

## Revisiting the multifunctionality of the adverbials of ACT and FACT in a cross-linguistic perspective

Aurelija Usonienė, Audronė Šolienė and Jolanta Šinkūnienė,<sup>1</sup> Vilnius University and Vytautas Magnus University

### Abstract

The last two decades have seen a great rise of interest in the corpus-based contrastive studies on the multifunctional nature of modal adverbials and discourse markers. Most of the attention has been devoted to the multifunctionality of the “actuality and reality” (Biber *et al.* 1999) adverbs *actually*, *in fact*, *really*, *indeed* and *truly* and their meanings have been proved to be very much discourse, syntactic and social context-dependent both diachronically and synchronically (Schwenter and Traugott 2000; Aijmer 2003; Paradis 2003; Aijmer and Simon-Vandenberg 2004; Lewis 2006; Aijmer 2007; Mortier and Degand 2009; Defour *et al.* 2010; Simon-Vandenberg 2013). The description of the complex and dynamic relief of their functional and semantic-pragmatic potential has been mainly based on the translation paradigm analysis. The languages dealt with are either Germanic (English, Dutch, Swedish) or Romance (French, Spanish). The present paper aims to check how the semantic pragmatic meanings of the two English adverbials (*actually* and *in fact*) are expressed in Lithuanian, a Baltic language. With the focus on the scope of multifunctionality of the adverbials under study an attempt will be made to find out how Lithuanian translation correspondences (TCs) ‘mirror’ the English actuality adverbials, i.e. how much language-specific or resembling the English adverbials the Lithuanian TCs are in terms of form and meaning. The study will also look at the pragmatic functions Lithuanian TCs perform in academic discourse thus attempting to arrive at the description of their functional potential.

### 1. Introduction

The core factor responsible for the semantic pragmatic diversification of these adverbials in all the language groups is semantic change. In some cases the change of meaning and function can be synchronically

---

<sup>1</sup> Thanks are due to the Research Council of Lithuania, which funded Usonienė and Šolienė’s research within the framework of project No MIP-062/2014 (*Modality and Evidentiality in the Lithuanian language*) and to the European Union Structural Funds project “Postdoctoral Fellowship Implementation in Lithuania”, which funded Šinkūnienė’s research for this article. We are also very grateful to the reviewers for their constructive criticism and advice, which has been very beneficial when working on the revision of the paper.

Usonienė, Aurelija, Audronė Šolienė and Jolanta Šinkūnienė. 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.

observable as is the case with *in fact* evolving into an additive marker (Lewis 2006). Diachronic studies provide sound evidence that the historical development of these adverbials is in line with the adverbial cline:

- (1) V Adv > IP Adv > (DM) > Discourse Particle (Traugott 1997)

The starting point for various lexical expressions is their functioning as a clause internal adverbial of manner, which further develops into a sentential adverbial of epistemic qualification of certainty and eventually it turns into a discourse marker of contrast and elaboration with textual and interpersonal functions (Bruti 1999; Traugott and Dasher 2003; Lewis 2006; Defour *et al.* 2010; Fanego 2010). It seems natural to expect that cross-linguistic cognates might follow this universal path of development. However authentic language-in-use data show that this is not the case. For instance, the French *actuellement* has remained stable as an adverbial modifier of time (Defour *et al.* 2010; Simon-Vandenberg 2013); it has not undergone intersubjectification and it has not evolved as an elaborative or contrastive discourse marker. Similarly the Lithuanian actuality cognate *aktualiai* is also a VP adverbial of manner. There have been found only eight occurrences of the Lithuanian cognate *faktiškai* ‘in fact’ as a TC for the English *in fact*, *actually*, *truly* in the parallel English-Lithuanian corpus (see section 3.2.). However the Corpus of Academic Lithuanian (CorALit) contains a few cases of its use as an elaborative or contrastive marker, a feature discussed in more detail in section 3.5., e.g.:

- (2) <...> išanalizavę praeities šaltinius, nustatė, kad iki XX a. antrosios pusės, **faktiškai** – iki okupacijų laikotarpio pradžios (iki 1940 m.), <...> dokumentuose dirvonai neminimi, <...>. (P 1846)  
‘Having analysed the sources, (they) found out that till the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, **in fact** – till the onset of the period of occupations (till 1940) there was no mention of the garrigue <...> in the documents <...>.’
- (3) Šios nepolitinės organizacijos turtas susidėjo iš jos globojamų mokyklų teikiamų lėšų <...> įvairių asmenų bei organizacijų

*aukų. Ji galėjo gauti ir valstybės paramą, tačiau faktiškai gimnazija ir kitos mokyklos buvo išlaikomos privačiomis lėšomis.*  
(H 927)

‘The assets of this non-political organization consisted of the funds received from the donations by its schools, various persons and other organizations. It could be supported by the state, however **in fact** the financing of the gymnasium and other schools was based on private funding.’

The most prototypical translation correspondences in Lithuanian for the English *in fact* and *actually* are expressions from the conceptual domains of TRUTH and REALITY, namely *tiesą sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the **truth**’ which can be transparently traced back to a comment clause and a prepositional phrase *iš tikrųjų/tikro* ‘in reality’. Table 1 gives the data of the most frequent TCs of *actually* and *in fact*. The entire translational paradigms of the adverbs in question are given in tables 6 and 7.

**Table 1.** The most frequent Lithuanian TCs for the English *actually* and *in fact*

EN-orig		LT-trans		EN-orig
raw	%		%	raw
		<b>TRUTH</b>		
	<b>29.5</b>		<b>45.6</b>	
	22.5	<i>tiesą sakant/pasakius</i> ‘to tell the <b>truth</b> ’	38.6	
	7	<i>iš tiesų, išties</i> ‘in truth/truly’	7	
<i>actually</i> (448)				<i>in fact</i> (246)
		<b>REALITY</b>		
	<b>19.5</b>		<b>11</b>	
	14.5	<i>iš tikrųjų/iš tikro</i> ‘in reality’	11	
	5	<i>tikrai</i> ‘really’	1	
	<b>34</b>	<b>Ø</b>	<b>27</b>	

As can be seen in table 1, the most common Lithuanian TCs for the English *in fact* and *actually* are two expressions of TRUTH, namely *tiesą sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the **truth**’ and *iš tiesų, išties* ‘in **truth**’. Moreover, the Lithuanian TCs for *in fact* appear to be more truth-based (45.6% of all the TCs) than those of *actually* (29.5%). Adverbials of

REALITY have been found to be more frequent among the TCs of *actually* than those of *in fact*.

The latest contrastive studies (Willems and Demol 2006; Simon-Vandenberg 2013) demonstrate that there is an overlap observed between the conceptual domains of ACT and FACT as well as between the domains of REALITY and TRUTH. However in Lithuanian the given overlap does not hold true. It is quite the opposite. It is the markers of the domains of TRUTH and REALITY that fill in the gap in the domains of ACT and FACT. Consider the data in table 2, which is based on the findings from the contrastive studies carried out so far.

**Table 2.** Core senses, cognates and the most frequent TCs in Germanic, Romance (Willems and Demol 2006; Aijmer 2007; Simon-Vandenberg 2013) and in Lithuanian

Semantic domains	FACT	ACT	REALITY	TRUTH
EN	<i>in fact</i>	<i>actually</i>	<i>really</i>	<i>truly</i>
FR	<i>en fait</i>	<i>en fait</i> *ACTUALLEMENT	<i>vraiment</i> 'truly' <i>réellement</i> 'really'	<i>vraiment</i> 'truly'
DU	<i>in feite</i>	<i>eigenlijk</i> 'in essence'	<i>werkelijk</i> , <i>echt</i> 'really'	<i>werkelijk</i> 'really'
SE	<i>faktiskt</i>	<i>faktiskt</i> <i>egentligen</i> 'actually'	<i>verkligen</i> 'really'	no studies found <sup>2</sup>
LT	<i>tiesą sakant/ pasakius</i> 'to tell the <b>truth</b> '  <i>FAKTIŠKAI</i> <sup>3</sup>	<i>tiesą sakant/ pasakius</i> 'to tell the <b>truth</b> '  *AKTUALIAI	<i>iš tikrųjų/ tikro</i> , 'in <b>reality</b> ' <i>tikrai</i> 'really'  *REALIAI	<i>iš tikrųjų/tikro</i> 'in reality' <i>iš tiesų, tiesą sakant/ pasakius</i> 'to tell the <b>truth</b> '

<sup>2</sup> As has been pointed out by one of the reviewers, there are a number of cognates for *truly* in Swedish (e.g., *sannerligen*); however, we have not found any empirical contrastive studies on *truly* in an English-Swedish perspective, therefore we can not claim that it is a most frequent TC of *truly*.

Thus, adverbials of TRUTH and REALITY in Lithuanian can be expected to have more functions and a broader range of meanings than their cognates in Germanic or Romance languages. The situation seems to be the opposite in Swedish, there are only three occurrences of the Swedish TC *i sanning* ‘in truth’ and three other correspondences of TRUTH *ju sannerligen* ‘truly as you know’, *om sanningen ska fram* ‘to tell the truth’ and *är de sant* ‘is it true’ found in the translations of the English *actually, in fact, really, indeed* (Aijmer 2007: 118-119), which might mean that the domain of TRUTH does not seem to be overlapping with the domains of FACT, ACT and REALITY. There are three key TCs that dominate in the three domains, namely *faktiskt* ‘in fact’, *i själva verket* ‘in actual fact’ and *verkligt* ‘really’.

The multifunctional nature of adverbials in general has been broadly analysed in linguistic literature (Biber *et al.* 1999; Hasselgård 2010; Lenker 2010). The findings of the studies carried out on the actuality and reality adverbials show that the most distinctive feature is their diverse semantic-pragmatic functioning (Bruti 1999; Traugott and Dasher 2002; Paradis 2003; Lewis 2006; Aijmer 2003, 2007; Mortier and Degand 2009; Defour *et al.* 2010; Simon-Vandenberghe 2013). The scholars unanimously agree that their meaning is very much context-dependent and the main functions performed can be summarised as follows: adversative and contrastive, elaborative and additive.

An increasing number of studies look at the semantic and functional potential of *in fact* and *actually* as well as their cognates in a variety of languages employing translational corpora or general spoken and written language corpora. The two markers, especially *in fact*, are also analysed in more specific fields, one of which is academic discourse. Traditionally pragmatic and rhetorical descriptions of *in fact* in academic discourse evolve around the categories of metadiscourse and emphasise its two major functions: reinforcement (i.e. strengthening of the proposition) and clarification (i.e. reformulation) though they do not necessarily have to be mutually exclusive. Mur Dueñas (2011) lists *in fact* together with its Spanish equivalent *de hecho* in the metadiscoursal category of boosters, the function of which is to emphasise the writer’s certainty about the proposition. Bellés Fortuño (2006: 135) notes that while *de hecho* acts as

---

<sup>3</sup> There have been found only a few cases of the Lithuanian adverb *faktiškai* ‘in fact’ as a TC, therefore it has not been asterisked in the table and its use in academic Lithuanian is discussed in 3.5.

an emphasiser in some contexts, it can perform the function of a reformulator in other contexts. In the same vein Hyland (2005) considers *in fact* both a booster and a code gloss, another metadiscourse category the function of which is to supply “additional information, by rephrasing, explaining or elaborating what has been said” (Hyland 2005: 52).

Almeida and Adams (2012) call *in fact* and *de hecho*, alongside with *indeed*, factual adverbs and discuss them under the category of evidentiality. Grossmann and Wirth (2007) analyse *in fact* and its French cognate *en fait* in scientific texts alongside other expectation markers. As part of the study, the authors investigate what functions characterise both markers in a comparable corpus of French and English research articles in linguistics, medicine and economics. Their results show that while some functions of the two markers overlap, some are more prominent for one or another marker in different languages. Grossmann and Wirth (2007: 217) conclude that *in fact* and *en fait* are good examples “of the way in which the reference to facts can be used in the scientific argumentation both to contradict and justify”.

We can see that data from various languages obtained from a variety of corpora can help to cast light on the evasive semantic and pragmatic nature of such linguistic items as *in fact* and *actually*. Speaking in favour of “translation method”, Aijmer *et al.* (2006: 113) convincingly argue that it can ultimately provide “insights into the question of multifunctionality and how it relates to semantic and pragmatic polysemy”. The authors also emphasise the need for more empirical work in different languages. Thus the present paper will look at the semantic properties of the Lithuanian TCs of *in fact* and *actually* as well as at their pragmatic and rhetorical functions in fiction and academic discourse.

The paper is structured as follows: section 2 describes the data and methods employed in the study, sections 3.1 – 3.4 describe the results obtained from translational corpora and section 3.5 looks at the findings from the Lithuanian academic corpus. Section 4 gives some concluding observations.

## 2. Methods and data

The method used in this study is a contrastive analysis based on several corpora. A parallel corpus has been proved to be a very reliable and

efficient tool for diagnosing the range of language specific realizations and semantic-pragmatic diversification of different linguistic items. The possibility of combining comparable and parallel corpora allowed us to pin down cross-linguistic differences and similarities of the adverbials in question that would not have been noticed otherwise.

The empirical data for the present paper have been obtained from a self-compiled bidirectional parallel corpus – ParaCorp<sub>EN→LT→EN</sub> (see Usonienė and Šolienė 2010). The corpus design follows the model of the English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus (Johansson 2007) and the only difference is that non-fiction texts are not included in ParaCorp<sub>EN→LT→EN</sub>. The corpus 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 model is that it allows different kinds of comparison and can be used both as a parallel corpus and a comparable corpus (Johansson 2007: 11). The present size of the corpus is about 5 million words (see table 3).

**Table 3.** The size of the two sub-corpora ParaCorp<sub>EN→LT</sub> and ParaCorp<sub>LT→EN</sub>

	Original	Translation	Total
ParaCorp <sub>EN→LT</sub>	1, 983, 266	1, 541, 038	3, 524, 304
ParaCorp <sub>LT→EN</sub>	608, 426	788, 897	1, 397, 323

Dyvik’s (2004: 311-326) method of “semantic mirrors” implies that the meaning of a lexical item is looked at as mirrored in its translations in another language. In this way, translational paradigms are established. Translational paradigms show, for example, which translations are more frequent or prototypical, and which are less frequent. Further, by looking at back-translations we can determine how strong the cross-linguistic correlation between the two or more items under consideration is. So, by going back and forth between languages we can determine not only the strength of the TCs but also the closeness of items in one language.

The study also employs a specialised, synchronic corpus of written academic Lithuanian which consists of about 9 million words of authentic material. The corpus covers 5 major science areas: Biomedical sciences (B), Humanities (H), Physical Sciences (P), Social Sciences (S) and Technological sciences (T), thus allowing the analysis of TCs of *in*

*fact* and *actually* both in soft and hard science fields. The structure and size of CorALit is shown in table 4:

**Table 4.** The structure and size of CorALit

Science area	Number of words
Biomedical sciences (B)	1, 638, 444
Humanities (H)	2, 028, 906
Physical sciences (P)	1, 510, 981
Social sciences (S)	1, 527, 455
Technological sciences (T)	1, 964, 827
<b>Total:</b>	<b>8, 670, 613</b>

Occasional reference has also been made to a self-compiled comparable research article corpus of academic Lithuanian and English (LERAC) and the Corpus of Contemporary Lithuanian Language (CCLL). The size of LERAC is roughly 600, 000 words, whereas CCLL comprises 140, 921, 288 words.

Frequencies of particular patterns and uses are of crucial importance to this study, since frequency can be an important factor in specification of meaning (Leech 2003; Simon-Vandenberg and Aijmer 2007). Since the sub-corpora are of different size, the raw frequency numbers have been normalised per 10,000 words. Furthermore, in order to check whether the similarities and differences are statistically significant, the log-likelihood test<sup>4</sup> was performed, which is commonly considered to be a more statistically reliable test than the chi-square test (cf. Dunning 1993). The cut-off value for statistical significance at the 1% level used in this research is 6.63 ( $p < 0.01$ ).

### 3. Findings

The data from the bidirectional parallel corpus ParaCorp<sub>EN→LT→EN</sub> have made it possible to contrast the adverbs of actuality in the two languages and to provide a better picture of similarities, differences and overlapping meanings.

---

<sup>4</sup> Available at: <http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/llwizard.html>. The log likelihood test results come under the header LL in the tables.

### 3.1. Overall frequencies

The first stage of the analysis examined the frequencies of *in fact* and *actually* in the source and target English texts. The source English texts are referred to using the abbreviation EN-orig, whereas target English is marked as EN-trans. Table 5 displays the frequencies of the two actuality adverbs.

**Table 5.** Frequencies of *in fact* and *actually* in ParaCorp<sub>EN→LT→EN</sub>

	EN-orig		EN-trans		LL
	raw	f/10,000	raw	f/10,000	
<i>in fact</i>	246	1.24	53	0.67	+ 18.6
<i>actually</i>	448	2.26	134	1.70	+ 8.8
<b>Total</b>	694	<b>3.5</b>	187	<b>2.37</b>	<b>+ 24</b>

The fact that *actually* is the more frequent of the two adverbs did not come as a surprise. This is in line with similar corpus-based studies by Biber *et al.* (1999), Aijmer (2003, 2007), and Simon-Vandenberg (2013). The most striking difference observed in table 5 is the much higher frequency of both adverbs in the English originals. The log likelihood score (+24) indicates a statistically significant difference in the frequency of *in fact* and *actually* in original English as compared to their frequency in translated English. In order to find the reasons why translators do not opt for *in fact* or *actually* so frequently when translating from Lithuanian into English, we took a closer look at the translational paradigms of the adverbs in question.

### 3.2. The translational paradigms of *in fact* and *actually*

The translational paradigm, as claimed in Aijmer (2003, 2007), Aijmer and Simon-Vandenberg (2004), and Simon-Vandenberg (2013), is a reliable tool for the investigation of multifunctional items. The analysis of the translations of *in fact* and *actually* into Lithuanian showed a great range of their TCs, which signals their multifunctional nature. The adverb *in fact* was translated into Lithuanian in 26 different ways, whereas *actually* can boast of as many as 49 different translation correspondences. Table 6 gives a translational paradigm for *in fact*:

**Table 6.** Lithuanian translations of *in fact* in ParaCorp<sub>EN→LT→EN</sub>

TCs in LT-trans	raw	%
<i>tiesą sakant/pasakius</i> 'to tell the truth'	95	38.62
<i>iš tikrųjų/tikro</i> 'in reality'	28	11.38
<i>atvirai kalbant/pasakius</i> 'to talk openly/to say honestly'	7	2.85
<i>net(gi)</i> 'even'	8	3.25
<i>iš tiesų</i> 'in truth/truly'	18	7.32
<i>tikrai</i> 'really'	1	0.41
<i>faktiškai</i> 'in fact'	1	0.41
other <sup>5</sup>	19	7.72
∅	69	28.05
<b>Total</b>	246	100

As can be seen from table 6, the prototypical translation correspondence of *in fact* in Lithuanian is *tiesą sakant/pasakius* 'to tell the truth', which makes up 38.6 % of all the concordance. The semantic cognate *faktiškai* 'in fact' is practically non-existent; only one case has been attested in the data, e.g.:

- (5) EN-orig: *Keeping his left hand, which was still numb from cold, in the pocket of his coat, he sat at the piano and played the passage as he had written it, slow, chromatic and rhythmically tricky. There were two time signatures **in fact**.*

LT-trans: *Neištraukdamas iš palto kišenės nuo šalčio sustirusios kairės rankos, jis sėdo prie fortepijono ir sugrojo naujai užrašytą pasažą - lėtą, chromatinį, žaismingo ritmo. **Faktiškai** jį tesudarė du taktai*

<sup>5</sup> The category *Other* includes such compensatory singleton translations as *regis* 'it seems', *rodės* 'it seemed/seemingly', *tiksčiau* 'more exactly', *pavyzdžiui* 'for example', etc.

Similarly, in Italian, the functional equivalence of *infatti* and *in fact* also amounts to almost nothing. They share only two functions in discourse: “They can function as topic management indicators and signal thematic connectedness in monologic discourse” (Bruti 1999: 531).

However, the results obtained in some other studies are different. Simon-Vandenberg’s study (2013) showed that in Dutch the most frequent translation of *in fact* was its semantic cognate *in feite* (17 %) and in French it was also *en fait* (33%). The findings in Aijmer (2007) also demonstrate that *in fact* is mainly translated by the Swedish *faktiskt* (32 % or 24 cases out of 75).

Since *in fact* and *actually* are closely related both in their meaning and etymology (cf. Schwenter and Traugott 2000; Traugott and Dasher 2002), the next reasonable step in the analysis was to consider the translational paradigm of *actually* and to compare it with the one of *in fact*. Table 7 illustrates a translational paradigm for *actually* based on translations from English into Lithuanian.

**Table 7.** Lithuanian translations of *actually* in ParaCorp<sub>EN→LT→EN</sub>

TCs in LT-trans	raw	%
<i>tiesą sakant/pasakius</i> ‘to tell the truth’	101	22.54
<i>iš tikrųjų/tikro</i> ‘in reality’	65	14.51
<i>iš tiesų, išties</i> ‘in truth/truly’	31	6.92
<i>tikrai</i> ‘really’	25	5.58
<i>net(gi), negi</i> ‘even’	13	2.90
<i>faktiškai</i> ‘in fact’	7	1.56
<i>tikriau/tiksliau pasakius</i> ‘to put it more precisely’	3	0.67
other <sup>6</sup>	49	10.94
∅	154	34.38
<b>Total</b>	448	100

<sup>6</sup>The category *Other* includes such compensatory singleton translations as *įdėmiai* ‘attentively’, *beje* ‘by the way’, *vos* ‘merely’, *na* ‘well’, etc.

The results demonstrate that *actually* is translated into Lithuanian by the same prototypical TCs with slight differences in frequency. The adverbials *tiesą sakant* and *tiesą pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’ have shown the highest rate of occurrences in translation from English (22.5 %). There’s no need to comment the Lithuanian cognate *aktualiai* ‘actually’ since it has never featured as a translation correspondence of *actually* in our dataset: in contemporary Lithuanian, it can only be a circumstantial adverbial in the meaning of ‘in an important manner’ and will never function as a propositional modifier or a discourse marker. Similarly, the French cognate *actuellement* is used as a time adverbial only and the semantic domain of ACT is filled in by *en fait* (Defour *et al.* 2010; Simon-Vandenberg and Willems 2011).

### 3.3. The semantic domains of TRUTH and REALITY and translation correspondences

The great number of shared translations is indicative of the semantic closeness of the two adverbs in question (Aijmer and Simon-Vandenberg 2004: 1786; Aijmer 2007: 112). The shared TCs of both *actually* and *in fact* are given in table 8. The calculations are presented in the following way: the raw frequencies come first; then the percentage is given (note that only the prototypical TCs have been considered here; for a more detailed picture of TCs see tables 6 and 7).

**Table 8.** The main shared Lithuanian TCs of *actually* and *in fact* in ParaCorp<sub>EN→LT→EN</sub>

	raw (%)	LT translation correspondences	raw (%)	
<i>actually</i> (n=448)	101 (22.5 %)	<i>tiesą sakant/pasakius</i> ‘to tell the truth’	95 (38.6 %)	<i>in fact</i> (n=246)
	31 (7 %)	<i>iš tiesų, išties</i> ‘in truth/truly’	18 (7 %)	
	65 (14.5 %)	<i>iš tikrųjų/tikro</i> ‘in reality’	28 (11 %)	
	25 (5.6 %)	<i>tikrai</i> ‘really’	1 (0.4 %)	
	153 (34 %)	∅	67 (27 %)	

The TCs are particularly interesting in view of the semantic concepts involved. The prototypical translations in table 8 mainly belong to the semantic domains of TRUTH and REALITY. The representatives of the TRUTH domain are *tiesą sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’ and *iš tiesų/išties* ‘in truth/truly’. This semantic domain incorporates the biggest number of Lithuanian correspondences of *in fact*: 45.6 % of its TCs come from the source domain of TRUTH. Similarly, 39.5 % of the TCs of *actually* belong to the same domain. The most frequent translation is *tiesą sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’, for both *in fact* and *actually*. Sentences (6) and (7) illustrate overlaps of the semantic domains:

- (6) EN-orig: *In fact, I didn't know that cats could grin.*  
 LT-trans: *Tiesą pasakius, nežinojau, kad katės iš viso moka juoktis.*
- (7) EN-orig: *Hatsumomo wasn't actually old; she was only twenty-eight or twenty-nine.*  
 LT-trans: *Tiesą pasakius, Hacumomo visai neatrodė sena. Jai buvo tik kokie dvidešimt aštuoneri ar dvidešimt devyneri metai.*

Although the Lithuanian translation correspondences seem not to fit into the frame of prototypical domains – FACT or ACT – that does not mean that they are bad or erroneous translations (cf. Aijmer 2003: 24). On the contrary, they are more acceptable choices of translation in certain contexts. Furthermore, the representatives of the domain of TRUTH are the most frequent expressions in the ParaCorp<sub>EN→LT→EN</sub> dataset; thus, they may be regarded as closer correspondences of *in fact* than the representatives of the prototypical domain, such as *faktiškai* ‘in fact’.

The second semantic block of translation correspondences refers to reality. The representatives of the REALITY domain include *iš tikrųjų/iš tikro* ‘in reality’ and *tikrai* ‘really’. The translations show that there are connections between the domains of ACT, FACT and reality. The TCs whose source domain is REALITY make up 11.4 % of all the translational paradigm of *in fact* and 20.1 % of *actually*, respectively. The following examples from ParaCorp<sub>EN→LT→EN</sub> illustrate that *iš tikrųjų* ‘in reality’ can cover the domain of ACT and FACT in Lithuanian:

- (8) EN-orig: *This fresco, **in fact**, is the entire key to the Holy Grail <...>.*  
LT-trans: ***Iš tikrujų** ši freska yra tikras raktas į Šventojo Gralio paslaptį.*
- (9) EN-orig: *Father **actually** considered sending me to Durmstrang rather than Hogwarts, you know.*  
LT-trans: *Suprantat, tėvas **iš tikrujų** labiau norėjo mane siųsti į Durmštrangą, o ne Hogvartsq.*

It is important to mention that the two semantic domains of TRUTH and REALITY dominate over other domains which have been labelled as FACT and ACT. The adverbials “*actually* and *in fact* share a number of translations [ . . . ], and are therefore close in meaning” (Aijmer and Simon-Vandenberg 2004: 1786) and the Lithuanian translation data support this claim. Furthermore, the Lithuanian findings are very much in line with the study by Hasselgård (2009), where she compares the semantic-pragmatic profiles of *in fact* and its Norwegian cognate *faktisk* based on the translation data from the English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus and states that: “The meanings ‘true’ and ‘in reality’ are more frequent in Norwegian than in English, which may point to differences in the grammaticalisation processes in the two languages” (Hasselgård 2009: 259).

#### 3.4. Back-translations and cross-matching of frequencies

The most frequent correspondence of *actually* and *in fact* proved to be the Lithuanian adverbial *tiesą sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’. The fact that needs commenting is the remarkable difference in the frequency of its use in the Lithuanian original and Lithuanian translated texts. Consider the data in table 9:

**Table 9.** Frequencies of *tiesq sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’ in ParaCorp<sub>EN→LT→EN</sub>

	LT-orig		LT-trans		LL
	raw	f/10,000	raw	f/10,000	
<i>tiesq sakant/pasakius</i> ‘to tell the truth’	22	<b>0.36</b>	355	<b>2.30</b>	-124.09

The log likelihood score (-124.09) shows a statistically significant predominance of *tiesq sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’ in translated Lithuanian, whereas in the original fiction texts it is not frequent. Moreover, *tiesq sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’ is not frequent in other types of discourse as well: in the CorALit corpus its frequency is only 0.05 and in CCLL it amounts to 0.6.

If we consider the concordance of *actually* in the translated English texts (i.e. its back-translations), we will see that it amounts to 134 occurrences. Its translational paradigm consists of as many as 24 different Lithuanian correspondences, and *tiesq sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’ is used only 4 times, which makes 3 % of all the TCs. A similar situation is observed with the TCs of *in fact*. It shows that the translators do not opt for *actually* or *in fact* as a prototypical TC when they translate *tiesq sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’ into English. Some other TCs come into play (see table 10).

**Table 10.** English translations of *tiesą sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’ in the EN-trans sub-corpus

TCs in EN-trans	raw	%
<i>to tell the truth</i>	6	27.3
<i>in truth</i>	1	4.5
<i>in fact</i>	2	9.1
<i>the fact is</i>	1	4.5
<i>actually</i>	4	18.2
<i>to be frank/honest/candid</i>	4	18.2
<i>really</i>	1	4.5
<i>as it happened</i>	1	4.5
∅	2	9.1
<b>Total</b>	22	100.0

As can be seen from table 10, *tiesą sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’ exhibits eight different TCs. The most common TC turned to be its English cognate *to tell the truth*, which makes up 27 % of all its correspondences. However, the frequency of *to tell the truth* and its Lithuanian cognate *tiesą sakant/pasakius* is very low both in the original and in translation. A very high level of cross-linguistic mismatch between the pairs of prototypical correspondences in the original and translation sub-corpora can be explained by the fact that the Lithuanian cognates of *actually* and *in fact* mostly function as VP adverbials; they have not yet advanced on the path of semantic change. The data from the fiction texts show that *faktiškai* ‘in fact’ and *aktualiai* ‘actually’ are not as functionally diverse as their English cognates and cannot be treated as their functional correspondences. This gap is compensated by expressions from the TRUTH and REALITY domains in Lithuanian, which demonstrates that in the Lithuanian translation there is a high overuse of Lithuanian cognate for *to tell the truth*. The translational paradigm for the Lithuanian discourse marker *tiesą sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’ is given in table 11. It shows the English original sources of *tiesą sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’.

**Table 11.** The translational paradigm of *tiesq sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’ in the EN-orig sub-corpus

<b>TCs in EN-orig</b>	<b>raw</b>	<b>%</b>
<i>actually</i>	101	28.5
<i>in fact</i>	95	26.8
<i>really/in reality</i>	28	7.9
<i>indeed</i>	15	4.2
<i>the truth is/was</i>	12	3.4
<i>to tell the truth</i>	15	4.2
<i>if truth be told</i>	4	1.1
<i>truthfully</i>	7	2.0
<i>in truth</i>	6	1.7
<i>it is/was true</i>	3	0.8
<i>frankly</i>	2	0.6
<i>honestly/to be honest</i>	12	3.4
<i>to be fair/it is fair to say</i>	2	0.6
<i>in effect</i>	3	0.8
<i>exactly</i>	8	2.3
<i>admittedly</i>	2	0.6
<i>as a matter of fact</i>	1	0.3
<i>in practice/in principle</i>	2	0.6
<i>you know/well</i>	4	1.1
Other	18	5.1
∅	15	4.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The back-translations confirm the fact the Lithuanian *tiesq sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’ is a good match for the English *actually* and *in fact*. *Tiesq sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’ also exhibits a great variety of other TCs in the English source texts: its translational

paradigm includes more than 20 different TCs, which witnesses its multifunctional potential. The findings are in line with the claim made in Aijmer and Simon-Vandenberg (2004: 1794) that “looking at the back-translations provides additional information on the strength of a particular equivalent”.

The typical semantic-pragmatic profile of the Lithuanian *tiesą sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’ encompasses its main functions as an elaboration marker and a hedge. Interestingly, in approximately half of the occurrences of *actually* (53 occurrences out of 101), when it was translated as *tiesą sakant* ‘to tell the truth’, *actually* figured in the initial sentence position and acted as an elaboration marker (sentence (10)) or a hedge (sentence (11)):

(10) EN-orig: *The ending of the school year did not give me the pleasure it seemed to give the other students. **Actually**, I felt nervous to the point of nausea whenever I thought of it.*

LT-trans: *Mokslo metų pabaiga man neteikė tokio malonumo, kaip, regis, kitiems moksleiviams. **Tiesą sakant**, apie tai pagalvojusi susinervindavau iki blogumo.*

(11) EN-orig: *He paused, looking more confused with every moment. “**Actually**, I think I’d like to use the rest room.”*

LT-trans: *Jis stabtelėjo, kas akimirka jausdamasis vis nesmagiau. — **Tiesą sakant**, mieliau užsukčiau į tualetą.*

If the TC of *actually* was *iš tikrųjų/iš tikro* ‘in reality’ and *iš tiesų, išties* ‘in truth/truly’, its function was predominantly adversative. In such contexts *actually* was usually accompanied by the adversative conjunction *but*, e.g.:

(12) EN-orig: *You may be right. **But actually** Da Vinci left a big clue that the painting was supposed to be androgynous.*

LT-trans: – *Galbūt jūs ir teisus. Bet **iš tikrųjų** Da Vinčis paliko rimtą užuominą, parodančią, jog nutapytas asmuo turėtų būti traktuojamas kaip dvilytis.*

Differently from *iš tikrųjų/iš tikro* ‘in reality’ and *iš tiesų, išties* ‘in truth/truly’, which can strengthen the proposition and boost the force of

an utterance or act as adversatives, *tiesą sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’ would not normally act as an emphasiser, but perform the role of an adversative or topic switcher, e.g.:

- (13) EN-orig: "You're right." "How does your arm feel?" "Just fine." **Actually**, it was starting to blaze under the bandage. I wanted ice.

LT-orig: – *Kaip ranka? – Viskas gerai. Tiesą sakant, po tvarsčiu ji degte degė. Norėjau ledo.*

- (14) EN-orig: What? Do you need help with Calculus?" Her tone was a tad sour. "No." I shook my head. "Actually, I wanted to know if you would... go to the movies with me tonight?"

LT-trans: ... *jos balsas buvo gaižokas. – Ne, – papurčiau galvą. – Tiesą sakant, norėjau paklausti, ar ... šįvakar nenueitum su manim į kiną?*

All the three Lithuanian TCs *iš tikrųjų/tikro* ‘in reality’, *iš tiesų, išties* ‘in truth/truly’ and *tiesą sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’ fully match and reflect the functional profile of *actually* and *in fact*. The adverbials *iš tikrųjų/tikro* ‘in reality’ are not typically used as hedges, whereas emphasis is not the main function of *tiesą sakant/pasakius* ‘to tell the truth’. Adversative and elaboration functions are also characteristic of these adverbials.

### 3.5. Distribution and functions of the cognates and TCs of *in fact* and *actually* in Lithuanian academic discourse

The two most frequently shared TCs of both *in fact* and *actually* are *tiesą sakant* ‘to tell the truth’ and *iš tikrųjų* ‘in reality’ as has been already shown in table 8. In order to show the semantic and pragmatic potential of the TCs of the two analysed markers, we will look at the functions they perform in Lithuanian academic discourse and compare them with the functions traditionally attributed to *in fact* and *actually*. We will also look at the distribution and functions of the cognate of *in fact*, i.e. *faktiškai*.

Table 12 presents the frequency of occurrences of *tiesą sakant* ‘to tell the truth’, *iš tikrųjų* ‘in reality’ and *faktiškai* ‘in fact’ normalised per

10,000 words in five major science areas of CorALit: Biomedical sciences (B), Humanities (H), Physical Sciences (P), Social Sciences (S) and Technological sciences (T). The raw frequency numbers are given in parenthesis.

**Table 12.** Frequencies of *in fact* and *actually* TCs in CorALit

TCs and cognates	B	H	P	S	T
<i>faktiškai</i> 'in fact'	0.1 (19)	0.5 (104)	0.6 (84)	0.8 (125)	0.2 (40)
<i>tiesą sakant</i> 'to tell the truth'	0.0 (1)	0.1 (19)	0.1 (12)	0.1 (12)	-
<i>iš tikrųjų/tikro</i> 'in reality'	0.2 (36)	0.8 (168)	0.5 (78)	1.1 (169)	0.3 (57)

As can be seen from table 12, all three markers are used in Lithuanian academic discourse, but they are not very frequent. *Tiesą sakant* 'to tell the truth', which was the most frequent TC of both *in fact* and *actually* in fiction, is used only marginally in academic discourse. Humanities, social sciences and physical sciences employ most of the three markers, while there were less of them in biomedical sciences and technology texts.

While it is true that the Lithuanian semantic cognate of *in fact* frequently occurs in its original manner meaning in academic discourse, its sentence adverbial function is also noticeable. It should be noted though that the functions *faktiškai* performs in Lithuanian academic discourse seem to be even more diverse than those of *in fact* in English. Apart from its contrastive function, mentioned in the introduction, which is quite rare, *faktiškai* 'in fact' is more frequent as an elaboration marker. Used in this way, it also acts as a tool for the authors of scientific text to enhance the strength of their propositions, for example:

- (15) *Tinklalapiai nebūtinai turi būti tik statiniai arba tik dinaminiai. Faktiškai dauguma didelių tinklalapių suderina abu puslapių organizavimo būdus.* (H 1412)

‘Webpages do not necessarily have to be either static or dynamic. **In fact**, most of the major webpages combine both ways of organization.’

In (15) *faktiškai* ‘in fact’ strengthens the proposition in the previous sentence by providing additional support. This function of *faktiškai* ‘in fact’ corresponds to the typical usage of the English *in fact* as an emphasiser noted by many previous studies. Consider sentence (16) from a linguistic paper of the LERAC corpus:

- (16) *This is, of course, not the only method by which speakers can move into the closing section of a telephone call nor are these MST turns necessarily always found solely in this location in sequence. **In fact** such multi-unit multi-action turns can be found at various points in talk and can close and initiate many different types of sequence.*

*Faktiškai* ‘in fact’ and *in fact* in sentences (15) and (16) are very similar, and resemble what Aijmer (2003: 29) calls “rhetorical” *in fact*. According to Schwenter and Traugott (2000: 12) such uses of *in fact* are rhetorical choices of the speaker that also do metatextual work. Acting as argumentative reinforcement markers, both *faktiškai* and *in fact* in (15) and (16) help authors structure their argument in a more effective way, drawing and focusing the reader’s attention on the proposition which follows.

Apart from the strengthening function, *faktiškai* ‘in fact’ can also occur in contexts where it seems to neither perform an emphasiser, nor a reformulation marker function, but rather that of a hedge, for example:

- (17) *Įdomi ikimokyklinio ugdymo patirtis sukaupta Japonijoje. **Faktiškai** visos ikimokyklinio ugdymo įstaigos yra dviejų tipų: darželiai ir dienos rūpybos centrai. (S 222)*  
 ‘Interesting pre-school practice can be observed in Japan. **Essentially** all pre-school institutions are of two types: kindergartens and day care centers.’

In (17) the closest equivalent to *faktiškai* ‘in fact’ seems to be *essentially*. If the claim of the author were not modified by *faktiškai*, it would sound very categorical. Compare the unmodified version of (17):

- (17a) ‘Interesting pre-school practice can be observed in Japan. All pre-school institutions are of two types: kindergartens and day care centers.

The function *faktiškai* ‘in fact’ performs in (17) seems to be that of a specific kind of hedges that Hyland (2001) calls “attribute hedges”. Their primary function is not to show the author’s epistemic commitment to the proposition, but rather to “limit the scope of the accompanying statement” (Hyland 2001: 301). The idea that *faktiškai* ‘in fact’ acts as an attribute hedge in (17) is further strengthened by the author’s argumentation in the text which follows after some sentences in between (17) and (18):

- (18) *Darželiai ir dienos rūpybos centrai nėra vienintelės ikimokyklinio ugdymo institucijos. Vaikai papildomai lanko įvairias pamokas.* (S 222)  
‘Kindergartens and day care centers **are not the only** pre-school institutions. Children additionally attend various classes.’

The fact that kindergartens and day care centres are not the only two types of pre-school institutions explains *faktiškai* in example (17). It signals that the scope of the claim is limited to being *mainly* the case rather than absolutely true.

It is difficult to say why *faktiškai* ‘in fact’ is a very rare TC of *in fact*. Perhaps one of the reasons could be the fact that *faktiškai* ‘in fact’ seems to occur in more formal contexts than fiction. Aijmer’s (2003) study of *in fact* translation correspondences, among which the cognate *faktiskt* was the most frequent, is balanced in terms of fictional and non-fictional texts, whereas ParaCorp<sub>EN→LT→EN</sub> is only composed of fictional material. The search for *faktiškai* ‘in fact’ in CCLL reveals that the biggest number of hits comes from non-fictional literature (958 hits) and administrative literature (951 hits) as compared to the fictional part of the corpus which yields only 157 hits and these come primarily from recently published fiction sources or translations. Since the sub-corpora of CCLL are non-

equivalent in size (the non-fictional literature sub-corpus contains 1, 373, 828 words, the administrative literature sub-corpus – 1, 380, 167 words and the sub-corpus of fiction – 919, 115 words) a valid comparison can only be made considering normalised frequency which is 7 vs 6.9 vs 1.7 occurrences per 10,000 words respectively. As we can see, the number of *faktiškai* ‘in fact’ is marginal in fiction so its usage might generally be more preferred in more formal contexts in Lithuanian.

Just like in translations, in those rare cases when *tiesą sakant* ‘to tell the truth’, the most frequent TC of *in fact* and *actually*, is used in academic discourse; it primarily functions as a hedge or as an elaboration marker. A typical example of elaboration is illustrated in (19):

- (19) *Respondentų požiūris į daugelį žmogaus gyvenimą įprasminančių dalykų paviršutiniškas ir nemotyvuotas. Tiesą sakant, silpnųjų ir vertybės silpnos, dažnai tiesiog nėra poreikio mąstyti apie tai, kas gyvenime svarbiausia <...>. (H 634)*  
 ‘The respondents’ attitude towards many aspects enriching human life is superficial and without motivation. **In fact**, the values of the weak are often weak themselves, frequently reflecting no need to contemplate the most important aspects of life.’

The functions of *iš tikrųjų* ‘in reality’, the second most frequent TC of *in fact* and *actually*, in academic discourse are primarily those of an emphasiser (20) and an adversative marker (21).

- (20) *Štai kodėl Platonas gilioje senovėje taip glaudžiai siejo gimnastiką su muzika. Iš tikrųjų tokios sporto šakos, kaip meninė, ritminė gimnastika, dailusis čiuožimas yra meno ir sporto derinys. (H 2084)*  
 ‘That is why in ancient times Plato linked gymnastics with music so closely. **In fact** such sports as free calisthenics and figure skating are a combination of art and sports.’
- (21) *Šis požiūris remiasi klaidinga prielaida, kad BUSP stiprėjimas gali pakenkti transatlantiniam ryšiui. Iš tikrųjų stipri BUSP transatlantiniams santykiams pakenktų mažiau nei dabar*

*Lietuvos patiriama žala dėl silpnos tarpvyriausybinių BUSP. (S 51)*

‘This view is based on a false assumption that the strengthening of CFSP can harm transatlantic relationships. **In fact** strong CFSP would harm transatlantic relationships less than the current weak inter-governmental CFSP which causes harm to Lithuania.’

It is interesting to note that there is one more marker in Lithuanian academic discourse which does not appear in the translational paradigms of *in fact* and *actually* but is close in its usage and functions to the contrastive meanings conveyed by *actually* and *in fact*. It is *tiesa* ‘truly/truthfully’, and it belongs to the conceptual domain of TRUTH. The parenthetical *tiesa* ‘truly/truthfully’ is frequent in Lithuanian and makes up about 60% of the concordance of nominal complement-taking predicate (CTP) *tiesa* ‘truth’NOM.SG in CCLL and 78% in CorALit (Usonienė 2014).

The predominant usage of *tiesa* ‘truly/truthfully’ as a discourse marker in a sentence initial position is that of adjusting, restricting or limiting the previous claim, as in examples (22) and (23):

(22) *Tolesnėje kultūros raidoje žmogaus kūnas, kaip psichofizinis organizmas, pamažu nustojo viešpatavęs materialinėje kultūroje. Tiesa, jo svarba visai nebuvo sumenkinta, bet tiesioginė veikimo sfera vis labiau siaurinama. (H 2084)*

‘In the further development of culture, the body of the human as a psychophysical organism, slowly ceased to rule the material culture. **Actually**, its significance was not diminished completely, but the direct field of influence increasingly became narrower.’

(23) *Šios aplinkybės lėmė tai, kad H. Elenbergo skalė tapo bene populiariausia tarp Europos floros tyrinėtojų. Tiesa, mums nepavyko rasti kai kurių rūšių įvertinimo dėl visiems suprantamų priežasčių <...>. (B 717)*

‘These circumstances determined that Elenberg’s scale became one of the most popular among the investigators of European

flora. **In fact**, we were not able to find the evaluation of some of the species <....>.’

In (22), *tiesa* ‘truly/truthfully’ comes quite close to the meaning of *actually* in its use in a sentence initial position which is mentioned by Oh (2000: 250): “actually functions to contradict an expectation, which has been raised in the prior discourse“. Perhaps in the case of *tiesa* ‘truly/truthfully’ it is not an absolutely adversative claim that is presented, but it does signal that an adjustment of the claim will follow. *Tiesa* ‘truly/truthfully’ in sentence (23) also appears to be matching the adjustment/rectification (restriction) value of *in fact* and *en fait* offered by Grossmann and Wirth (2007: 214). The authors do not develop further the description of this particular function of both markers at the sentence initial position, limiting their observations just to the fact that it is more frequent in French. However, it seems that a similar value of adjustment is also characteristic of *tiesa* ‘truly/truthfully’. The distribution of *tiesa* ‘truly/truthfully’ in different Lithuanian science fields reflects frequency trends typical of TCs of *in fact* and *actually* (see table 13 where the frequency is normalised to 10,000 words and raw frequency numbers are provided in brackets):

**Table 13.** Frequencies of *tiesa* ‘truly/truthfully’ in CorALit

	<b>B</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>T</b>
<i>tiesa</i> ‘truly/truthfully’	0.20 (32)	2.27 (461)	0.64 (96)	1.72 (263)	0.20 (40)

It is most frequent in the soft fields and used to a much less extent in the hard fields with physical sciences occupying a middle position. A similar pattern of frequency distribution is noted by Grossmann and Wirth (2007) for *in fact*. They found that out of the three disciplines (linguistics, economics and medicine); it is linguists who most frequently use *in fact* whereas this marker is only marginal in medical articles. Bearing in mind the argumentative nature of *in fact* and its functionally similar markers in Lithuanian, this confirms the general inclination of researchers in soft science domains to resort more actively to various argumentative techniques in order to sound more convincing rhetorically (cf. Hyland 2008).

If we look at the translation correspondences of *tiesa* ‘truly/truthfully’ when it is rendered into English in ParaCorp<sub>EN→LT→EN</sub>, *actually* or *in fact* are not frequent choices. *In fact* was never used by translators and *actually* occurred only several times, as in (24):

- (24) LT-orig: <...> *bet per vienuolika dienų surenčiau kieme dailų pasakų namelį. Tiesa, paskutines keturias dienas man padėjo du kaimynai.*  
EN-trans: *I had never before tried my hand at carpentry, but in eleven days I had built a lovely storybook house. Actually, during the last four days two neighbors helped me.*

The most frequent TCs of *tiesa* ‘truly/truthfully’ are various conjunctions of contrast:

- (25) LT-orig: *Tiesa, net tapęs „laisvu žmogumi“ Šiaurės Afrikoje jis jautėsi it kalėjime.*  
EN-trans: *But even as a "free man" in North Africa, he felt imprisoned.*
- (26) LT-orig: *Tiesa, moteris ir vaikus atskyrė nuo vyrų, mums buvo skirtas geresnis denis, patogesnės kajutės.*  
EN-trans: *The way the boat is set up, the women and children are separated from the men however, we got the better deck and the more comfortable cabins.*

As has already been shown in previous sections, *in fact* and *actually* are rarely conceptualised as conveying the TRUTH element of the Lithuanian markers in translations from Lithuanian, even though functionally they seem very similar.

#### 4. Concluding observations

The combination of different corpus types proved to be successful and beneficial for a better understanding of the polysemy and multifunctionality of the adverbials in question in different languages. The data obtained from the translation corpus can be successfully further complemented by valuable insights offered by the monolingual corpus

analysis. The findings of the corpora-based analysis have cast light on the language-specific choice of adverbials for the realizations of epistemic, textual and interpersonal projection of author stance. Functional and semantic potential of the English adverbials under analysis can be fully reflected by TCs in other languages. Translation corpora data findings show that the overlap observed by many linguists among different groups of languages varies. The range and the semantic domains covered by the overlap phenomenon do exhibit language-specific features. The gap phenomenon of corresponding sentence adverbial cognates which is attested in French in the semantic domain of ACTUALITY holds true for the Lithuanian language. In Lithuanian, the gap of sentence adverbial cognates as TCs in the semantic domain of ACTUALITY and FACT is fully compensated by the discourse markers from the domains of TRUTH and REALITY. Hence the same diversity of functions is performed by fewer markers.

Absence of cognates across different groups of languages varies, however the basic functional repertoire characteristic of the four domains can be successfully performed by fewer resources. In Swedish adverbials of TRUTH seem to be very rarely used as TCs of the English *actually*, *in fact* and *really*. In Lithuanian, the two REALITY and TRUTH markers cover the four semantic domains, which can be explained by the fact that the main functions of elaboration and contrast are shared by all the markers in many languages.

Despite the fact that the most frequent Lithuanian TCs of *in fact* and *actually* belong to different conceptual domains, those of TRUTH and REALITY rather than ACT and FACT, they perform very similar functions. This is also confirmed by the data from a more specific field of academic discourse. While the Lithuanian cognate of *in fact* very rarely occurs in translations of fictional literature, it performs different functions including that of hedging in more formal registers. Unlike epistemic hedges, *faktiškai* 'in fact' does not indicate the author's lack of commitment towards the proposition, but rather a wish to show that the claim is *mainly* or *essentially* true. Described as "attribute" hedges by Hyland (2001, 2004, *inter alia*), these rhetorical devices refer "to the relationship between propositional elements rather than between propositions and writers" (Hyland 2004: 96). Finally, the rhetorically diverse nature of TCs of *in fact* and *actually* as well as of other markers

belonging to the domain of TRUTH determines their more frequent use in more argumentative soft science fields.

*Data sources*

CCLL – Corpus of Contemporary Lithuanian Language (<http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/>)

CorALit – Corpus Academicum Lithuanicum (<http://coralit.lt/>)

LERAC – Lithuanian English Research Article Corpus

ParaCorp<sub>PEN→LT→EN</sub> – Bidirectional Parallel Corpus of English and Lithuanian

*List of abbreviations*

CFSP – Common Foreign and Security Policy

CTP(s) – complement taking predicate(s)

DM(s) – discourse marker(s)

LL – log likelihood test score

TC(s) – translation correspondence(s)

VP – verb phrase

*References*

- Aijmer, Karin. 2003. "Discourse particles in contrast: The case of *in fact* and *actually*." *Corpus Linguistics by the Lune. A festschrift for Geoffrey Leech*. Eds. Andrew Wilson, Paul Rayson and Tony McEnery. Frankfurt: Peter Lang. 23-36.
- Aijmer, Karin. 2007. "The actuality adverbs *in fact*, *actually*, *really* and *indeed* – Establishing similarities and differences." *Proceedings of the BAAL Conference*. 111-120.
- Aijmer, Karin, Ad Foolen and Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberg. 2006. "Pragmatic markers in translation: A methodological proposal." *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Ed. Kerstin Fischer. Oxford/Amsterdam: Elsevier. 101-114.
- Aijmer, Karin and Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberg. 2004. "A model and a methodology for the study of pragmatic markers: The semantic field of expectation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 36: 1781-1805.
- Bellés Fortuño, Begoña. 2006. *Discourse markers within the university lecture genre: A contrastive study between Spanish and North-*

- American lectures*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. Universitat Jaume I. <http://www.tdx.cat/bitstream/handle/10803/10442/tesis.pdf?sequence=2>.
- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad and Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
- Bruti, Silvia. 1999. "In fact and infatti: The same similar or different." *International Journal of Pragmatics* 9(4): 519-533.
- Degand, Liesbeth and Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberg. 2011. "Introduction: Grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification of discourse markers." *Linguistics* 49(2): 287-294.
- Defour, Tine, Ulrique D'Hondt, Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberg and Dominique Willems. 2010. "In fact, en fait, de fait, au fait: A contrastive study of the synchronic correspondences and diachronic development of English and French cognates." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 111(4): 433-463.
- Dunning, Ted. 1993. "Accurate methods for the statistics of surprise and coincidence." *Computational Linguistics* 19(1): 61-74.
- Dyvik, Helge. 2004. "Translations as semantic mirrors: From parallel corpus to wordnet." *Advances in Corpus Linguistics: Papers from the 23rd International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora (ICAME 23)*. Eds. Karin Aijmer and Bengt Altenberg, Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi. 311-326.
- Fanego, Teresa. 2010. "Paths in the development of elaborative discourse markers: Evidence from Spanish." *(Inter)subjectivity and (Inter)subjectification: A Reassessment*. Eds. Kristin Davidse, Lieven Vandelandotte and Hubert Cuyckens. Berlin/New York: Mouton De Gruyter. 197-239.
- Grossmann, Francis and Françoise Wirth. 2007. "Marking evidentiality in scientific papers: The case of expectation markers." *Language and Discipline Perspectives on Academic Discourse*. Ed. Kjersti Fløttum. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 202-218.
- Hasselgård, Hilde. 2009. "A textual perspective on the pragmatic markers *in fact* and *faktisk*." *From will to well: Studies in Linguistics offered to Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberg*. Eds. Slembrouck, Stef, Miriam Taverniers and Mieke Van Herreweghe. Ghent: Academia Press. 257-266.

- Hasselgård, Hilde. 2010. *Adjunct Adverbials in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, Ken. 2001. "Definitely a possible explanation: Epistemic modality in academic argument." *Modality in Specialized Texts*. Eds. Maurizio Gotti and Marina Dossena, Bern: Peter Lang. 291-311.
- Hyland, Ken. 2004. *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Hyland, Ken. 2005. *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London/New York: Continuum.
- Hyland, Ken. 2008. "Persuasion, interaction and the construction of knowledge: Representing self and others in research writing." *International Journal of English Studies* 8(2): 1-23.
- Johansson, Stig. 2007. *Seeing Through Multilingual Corpora: On the Use of Corpora in Contrastive Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 2003. "Modality on the move: The English modal auxiliaries 1961-1992." *Modality in Contemporary English*. Eds. Roberta Facchinetti, Manfred Krug and Frank Palmer. Berlin/New York: Mouton De Gruyter. 191-240.
- Lenker, Ursula. 2010. *Argument and Rhetoric: Adverbial Connectors in the History of English*. Berlin/New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Lewis, Diana M. 2006. "Discourse markers in English: A discourse-pragmatic view." *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Ed. Kerstin Fischer. Amsterdam: Elsevier. 43-60.
- Mortier, Liesbeth and Liesbeth Degand. 2009. "Adversative discourse markers in contrast. The need for a combined corpus approach." *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 14: 338-366.
- Mur Dueñas, Pilar. 2011. "An intercultural analysis of metadiscourse features in research articles written in English and in Spanish." *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 3068-3079.
- Oh, Sun-Young. 2000. "Actually and in fact in American English: a data-based analysis." *English Language and Linguistics* 4: 243-68.
- Paradis, Carita. 2003. "Between epistemic modality and degree: The case of really." *Modality in Contemporary English*. Eds. Roberta Facchinetti, Manfred Krug and Frank Palmer. Berlin/New York: Mouton De Gruyter.

- Schwenter, Scott A. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2000. "Invoking Scalarity. The Development of *in fact*." *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 1(1): 7-25.
- Simon-Vandenberg, Anne-Marie and Karin Aijmer. 2007. *The Semantic Field of Modal Certainty. A Corpus-based Study of English Adverbs*. Berlin/New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Simon-Vandenberg, Anne-Marie and Dominique Willems. 2011. "Crosslinguistic data as evidence in the grammaticalization debate: The case of discourse markers." *Linguistics* 49(2): 333-364.
- Simon-Vandenberg, Anne-Marie. 2013. "REALITY and related concepts: Towards a semantic-pragmatic map of English adverbs." *English Modality: Core, Periphery and Evidentiality*. Eds. Juana I. Marín Arrese, Marta Carretero, Jorge Arús Hita and Johan van der Auwera. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. 253-280.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1997. "The Role of the Development of Discourse Markers in a Theory of Grammaticalization." Paper presented at ICHL XII, Manchester 1995; Version of 11/97. <http://www.stanford.edu/~traugott/ect-papersonline.html>.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. and Richard B. Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Usonienė, Aurelija. 2014. "On the morphosyntactic status of complement-taking predicate clauses in Lithuanian." *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 46: 1-27.
- Usonienė, Aurelija and Audronė Šolienė. 2010. "Choice of strategies in realizations of epistemic possibility in English and Lithuanian." *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 15(2): 291-316.
- Willems, Dominique and Annemie Demol. 2006. "*Vraiment* and *really* in contrast: When truth and reality meet." *Pragmatic Markers in Contrast*. Eds. Karin Aijmer and Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberg. Amsterdam: Elsevier.Gruyter. 215-235.