperative *don't you see*, so *na* can be dispensed with in the translation.

5. Conclusions

The quantitative findings demonstrate that *nu*, due to its greater degree of informality than *na*, is overwhelmingly prevalent in spoken discourse. The reason for a rather low frequency of *nu* in fiction could be the fact that *nu* is considered to be a feature of colloquial Lithuanian and fiction texts are usually proofread. Both DMs are less frequent in fiction; their prototypical use is in oral discourse. The qualitative results reveal an array of different functions the two discourse markers can perform both in dialogic responsive and non-responsive environments as well as non-dialogic contexts. Their primary functions

encompass responding to a previous turn or facilitating cohesion and the flow of discourse in conversations and narratives.

The functional & semantic potential of the DMs can be fully reflected by their TCs. Though the prototypical correspondence of *na* and *nu* in their functional repertoire is the English *well*, there is a correlation between different functions performed by the DMs in question and their other various TCs. In addition, zero correspondence of the DMs is indicative of their extreme multifunctionality, non-propositionality, context-dependence and non-referential (interpersonal and textual) function.

Acknowledgements

Thanks are due to the Research Council of Lithuania, which funded this research within the framework of project No S-MIP-17-44 (*Discourse markers in Lithuanian: A synchronic and diachronic study*).

List of abbreviations

DM(s)	– discourse marker(s)
EN	– English
f	– normalized frequency
LL	– log likelihood test value
LT	– Lithuanian
n	– number of tokens analysed
Ø	– zero correspondence
orig	– original texts
TC(s)	– translational correspondence(s)
trans	– translated texts

Data sources

CCLL	Corpus of Contemporary Lithuanian Language. Available at: http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/
ParaCorp _{EN→LT→EN}	Bidirectional Parallel Corpus of English and Lithuanian (Šolienė 2013)

References

- Aijmer, K. & Altenberg, B. (1996). Introduction. In K. Aijmer, B. Altenberg & M. Johansson (eds) *Language in contrast: papers from a symposium on text-based cross-linguistic studies, Lund, March 1994*. Lund: Lund University Press, 9-16.
- Aijmer, K. & Altenberg, B. (2001). Zero translations and cross-linguistic equivalence: evidence from the English-Swedish parallel corpus. In A. Hasselgren & L. E. Breivik (eds) *From the Colt's Mouth, and Other Places: Studies in Honour of Anna-Brita Stenström*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. 19-41.
- Aijmer, K. & Simon-Vandenberg, A.M. (2003). The discourse particle *well* and its equivalents in Swedish and Dutch. *Linguistics* 41(6), 1123-1161.
- Aijmer, K. & Simon-Vandenberg, A.M. (2006). Introduction. in K. Aijmer & A.M. Simon-Vandenberg (eds) *Pragmatic Markers in Contrast*. The Netherlands: Elsevier, 1-11.
- Aijmer, K. (2007). The meaning and functions of the Swedish discourse marker *alltså* – evidence from Translation Corpora. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 6, 31-59.
- Amador-Moreno, C. P., McCarffery, K. & Vaughan, E. (2015). *Pragmatic Markers in Irish English*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ambrazas, V. (2006a). *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė sintaksė*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
- Ambrazas, V. (ed.). (2006b). *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

- Auer, P. & Maschler Y. (eds). (2016). *NU/NÁ– A Family of Discourse Markers Across the Languages of Europe and Beyond*. Berlin & Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Bazzanella, C. & Morra, L. (2000). Discourse markers and the indeterminacy of translation. In I. Kortzen & C. Marello (eds) *Argomenti per una linguistica della traduzione. On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. Notes pour une linguistique de la traduction*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 149-157.
- Beeching, K. & Detges, U. (eds). (2014). *Functions at the left and right periphery: Crosslinguistic investigations of language change*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bielinskienė, A. (2009). Relevancijos teorija ir diskurso jungtukų bei jungiamųjų žodžių pragmatika. *Kalby studijos* 15, 53-62.
- Brinton, L. J. (2017). *The Evolution of Pragmatic Markers in English. Pathways of Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crible, L. (2017). Towards an operational category of discourse markers. A definition and its model. In C. Fedriani & A. Sanso (eds) *Pragmatic Markers, Discourse Markers and Modal Particles*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 97-124.
- Degand, L. (2009). On describing polysemous discourse markers. What does translation add to the picture? In S. Slembrouck, M. Taverniers & M. Van Herreweghe (eds) *From will to well. Studies in Linguistics offered to Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberghe*. Gent: Academia Press, 173-183.
- Fedriani, C. & Sansó A. (2017). *Pragmatic Markers, Discourse Markers and Modal Particles. New perspectives*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fraenkel, E. (1962). *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Band 1. Heidelberg/Göttingen: C. Winter.
- Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics* 3, 931-952.
- Furkó, B. P. (2014). Perspectives on the translation of discourse markers. *Acta Universitatis Spientiae, Philologica* 6, 181-196.
- Holvoet, A. & Pajėdienė, J. (2005). Aplinkybės ir jų tipai. In A. Holvoet & R. Mikulskas (eds.) *Gramatinių funkcijų tyrimai*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 93-116.
- Johansson, S. (2007). *Seeing through Multilingual Corpora: On the use of corpora in contrastive studies*. (Studies in Corpus Linguistics 26). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lewis, D. (2006). Contrastive analysis of adversative relational markers, using comparable corpora. In K. Aijmer & A.M. Simon-Vandenberghe (eds) *Pragmatic Markers in Contrast*. Oxford: Elsevier, 139-153.
- Masaitienė, D. (2003). Discourse Markers in English and Lithuanian. *Kalbotyra* 53(3), 64-70.
- Maschler, Y. & Dori-Hacohen, G. (2012). From sequential to affective discourse marker: Hebrew *nu* on Israeli political phone-in radio programs. *Discourse Studies* 14(4), 419-455.
- Nau, N. & Ostrowski, N. (2010). Background and perspectives for the study of particles and connectives in Baltic languages. In N. Nau & N. Ostrowski (eds) *Particles and Connectives in Baltic*. Vilnius: Vilniaus Universitetas & Asociacija "Academia Salensis", 1-37.
- Sawicky, L. (2012). Responsive discourse particles in Lithuanian dialog. *Baltic Linguistics* 3, 151-175.
- Sawicky, L. (2016). The Polish multifunctional particle *no*. In P. Auer & Y. Maschler (eds) *NU/NÁ– A Family of Discourse Markers Across the Languages of Europe and Beyond*. Berlin & Boston: Mouton De Gruyter, 81-103.
- Schiffrin, D. (2008). Discourse markers: language, meaning, context. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. E. Hamilton (eds) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. MA: John Wiley & Sons, 54-75.
- Smetona, A. & Usonienė, A. (2012). Autoriaus pozicijos adverbialai ir adverbializacija lietuvių mokslo kalboje. *Kalbotyra* 64, 124-139.
- Smoczynski, W. (2007). *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.
- Šolienė, A. (2013). *Episteminio modalumo ekvivalentiškumo parametrai anglų ir lietuvių kalbose*, (ms.). Humanitarinių mokslų daktaro disertacija. Vilnius: Vilnius University.
- Urgelles-Coll, M. (2010). *The Syntax and Semantics of Discourse Markers: Continuum Studies in Theoretical Linguistics*. London: Continuum.
- Usonienė, A., Šolienė, A. & Šinkūnienė, J. (2015). Revisiting the multifunctionality of the adverbials of ACT and FACT in a cross-linguistic perspective. *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 14(1), 201-231.