

## **Multifunctionality of the Lithuanian *tada* and English *then* in spoken discourse: a cross-linguistic analysis**

**Indrė Makauskaitė**

Department of Lithuanian Language  
Vilnius University  
Universiteto g. 5  
LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania  
E-mail: [makauskaite.indre@gmail.com](mailto:makauskaite.indre@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

The present study examines the multifunctionality of the Lithuanian *tada* and the corresponding English *then*. The aim of the analysis is to compare their semantic and functional behaviour in spoken discourse. In English and Lithuanian dictionaries, the meanings of *tada* and *then* differ: Lithuanian dictionaries only provide definitions related to time and result, whereas English dictionaries offer a few pragmatic meanings alongside the meanings of time and result. This raises the question of whether the Lithuanian adverbial *tada* possesses any pragmatic meanings. Several studies have closely analysed *then* as both a temporal adverbial and as a discourse marker but there have been no studies to date of *tada* as a discourse marker. The process of a predication adverbial turning into a sentence adverbial and then into a discourse marker is common in many languages and, as such, this transformation may be considered universal. One of the aims of the paper is to verify if this adverbial cline exists in the Lithuanian language. The analysis is corpus-based and the data are obtained from the Corpus of the Contemporary Lithuanian Language and the British National Corpus.

**Keywords:** temporal adverbial, discourse marker, spoken discourse, temporal deixis, corpus linguistics, cross-linguistic analysis, adverbialisation

## **Lietuvių *tada* ir anglų *then* daugiafunkciškumas sakininėje kalboje: tarpkalbinė analizė**

### **Santrauka**

Straipsnyje nagrinėjamas lietuvių kalbos *tada* ir anglų kalbos *then* daugiafunkciškumas. Tyrimo tikslas – atskleisti *tada* ir *then* daugiafunkciškumo aspektus, palyginti jų

semantinę ir funkcinę raišką sakytiniame diskurse. Anglų ir lietuvių kalbų žodynuose šių žodžių pateikiamos reikšmės skiriasi: lietuvių kalboje vyrauja su laiku susijusios reikšmės, taip pat pateikiama rezultato reikšmė, o anglų kalboje, be šių reikšmių, nurodoma ir keletas pragmatinių reikšmių. Kyla klausimas, ar lietuvių kalbos *tada* neturi pragmatinių reikšmių. Anglų kalbos *then* lingvistų tirtas ir kaip laiko adverbialas, ir kaip diskurso markeris, o lietuvių kalbos *tada* kaip diskurso markeris dar netyrinėtas. Tačiau procesas, kairieveiksmis virsta diskurso markeriu, desemantizuojasi ir įgyja naujų funkcijų bei pragmatinių reikšmių, būdingas daugeliui pasaulio kalbų, galbūt jis net universalus, todėl vienas šio straipsnio tikslų ir yra patikrinti, ar šis virsmas lietuvių kalbai iš tiesų nebūdingas, ar tiesiog žodynai jo neatspindi.

Tyrimas paremtas tekstynų metodologija – empirinė medžiaga paimta iš Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos tekstyno ir Britų nacionalinio tekstyno. Atliktos kokybinės analizės rezultatai rodo, kad tiek lietuvių *tada*, tiek anglų *then* funkcionuoja ir kaip laiko adverbialas, ir kaip diskurso markeris. Kaip laiko adverbialai *tada* ir *then* atlieka dvi funkcijas: nusako sutampantį laiką ir nesutampantį laiką, arba įvykių seką. Kaip diskurso markeriai *tada* ir *then* sieja vienas po kito einančius diskurso vienetus, jais gali būti nusakomas rezultatas esant hipotetinei arba nehipotetinei situacijai, taip pat prielaida, pridūrimas (perėjimas prie kito tos pačios temos aspekto), žymima pokalbio (teiginio ir pan.) pradžia arba pabaiga.

**Raktažodžiai:** laiko adverbialas, diskurso markeris, sakytinė kalba, laiko deiksė, tekstynų lingvistika, tarpkalbinė analizė, adverbializacija

## 1 Introduction

The aim of this cross-linguistic, corpus-based analysis is to examine the multifunctionality of the Lithuanian *tada* and English *then* by comparing their semantic and functional behaviour in spoken discourse. This method of contrastive analysis is widely practised in contemporary linguistics. According to Facchinetti and Palmer, “a cross-linguistic study may reveal more about one phenomenon in each of the languages compared than mono-linguistic study would; moreover, similarities between languages can lead to moderate aspects of language theory that trespass on the specific boundaries of one single language, <...> differences in the linguistic realisations of the same semantic/pragmatic concept can contribute to predicting or explaining the peculiarities of one language” (Facchinetti, Palmer 2004, xi). Since the Lithuanian *tada* has been less analysed in comparison with the English *then*, the aim of this article is to analyse the multifunctionality of the Lithuanian *tada* based on previous studies of the English *then*.

*Tada* and *then* serve as one of the main Lithuanian and English temporal adverbials. Temporal adverbials “identify temporal, sequential, preceding, successive, and other relationships between actions and events in portions of texts that range from phrases to sentences to whole sections of narratives. They establish and maintain temporal discourse deixis and play an important role in text cohesion” (Halliday and Hassan 1976, as cited in Hinkel 2014, 122). Certain temporal adverbials may function as discourse markers in written language. Since the latter phenomenon has only recently become a subject of analysis in Lithuanian linguistics, more attention will be paid to its theoretical aspects. The aim is to define the functions of *tada* and *then* as temporal adverbials and as discourse markers through semantic analysis.

Both adverbials – the Lithuanian *tada* and English *then* – are polysemic and multifunctional. However, their range of meanings differ in the major Lithuanian and English dictionaries: they are given 2 meanings in the *Dictionary of the Contemporary Lithuanian Language* (DLKŽ)<sup>1</sup>, 3 in the *Dictionary of the Lithuanian Language* (LKŽ)<sup>2</sup>, 6 in the *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary*<sup>3</sup>, 3 in the *Oxford Dictionary of English* (2003)<sup>4</sup>, 4 in the *Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* (2013)<sup>5</sup>, and 4 in the *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners* (2002)<sup>6</sup>. The first meaning for *tada* and *then* in all of these dictionaries is ‘at a particular time in the past or in the future’, the second meaning denotes temporal sequence, and the third meaning is that of ‘result’. Other meanings are provided in a different order. When *tada* and *then* lose their temporal meanings, they start functioning as discourse markers. In Lithuanian dictionaries, only

<sup>1</sup> 1. *tuo metu, tuomet* (‘at that time’); 2. *po to* (‘afterwards’) (DLKŽ 2012, 826).

<sup>2</sup> 1. *tuo laiku, tuomet, tąsyk* (‘at that time’) || *tais (praėjusiais, dabar minimais) laikais, anuomet* (‘at a particular time (mentioned at the moment of speaking) in the past’); 2. *paskui (tai padarius), po to* (‘afterwards, after that’) || *toliau iš eilės (ką išvardijant)* (‘next’); 3. *tuo atveju, tokiomis aplinkybėmis* (‘in that case’) (LKŽ XV 1991, 643–644).

<sup>3</sup> 1. *used to refer to a particular time in the past or future*; 2. *used to introduce the next item in a series of actions, events, instructions, etc.*; 3. *used to show the logical result of a particular statement or situation*; 4. *used to introduce additional information*; 5. *(formal) used to introduce a summary of something that has just been said*; 6. *used to show the beginning or end of a conversation, statement, etc.* (OALD 2015, 1622–1623).

<sup>4</sup> 1. *at that time; at the time in question*; 2. *after that; next; afterwards* || *also, in addition*; 3. *in that case; therefore* || *used at the end of a sentence to emphasize an inference being drawn* || *used to finish off the conversation* (ODE 2003, 1829).

<sup>5</sup> 1. *(at) that time (in the past or in the future)*; 2. *next or after that*; 3. *in addition*; 4. *as a result; in that case; also used as a way of joining a statement to an earlier piece of conversation* (CALD 2013, 1626–1627).

<sup>6</sup> 1. *at a particular time in the past or in the future*; 2. *used for introducing the next thing that happens*; 2. *as a result*: a. *used for saying what the result must be if something is true*; b. *SPOKEN used at the end of a question when you think something must be true because of what has just been said*; c. *LITERARY used when you are giving the result of the events that you have been describing*; 4. *SPOKEN used at the end of a conversation for showing that you think something has been agreed* (MEDAL 2002, 1487–1488).

temporal meanings of *tada* are defined. Almost no discourse functions of the word are given; the *Dictionary of the Lithuanian Language* only offers the meaning of ‘result’. In English dictionaries, on the contrary, few pragmatic functions of *then* are given. This raises the question of whether *tada* functions mainly as a temporal adverbial and has just one pragmatic function. One of the aims of the present study is to verify if *tada*, as a discourse marker, is an isolated phenomenon in the Lithuanian language or is it a result of insufficient representation in Lithuanian dictionaries.

The focus of the present paper is on Lithuanian and English spoken discourse. Spoken language is unedited and uncorrected; it has its own words, expressions, and meanings. The main features of spoken language are pauses, repetitions, reformulations, interruptions, digressions, elisions, and blends, to name but a few. The reason why spoken discourse was chosen for the present study is not only because of its authenticity and naturalness but because the definitions of the meanings of *tada* and *then* show that more functions of discourse markers are revealed in spoken discourse, some of which are unique to spoken language.

Biber *et al.*'s (1999, 561) analysis of sizable British and American English corpora, consisting of transcribed conversations, fiction, news, and academic prose, revealed that time adverbs are more often used in spoken language than in written discourse, and in academic texts they are used very rarely. As Brinton stated, “pragmatic markers are predominantly a feature of oral rather than of written discourse. The appearance of pragmatic markers is a result of the informality of oral discourse and the grammatical ‘fragmentation’ caused by the lack of planning time, which makes the use of pragmatic markers expedient” (Brinton 1996, 33). Besides, one of the functions of discourse markers – to define a relation between the participants of a conversation – is best revealed through spoken discourse.

The data for the study were retrieved from two different corpora. Lithuanian spoken language data were selected from the Corpus of the Contemporary Lithuanian Language (CCLL, <http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/tekstynas/>), namely, from the subcorpus of spoken language, and English spoken language data were selected from the British National Corpus (BNC, <http://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/>), also from the subcorpus of spoken language. Since the aim of the study is qualitative analysis, 1,000 examples of each language were analysed.

In contemporary linguistics, corpus analysis is a progressive and accurate method of analysing linguistic phenomena, which is why it is favoured as an analytical tool by linguists (Sinclair 1991; Biber, Conrad, Reppen 1998; Kennedy 1998; Partington 1998; McEnery, Wilson 2001; Tognini-Bonelli 2001; Meyer 2002; Marcinkevičienė 2010 etc.).

The possibility to use data from different language corpora enables linguists to undertake objective comparative analyses, verify hypotheses, and submit reliable and objective results. Rundell and Granger mention two important insights arising from corpus linguistics:

*First, a recognition of the limitations of our own mental lexicons. Our intuitions as fluent speakers are a valuable resource when we are analysing language data, but they are not always a reliable guide to how language is actually used, and introspection alone can never underpin a satisfactory account of word meaning and word behaviour. Secondly, the study of corpus data reveals the 'conventional' and repetitive nature of most linguistic behaviour, and demonstrates the fundamental importance of context and co-text in the way we use and understand words. (Rundell, Granger 2007)*

## 2 *Tada* and *then* as temporal adverbials

The concept of adverbial is rarely used in Lithuanian linguistics when dealing with temporal expressions. However, the notion is more frequently used in the field of modality. According to Klein, one of the main researchers to analyse time in language, adverbials are “the richest class of temporal expressions, <...> functionally, they can describe very different temporal features, such as position on the time line <...>, duration <...>, frequency” etc. (Klein 2009, 40–41). Temporal adverbials may be adverbs, nouns and noun phrases, prepositional or postpositional phrases, and subordinate clauses. As Smetona and Usonienė explain, “semantic-functional adverbial class exceeds the inconvenient limits among the semantics and functions of the traditional parts of speech of Lithuanian grammar”<sup>7</sup> (Smetona, Usonienė 2012, 134):

- (1) *Šiais metais vidutinė metinė oro temperatūra pakilo net dviem laipsniais.* (Smetona, Usonienė 2012, 135)  
‘Average annual temperature has risen two degrees **this year**.’<sup>8</sup>
- (2) *Šįmet buvo gausus bulvių derlius.* (Smetona, Usonienė 2012, 135)  
‘The potato harvest has been rich **this year**.’

*Šiais metais* ‘this year’ and *šįmet* ‘this year’ “are clearly members of the same semantic-functional class, actually absolute synonyms. However, in terms of parts of

---

<sup>7</sup> “Semantinės-funkcinės adverbialų klasės skyrimas peržengia gana neparankias ribas tarp tradicinės lietuvių kalbos gramatikos kalbos dalių semantikos, funkcijų.” (Smetona, Usonienė 2012, 134)

<sup>8</sup> In order to demonstrate their equivalents, the Lithuanian examples will be translated into English.

speech they belong to different grammatical categories <...>. Maybe in this context, it is high time to start thinking about a new classification of word classes?”<sup>9</sup> (Smetona, Usonienė 2012, 135).

*Tada* and *then* are typical deictic temporal adverbials. The first studies of deixis as a linguistic phenomenon appeared in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. According to Hurford *et al.*,

*all languages do contain small sets of words whose meanings vary systematically according to who uses them, and where and when they are used. These words are called deictic words: the general phenomenon of their occurrence is called deixis. <...> A deictic word is one which takes elements of its meaning from the context or situation (i.e. the speaker, the addressee, the time and the place) of utterance in which it is used. (Hurford et al. 2007, 65–66, 68)*

The temporal adverbials *tada* and *then* are related to two types of deixis: temporal deixis and discourse deixis. Temporal deixis is best revealed in spoken discourse, when the participants, together with the place and time of speaking, are known, when it is easy to define the moment of utterance in order to relate the *now* of the hearer to the *now* of the speaker. The adverbials *tada* and *then* are examples of distal (far from the speaker and/or closer to the addressee), temporal deixis.

Deixis, as a transitional phenomenon in both written and spoken discourse, is close to anaphora. Deictic structures show how an utterance is related to the discourse that contains it; they introduce a referent, and anaphoric elements refer to the same entity that was mentioned before. Therefore, “where a pronoun refers to a linguistic expression (or chunk of discourse) itself, it is discourse-deictic; where a pronoun refers to the same entity as a prior linguistic expression refers to, it is anaphoric” (Levinson 1983, 86). E.g.

(3) a. *Hey, they've promoted Fred to second vice president.*

b. *That's a lie.* (Webber 1988, 4)

(4) *John came into the room. He sat down.* (Levinson 1987, 383)

(3) illustrates discourse deixis: the referent of *that* is the whole preceding utterance, i.e. chunk of text. And (4) is a case of anaphora: *he* refers to John.

---

<sup>9</sup> “Abi žodžių poros <...> aiškiai yra tų pačių semantinių-funkcinių laukų dalykai, iš esmės absoliutūs sinonimai. Tačiau kalbos dalių kontekste joms priskiriamos skirtingos kategorinės reikšmės ir skirtingos gramatinės kategorijos <...>. Galbūt laikas būtų šiame kontekste pradėti mąstyti apie naują žodžių klasių klasifikaciją?” (Smetona, Usonienė 2012, 135)

According to Schiffrin, “[t]hen is both deictic and anaphoric <...> deictic uses of *then* indicate reference time, a temporal relationship between a linguistic event and speaking time, and anaphoric uses of *then* indicate event time, a temporal relationship between two linguistic events” (Schiffrin 1987, 248). E.g.

- (5) a. *When did you visit John?*  
b. *I visited him **then**.* (Schiffrin 1987, 248)
- (6) a. *So, when did they come here?*  
b. *1906. Um: around 1906.*  
c. *How old were they **then**?*  
d. *Um: my dad was about twenty two, my mum was uh: a-about twenty.* (Schiffrin 1987, 249)

Deictic *then* is demonstrated in (5), and anaphoric *then* in (6). In (6c), *then* is anaphoric because it indicates the time of an event mentioned in prior discourse. Event time is a relationship between two linguistic events and it is not related to the time of speaking, thus it is not deictic. The same could apply to the Lithuanian adverbial *tada*.

*Tada* and *then* as temporal adverbials may indicate two kinds of temporal relationships: simultaneity and temporal sequence. In English, “clause-final *then* establishes a coterminous event time, and clause-initial *then* establishes a successive event time. An exception to this is when initial *then* figures in a temporal comparison” (Schiffrin 1987, 250):

- (7) *Well, my nephew was– was down the shore the last time we were there, and he’s about fourteen or fifteen months. And he had been on the beach last summer, y’know when he was about two months, like your– your other grandson. And **then** he just slept on his carriage. He didn’t know where he was. But this year, we were really anxious t’see if he would like the water.* (Schiffrin 1987, 250)

In (7), the last summer and the coming summer are compared, and *then* establishes simultaneity, i.e. refers to the last summer. “Thus, even though *then* is clause-initial, the discourse forces *then* to mark a coterminous event time.” (Schiffrin 1987, 250)

### 3 *Tada* and *then* as discourse markers

According to Lyavdansky, temporal deictic adverbs have two types of meaning: “the temporal (adverbial) meaning and the discursive (textual) meaning” (Lyavdansky 2010, 22). Temporal adverbials with discursive meaning are called discourse markers.

Discourse markers have been analysed for several decades but their status is still unclear and they remain problematic and difficult to define. According to Schiffrin, the author of the first major study on discourse markers, they are “linguistic, paralinguistic, or non-verbal elements that signal relations between units of talk by virtue of their syntactic and semantic properties and by virtue of their sequential relations as initial or terminal brackets demarcating discourse units” (Schiffrin 1987, 40). The marker has no influence on the sentence structure – if it is omitted from the sentence, the structure stays unchanged:

- (8) *Jeigu jau būsiu kur nors kitur, tai aš parašysiu raštelį **tada** ant katedros durų.*<sup>10</sup>  
 ‘If I am somewhere else, I will **then** put a note on the door of the room of the department.’
- (9) *Jeigu jau būsiu kur nors kitur, tai aš parašysiu raštelį ant katedros durų.*  
 ‘If I am somewhere else, I will put a note on the door of the room of the department.’

In (9), the discourse marker *tada* has been omitted, but the sentence is still comprehensible, i.e. its propositional content is the same.

Fraser (1990; 1996; 1999) proposes a grammatical-pragmatic understanding of discourse markers. His theory differs from that suggested by Schiffrin: according to Fraser, discourse markers are only linguistic elements, while Schiffrin maintains that paralinguistic phenomena and non-verbal gestures may also be regarded as discourse markers. Fraser posits the following definition: discourse markers “are lexical expressions drawn from the syntactic classes of conjunctions, adverbs, and prepositional phrases. With certain exceptions, they signal a relationship between the segment they introduce, S2, and the prior segment, S1. They have a core meaning which is procedural, not conceptual” (Fraser 1999, 950). Discourse markers do not form one grammar class; they are different linguistic expressions and belong to different classes. However, their functions are the same. Discourse markers encode meanings that define the relationship between discourse segments but they do not have any impact on the content of those segments: they “may be deleted with no change in the propositional content of the segments. However, where the DMs [discourse markers] are not present, the hearer is left without a lexical clue as to the relationship intended between the two segments” (Fraser 1999, 944):

- (10) *I want to go to the movies tonight. **After all**, it's my birthday.* (Fraser 1999, 944)
- (11) *I want to go to the movies tonight. It's my birthday.*

---

<sup>10</sup> No data source is given for the examples from the corpora (English examples – from the BNC, Lithuanian examples – from the CCLL).



In (10) and (11), the propositional content of utterances is the same but in (11), where the discourse marker is removed, the relationship between the two segments is not clear to the hearer – is the birthday of the speaker a reason why he/she wants to go to the movies or is the speaker just informing the hearer that today is his/her birthday? Moreover, there are certain cases when, for syntactic reasons, it is impossible to omit the discourse marker, e.g. *since, while, whereas, because* (Fraser 1999, 944). There also are some discourse markers in Lithuanian that cannot be omitted from an utterance without changing its propositional content, e.g. *kol, nes, todėl* etc.

Blakemore (1987; 1992) introduced one more theoretical perspective on discourse markers. Her study is based on something called relevance theory. According to Blakemore, discourse markers are a type of conventional implicature, that is, they only have procedural meaning and have no representational meaning. She argues that “information conveyed by an utterance can be relevant” in four ways:

*It may allow the derivation of a contextual implication (e.g. so, therefore, too, also);*  
*It may strengthen an existing assumption, by providing better evidence for it (e.g. after all, moreover, furthermore);*  
*It may contradict an existing assumption (e.g. however, still, nevertheless, but);*  
*It may specify the role of the utterance in the discourse (e.g. anyway, incidentally, by the way, finally).* (Blakemore 1992, 138–141)

Thus, in some studies, discourse markers are considered to be linguistic expressions that relate discourse units, and the second approach treats discourse markers “as pragmatic devices that contribute to the interpretation and comprehension of an utterance by encoding procedural information and control the choice of contextual information. In other words, such devices encode relevance relations between propositions (thoughts) and the cognitive environment of an individual” (Hussein 2008, 24, 25). There are further definitions to add to the confusion: discourse markers, pragmatic markers, pragmatic particles, interaction signals, connectives, pragmatic expressions, small words etc. (Šiniajeva 2005, 21). The two most frequently used definitions in studies of English are discourse marker and pragmatic marker. According to Péter, there is still a lot of uncertainty around the relationship between the label ‘discourse marker’ and the term ‘pragmatic marker’, as discourse markers “simultaneously fulfil a variety of functions: *pragmatic* (e.g. marking attitudes, certainty, face considerations, etc.) and *discourse* (e.g. sequencing, marking story structure, etc.) functions alike” (Péter 2005, 25). In this paper, the problem of this dichotomy will not be discussed and the notion ‘discourse marker’ will be used.

There are several studies of Lithuanian discourse markers even though numerous Lithuanian phrases and words could be considered discourse markers. The concept

is clearly subject to the same ambiguity in Lithuanian linguistics: *diskurso žymikliai* (Masaitienė 2003; Buitkienė 2005; Bartkutė 2007; Šimčikaitė 2012), *diskurso jungtukai* (discourse conjunctions) (Verikaitė 2005; Šliogerienė *et al.* 2015), *diskurso jungtukai ir jungiamieji žodžiai* (discourse connectives) (Bielinskienė 2009), *diskurso markeriai* (Usonienė 2016).

Since discourse markers are desemantised, their functions and not their meanings are analysed. According to Brinton, all functions of discourse markers fall into two categories: they belong to the textual mode of language (e.g. *then, now*) and to the interpersonal mode (e.g. *oh, well*); in the textual mode, “the speaker structures meaning as text, creating cohesive passages of discourse”, and the interpersonal mode “is the expression of the speaker’s attitudes, evaluations, judgments, expectations, and demands, as well as of the nature of the social exchange, the role of the speaker and the role assigned to the hearer” (Brinton 1996, 38). Both functions are pragmatic; hence the term pragmatic markers.

Another important aspect is the process by which an adverb becomes a discourse marker. Part of this process is called adverbialisation, which is when units of language start functioning as adverbials. As Smetona and Usonienė demonstrate, “adverbialisation is closely related to the process of grammaticalisation and grammaticalisation is directly related to (inter)subjectivisation”<sup>11</sup> (Smetona, Usonienė 2012, 129, 130). During these processes, the lexical meaning of language unit fades – a process known as desemantisation. Adverbials that function as connectives may further evolve into discourse markers.

The scheme of an adverbial cline was presented by Traugott (1997): verbal adverbial → sentential adverbial → discourse marker. According to Traugott:

*the hypothesis is that an adverbial, say a manner adverb, will be dislocated from its typical clause-internal position within the predicate, where it has syntactic narrow scope and pragmatically evaluates the predicated event, to whatever position is the site for wide-scope sentential adverbs. As an IPAdv [sentential adverbial] it pragmatically and semantically evaluates the content of the proposition <...>. Whatever its syntactic site, a IPAdv that has the appropriate semantics and pragmatics may acquire new pragmatic functions and polysemies that give it the potential to become a DM [discourse marker]. Over time these functions may be semanticized either in this position or in a further dislocated position resulting in the new DM function. This stage involves the acquisition not only of new polysemies and morphosyntactic constraints, but also*

---

<sup>11</sup> “Adverbializacija yra glaudžiai persipynusi su gramatikalizacijos procesu, o pastarasis tiesiogiai susijęs su (inter)subjektyvizacija.” (Smetona, Usonienė 2012, 129, 130)

*of new prosodic characteristics. The form in this new function serves pragmatically to evaluate the relation of the up-coming text to that which precedes, and does not evaluate the proposition itself. (Traugott 1997, 13)*

Thus, the origin of discourse markers is adverbial and this cline is a characteristic feature not only of Lithuanian or English. A good example is the Swedish adverbial and discourse marker *alltså* (English ‘therefore, thus, then, so, consequently’). According to Aijmer:

*grammaticalisation and pragmaticalisation have been a great help in understanding the polysemy of alltså and how the different meanings and functions are related. Alltså has two main functions as an inference particle (marking inference or a request for confirmation) and the context adjusting function <...>. In addition, alltså is a reformulation marker (i.e. it has functions on structural level such as correction, paraphrasing, clarification, elaboration). <...> Alltså has developed from a manner adverb to an adverb with the meaning of cause or result and further to a discourse marker with inferential meaning (a marker of conclusion) which can also be used as a request for confirmation. However, the adverb can also develop along a different trajectory to a marker or reformulation. (Aijmer 2007, 54–55)*

This raises the question of whether these processes commonly occur in Lithuanian: if a temporal (or any other adverb) starts functioning as a discourse marker, is it proof of an adverbial cline?

#### **4 Discourse marker or temporal adverbial?**

Even though the categories of adverbial and discourse marker are different, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish when *then* functions as a discourse marker and when as a temporal adverbial. Temporal adverbials and discourse markers relate units of prior and upcoming discourse, but, according to Schiffrin, “adverbial *then* displays a temporal relationship between two linguistic events internal to the discourse <...>, whereas marker *then* displays this relationship not only between linguistic events, but between warrants and inferences, and actions” (Schiffrin 1987, 247).

Both the adverbial *then* and marker *then* may be used at the beginning or at the ending of an utterance: “[I]nitial *then* has wider scope as a discourse marker than final *then*, i.e. it marks global discourse relations between episodes [(12)], and final *then* is frequently used to mark relationships between actions” (13) (Schiffrin 1987, 247):

(12) *So w– there’s two big red buckets. One has a handle and one doesn’t. And there was a green bucket, with a handle. <...> And **then** there was like a blue shovel*

with *r-eh* it was a rake. One had– there was only one like that. The other was an ordinary shovel. (Schiffirin 1987, 251)

- (13) a. *Um, how many years of school did you get a chance to finish?*  
b. *Twelve.*  
c. *Twelve. So you went through high school, **then**.*  
d. *Umhmm.* (Schiffirin 1987, 254–255)

To summarize, Schiffirin treats the following cases of *then* as markers: “(1) all clause initial cases (whether in a separate intonational unit or not), (2) all cases following a clause initial marker, (3) all clause final cases which have a pragmatic function” (Schiffirin 1987, 248). Lithuanian word order is more frequent than English word order, which thus makes it impossible to decide whether *tada* is an adverbial or a marker based solely on the word alone.

Schiffirin mentions one more way of defining the limit between the adverbial *then* and the marker *then* but before that three important notions – reference time, discourse time, and event time – should be explained. The deictic relationship between a proposition and its presentation in an utterance is called reference time; the temporal relationship between utterances is called discourse time; and the temporal relationship between propositions is called event time (Schiffirin 1987, 229):

- (14) *Sue wrote a book.*  
*She was teaching linguistics **then**.* (Schiffirin 1987, 229)

In (14), the reference time of both utterances “is past (prior to speaking time). The event time is the relationship between the two propositions: as indicated by the progressive [*was teaching*], and by *then* [when Sue was writing a book], the two overlap in time” (Schiffirin 1987, 229). The discourse time is the order in which utterances are presented in the discourse.

Furthermore, there is another possible way of defining the limit between the adverbial *then* and the marker *then*: *then* is an adverbial “when discourse time mirrors event time, <...> for it is then that it is marking a successive relationship between events” (Schiffirin 1987, 264):

- (15) *Sue was operated on last week.*  
***Then** yesterday she had a relapse.*  
***Then** she left the hospital today.* (Schiffirin 1987, 263)

*Then* is a marker “when discourse time mirrors not event time, but some other successive relationship” (Schiffirin 1987, 264):

- (16) *She left the hospital today.*  
**Then** *she was operated on last week.*  
**Then** *yesterday she had a relapse.* (Schiffrin 1987, 264)

Thus, it is “only when the temporal relationships underlying talk *include* event time that *then* can be an adverb” (Schiffrin 1987, 264).

Nevertheless, it is still difficult in some cases to define a limit between a prototypical adverbial and a discourse marker. In this study, the following rule will be applied: when *tada* and *then* lose their temporal meaning and their use has no influence on the semantic content of an utterance, they will be considered discourse markers.

## 5 Multifunctionality of the Lithuanian *tada* and the English *then*

### 5.1 Simultaneity

The main function of Lithuanian *tada* and English *then* as temporal adverbials is to indicate certain time in the past or in the future, i.e. to express simultaneity. ‘Certain time’ is an abstract and vague expression but each time it is concretised by context. The context that concretises the meaning of the temporal adverbials *tada* and *then* can be distant (previous sentence or utterance, previous paragraph etc.) or close (the same sentence or utterance).

- (17) *Jogailė su pirmąja kritika susidūrė jau atrankoje į realybės šou „Dangus 2“.*  
**Tada** *jai buvo buvo viešai pasiūlyta atsikratyti antsvorio <...>.*  
 ‘For the first time Jogailė was criticised during the audition for the reality show “Dangus 2”. **Then** she was publicly offered to lose some weight <...>.’
- (18) *After the a-- er after the time when when you began to support your mum... – Yeah.*  
 – ... *did you notice any change in her [unclear]? – Oh she was a much happier person then.*

In (17), the certain time referred to by the adverbial *tada* is in a previous utterance – ‘during the audition for the reality show’, as is the case with (18) – ‘when mom started being supported’. Both are instances of anaphoric use of the adverbials *tada* and *then* and point to the preceding discourse. When *tada* and *then* point to the succeeding discourse, they are examples of cataphoric expression, e.g.:

- (19) *Žinai, kaip ji gali iš tikrųjų daryt, jina gali pas mane pabūt, o po to su truliku grįžt, kaip tada, per Vilmantės gimtadienį.*  
 ‘You know, what she can really do, she can stay for a while at my place and then take a trolley-bus, just like **then**, at Vilmantė’s birthday.’

- (20) *Well I dunno, I mean on the one hand in nine-- in nineteen forty five I think it was, they were saying you know well in order to do, have s-- s-- s-- successful land reform you need three conditions, they said the same thing in nineteen forty eight, they said you need this, this, this and then we have to be militarily secure but **then** in nineteen forty six they're saying no, don't worry about it, just get the land reform sorted out, just do it.*

In (19), the certain time, referred to by the adverbial *tada*, is 'at Vilmantė's birthday', and in (20), referred to by *then*, is 'in 1946'. No broader context is required when the adverbials *tada* and *then* are used cataphorically; their referent is right after the adverbial, as adverbial modifiers of time.

One type of cataphoric expression used both in Lithuanian and English is the temporal clause with *kai* (*tada, kai...*) and *when* (*then, when...*):

- (21) – *O man visą laiką ta duona taip skanu, taip skanu, bet jos valgyt daug niekaip negali. Labai sotu. – Kai **tada, kai** iš „Amerikos“ parnešė.*

‘– And that bread is always so delicious to me, so delicious, but you can't have loads of it. It makes you very full. – Just like **then, when** they brought it from “America”.’

- (22) <...> *and I reckon what it is they spray the fields with all this stuff – [unclear] – and all that lot, yeah, and **then when** it, **when** it rains you see cos it's a lot of clay.*

In (17–21), the adverbials *tada* and *then* point to an event in the past. However, they can also point to an event in the future. Future tenses are used in Lithuanian and English in that case; in other cases (22, 23) present tenses are used:

- (23) – *Žinai ką, pasakysiu dar vieną baisų dalyką. Aš labai nemėgstu gyventi vienoj vietoj keletus metus. – Kodėl? – Nes **tada**, po keletu metu, toj vietoj atsiranda irgi kažkas tokio.*

‘– You know, what, I'll tell you one more awful thing. I don't like living in the same place more than a few years. – Why? – Because **then**, after a few years, something always happens there.’

- (24) *Tai vasarą nieko, žinai, išvažiuoja vis tiek į sodą, turi ką veikti, bet jau kai ruduo, žiema bus, tai aš nežinau, užsisėdės namuose. Tai sakė jau **tada** šuniuką pirks.*

‘In summer it's OK, you know, she goes to the garden, she has things to do, but when autumn or winter comes, I don't know, she'll stay at home too much. She said she's gonna buy a puppy **then**.’

- (25) *We've got to give them to them today have we... Andy and Michelle? – I seem to remember she says she's gonna do that on the fourteenth. – What Christmas presents, same time as the Golden Wedding? – Mm, think so. – What at her rap? – Suppose so give them, I mean I don't think they're gonna be opened then.*

There are certain cases when the adverbials *tada* and *then* point to a past time that is part of the present conversation between the interlocutors. Such cases should be considered a modification of this function of the adverbials *tada* and *then*. In all of these cases, only the past is referred to, and the period of time is long and vague. Moreover, the past time is in contrast with actual time as the speaker emphasises the period of time they are talking about is over:

- (26) *Ir aš kaip pažinodamas Viktorą Muntianą jau keletą metų, turiu pasakyti, kad nebe tas Viktoras Muntianas. Tada buvo žmogus ryžtingas, stovintis už savo iškeltą klausimą, mokantis apginti save ir... ir... ir iškeltą uždavinį. Šiandieną Viktoras Muntianas kitoks.*

‘And as I have known Viktoras Muntianas for a few years now, I must say, he is a different Viktoras Muntianas. **Then** he was a firm man, he could defend his own position and himself and... and... and his goal. Today Viktoras Muntianas is different.’

- (27) *It was a different world though then wasn't it? You know? The nineteen sixties.*

In (26), the adverbial *tada* points to the first years of knowing Viktoras Muntianas; in (27) *then* refers to the 1960s. In both cases, the contrast between past and present is distinct.

## 5.2 Sequence

Temporal succession of actions, events, states etc. can also be expressed by the adverbials *tada* and *then*. This function can be contrasted with the function of simultaneity discussed above. The most representative case of temporal sequence is where there are other adverbials of temporal sequence used in an utterance, such as Lithuanian *pirma, visų pirma, iš pradžių*, and English *first, first of all* etc. In all of these cases, the second or the last event or state is referred to by the adverbials *tada* and *then*:

- (28) *Iš pradžių elektroniniu paštu nusiunčiau į prezidentūrą klausimą, tai, matyt, elektroniniu paštu jie labai rimtai nežiūri į tokius dalykus. Tada paėmėm leidyklos firminį lapą, parašėm laišką normaliai prezidentui <...>.*

‘**First** I e-mailed my question to the Executive Office of the President, but I guess they don't take such things seriously. **Then** we took the publishing house's letterhead and wrote a normal letter to the president <...>.’

- (29) ***First** you make a fairly detailed ground plan, and **then** you essentially turn that ground plan into a three dimensional plan inside the computer.*

In (28), the sequence of events is as follows: sending an inquiry by e-mail, then taking a letterhead; in (29) it is making a ground plan, then making a three dimensional plan. In both examples, the adverbials *tada* and *then* are not deictic because they are neither related to the time of speaking nor any preceding discourse: the reference point is another event. Both events precede each other in the axis of time but the adverbials *tada* and *then* define their order.

Temporal sequence can also be expressed without other adverbials. In such cases, only *tada* or *then* is used:

- (30) *Bet aš atsimokiau tiktai du metus, pirmą ir antrą klasę, ir **tada** tėvas gavo paskyrimą tarnauti Chabarovske.*

‘But I had been at school for two years only and **then** my father was appointed to serve in Khabarovsk.’

- (31) *And once you’ve got er the channel in there, you can **then** record its activity simply by putting micro electrodes into these two er compartments A and B here.*

Temporal sequence (32) may be expressed by the same Lithuanian construction *tada, kai...* as simultaneity (cf. (21)):

- (32) *Ir **tada, kai** tu paliksi paliksi, ir perspėk mane.*

‘And **then, when** you leave, leave, warn me.’

The same holds true in English: both simultaneity (cf. (22)) and temporal succession (33) can be expressed using the construction *then, when...*:

- (33) *And **then when** I got up and saw the time, I thought oh bugger me!*

The English construction *then after* is used in a similar way to express temporal sequence:

- (34) ***Then after** you had finished the sowing, that would be the next job.*

In order to emphasise the last position in the sequence, the particles *tik* and *only* are used:

- (35) *Tik po to, kai tauta sužino visą medžiagą, išsakytą spaudoje, išdiskutuotą visuomenėje, kartoju, išdiskutuotą visuomenėje, **tik tada** galima organizuoti referendumą.*

‘Only then, when the nation is acquainted with all the material that was written in the press and publically discussed, I repeat, publically discussed, **only then** will it be time to organise the referendum.’



- (36) *Now critics of contemporary systems say so much for the worse for contemporary system, we have to move to one of the other models, maybe [unclear] suitably amended and **only then** will we be truly free and equal.*

Temporal sequence, expressed using the adverbials *tada* and *then*, can refer to the past (cf. (28)), the present (35), or the future (36).

In all of the examples the sequence of different events or states is presented and the subject could be either the same (cf. (32)) or different (cf. (30)). Another possibility is when repetition of the same event or state occurs, in which case the subject is always the same but the objects are different:

- (37) *Toliau – tikslas, uždaviniai, **tada** – objektas, metodas. Viską surašai.*  
'Then – purpose, goals, **then** – object, method. You put down everything.'
- (38) *First of all, penetrates from the [unclear] into the bloodstream and **then** into the cerebral spinal fluid.*
- (39) *Oxford first, **then** we went to Bournemouth, **then** we went to Winchester and **then** we went to Cheltenham <...>.*

In (37, 38), description of the action is omitted in order to prevent repetition. In (39), the description of the same action is repeated three times. In (37), the following sequence of actions is presented: putting down the aim and goals, putting down the object and method; in (38) it is penetration into the bloodstream, penetration into the cerebral spinal fluid; in (39) it is going to Oxford, going to Bournemouth, going to Winchester, going to Cheltenham.

When *tada* and *then* lose their temporal functions (express neither simultaneity nor temporal sequence), they no longer function as adverbials and become discourse markers. The functions of *tada* and *then* as discourse markers will be discussed at a later point.

### 5.3 Resultative function

One of the most distinctive functions of the discourse markers *tada* and *then* is to connect two successive units of discourse and form a causal relationship between them. In general, this function might be called a function of result. *Tada* and *then* relate two discourse units; that which precedes it and that which succeeds it.

#### 5.3.1 Result in hypothetical conditionals

*Tada* and *then*, as discourse markers, are used in *if*-clauses (*jei(gu)... tada... and if... then...*). They express the logical result of particular circumstances or of a particular case:

(40) <...> *o jeigu neturi veiklos darbe ar kur nors, tada miegas ima <...>*.  
'<...> and **if** you don't have anything to do at work or wherever, **then** you become sleepy <...>.'

(41) <...> **if** we knock the toxin out **then** the disease can't occur.

In (40, 41), the result of certain conditions is expressed but it is unclear if these conditions will be fulfilled or not, thus rendering them purely hypothetical situations.

According to Biezma, who analysed *then* as a discourse marker coordinating the anaphoric relation between consecutive discourse-moves, i.e. between the information gained from those discourse-moves, such cases may be termed conditional structures when the antecedent (*if*-clauses) "provides sufficient conditions for the truth of the consequent" (main clauses) (Biezma 2014, 2). In other words, two propositions are cause-related: an antecedent is the cause of a consequent.

In both Lithuanian and English, the second part of the constructions mentioned above – *tada* and *then* – can be omitted. If *tada* and *then* were deleted from (40) and (41), the semantic content of the utterances would remain unchanged, but the result would not be emphasised:

(42) <...> *o jeigu neturi veiklos darbe ar kur nors, miegas ima <...>*.  
'<...> **if** you don't have anything to do at work or wherever, you become sleepy <...>.'

(43) <...> **if** we knock the toxin out the disease can't occur.

The fact that *tada* and *then* can be omitted in conditionals without any change in the semantic content of an utterance demonstrates that they are not obligatory elements in the clause and they function as discourse markers.

According to Biezma, "*then* is possible in some conditionals but not in others <...> there are some conditionals in which *then* is not possible" (Biezma 2014, 2):

(44) *Even if Smith is dead, (#then) the Sheriff wants him.* (Biezma 2014, 3)

(45) *If Smith is dead or alive, (#then) the Sheriff wants him.* (Biezma 2014, 3)

(46) *Whether Smith is dead or alive, (#then) the Sheriff wants him.* (Biezma 2014, 3)

(47) *If you are hungry, (#then) there is pizza in the fridge.* (Biezma 2014, 3)

It may be explained in the following way: "a conditional (without *then*) *if p, q* simply conveys that in the most similar worlds to the actual world (best worlds) in which *p* is

true, *q* is also true. <...> The presence of *then* adds to this conditional claim that it is because of *p* that *q*” (Biezma 2014, 9).

*Tada* is impossible in (44–46) in Lithuanian but it might be possible in (47) even though the word *tai* or a zero discourse marker would be more common. The reason for this is that both events in the utterance – ‘you are hungry’ and ‘there is pizza in the fridge’ – are not cause-related: pizza would still be in the fridge regardless of whether the person is hungry or not.

In (40, 41), *if*-clauses come first followed by the result (main clauses). In spoken Lithuanian, this order can be reversed, although, in such cases the importance of the result is emphasised:

- (48) *Oi fainas dalykas, ta prasme, iš principo – tai jachtos yra gerai tada, jei turi savo jachtą ir didelę <...>.*  
‘It is such a fine thing, I mean, in principle – yachts are good **only if** you have your own yacht, and a big one <...>.’

In the BNC, no examples of *only if then* were found.

Hypothetical conditionals can be expressed in clauses without *if* and *jei*, but then the subjunctive mood should be used:

- (49) *Todėl jūs turėtumėte išaiškinti, kaip bus organizuojama forumo veikla, kokios bus tarybos funkcijos, kas bus valdyboje. Tada mes suprastume, kiek galima siūlyti narių.*  
‘That is why you should explain how the work of the forum would be organised, what the functions of the council would be, who would be at the council. **Then** we could understand how many members to offer.’
- (50) *I’d like to have his support for stronger planning laws, then we could do the things that he says we ought to do.*

### 5.3.2 Result in non-hypothetical situations

When the discourse markers *tada* and *then* express result in a non-hypothetical situation, *if* and *jei* are not used in an utterance but the meaning is similar to the meaning in conditionals. In English, the result in a non-hypothetical situation is expressed using so-called *then*-clauses:

- (51) *I am not hungry. – You don’t want it? – [unclear] – Give it to daddy then, daddy eat it.*

- (52) *Chrissy, have you got a potato, love? – Oh yes, please. – Here, have a couple. – I only want one, Dad. – Oh, alright. Only have one **then**.*
- (53) *Don't say anything cos my mum 'll kill me. – Alright I won't say anything **then**.*

As in the case of conditionals, *then*-clauses also have antecedents and consequents. Antecedent is a discourse unit that precedes the *then*-clause, and the *then*-clause is a consequent. Without antecedent it would be impossible to define the function of *tada* and *then*. In other words, a broader context is needed to define the function of a discourse marker.

In order to express non-hypothetical situations in Lithuanian without *jei(gu)*, the indicative or imperative is used:

- (54) *Kaip vadinasi šita bažnyčia? – Prisikėlimo. – Prisikėlimo bažnyčia, matom kranus. – Ar buvot užkilę ten i viršų? – Ne. – Tai nuvarykit, užkilkit **tada** i viršų.*  
 ‘What is this church called? – Church of the Resurrection. – Church of the Resurrection, we can see the cranes. – Have you ever been on the roof of it? – No. – Go, **then** get onto the roof of it.’
- (55) – „Megoj“ tai tikrai yra. – Nu tai **tada** reikės i „Mega“ nuvažiuot pažiūrėt.  
 ‘– You can really find it in “Mega”. – **Then** I’ll need to go to “Mega” to check it.’

In (51), (52) and (54), the consequent is imperative: (51) – if you don’t want to eat, give to daddy, (52) – if you want only one potato, have one, (54) – if you have never been up there, do it. In (53) and (55), the consequent is indicative: (53) – if mom could kill you for this, I say nothing, (54) – if I can find it in “Mega”, I need to go there. In (51–55), there are no hypothetical condition as the situations are coherent: does not want to eat; wants only one potato; mom will kill him; have never been up there; you can find it in “Mega”. The situation may happen in the past (54), at the moment of speaking (51, 52, 55), or in the future (53). As the situation in the future is the most uncertain, these cases are similar to hypothetical conditionals.

### 5.3.3 Assumption

Assumption may also be expressed by the discourse markers *tada* and *then*. Assumption applies to situations when a speaker, based on his/her common knowledge or on specific information provided by his/her interlocutor, assumes something to be true and requests confirmation of it. Assumption and result share the same logic structure: *if... then...* (if I know that one thing is true, I assume that another thing is true, and request confirmation to that effect). Such cases are called *warranted requests* by Schiffrin: “another unit

whose temporal succession is marked in discourse by *then* is an action, in particular a request from Speaker B which has just been motivated by prior talk from Speaker A. <...> most warranted requests with *then* are for confirmation <...> the focus of the request is background information assumed to be either mutual knowledge, or knowledge of the hearer” (Schiffrin 1987, 254):

- (56) *Ir dar vienas dalykas, O kursinį devintą dieną atnešti reikia? Bet kaip keistai, nu gerai, atnešim devintą dieną ir tada dvi savaitės laisvos lieka? – Tada gerai labai iš tikrųjų. – Nu jo, gerai, bet, [taboo], labai jau paskubėt tą kursinį daryti.*  
‘And one more thing. The course paper – should we present it on the ninth? But it is so weird, OK then, we’ll present it on the ninth and **then** we’ll have two free weeks? – In fact, that is very good then. – Yeah, good, but [taboo] we should be in a hurry to write that course paper.’
- (57) *So he could have saved himself but he didn’t want to. – The hologram? – Aye. – And did he not save himself then? – No.*

In (56), Speaker A, based on the information he/she and Speaker B have – that the course paper should be presented on the ninth, and their common knowledge of calendric time and what day it is – makes the assumption (i.e. calculates) that they will have two free weeks, and seeks confirmation of the fact. Speaker B does not confirm their assumption – they draw the conclusion that it is ok and this is an indirect confirmation of Speaker’s A assumption. In (57), Speaker A, based on the information that the subject, i.e. hologram, could save himself but did not want to, requests confirmation that the hologram did not save himself. Speaker B confirms it. Thus, in (56), the assumption is made based more on the common knowledge that humans have as social creatures, while in (57), the assumption is made based solely on information received from the speaker.

Assumption may be expressed both in questions (56, 57) and in statements (58, 59):

- (58) – *Tai ir Sandra turėjo išvažiuot. – Jo? Tai tada ir jis išvažiavo. – Gal.*  
‘– So, Sandra should have left, too. – Yeah? **Then** he has left, too. – Maybe.’
- (59) *But then he got the electric and the county water but the Sten-- the Kirkwall Hotel and the Stromness Hotel and the Stenness Hotel was all connected with the man’s own private phone. He had his own private phone. For he quarrelled with the telephone people and he put another wire on the other side of the road to himself. – Good grief. – He didn’t th-- he didn’t have a public phone that was a private phone he had. – Mm. – I remember [unclear] the school. – Mm. Heavens. So the Stenness Hotel has been up for a while then. – It was up [unclear] nineteen five*

*I think for tourists or nineteen three somewhere ni-- Just after the turn of the century.*

In (58), Speaker B, based on what was said by Speaker A (that Sandra had to go), makes the assumption that another man also left. This assumption is in the form of a statement. Speaker A neither confirms nor denies it because they do not have the information – their answer is ‘Maybe’. In (59), Speaker B, based on what was said by Speaker A about the Stenness Hotel, makes the assumption that the hotel has existed for a while. As the assumption is a statement, it looks like a generalisation of what was said by Speaker A. Speaker A confirms this assumption by giving the dates when the hotel was built.

Based on the information received during a conversation, assumptions can be made in the form of requests to take action, such as in (60):

(60) *The box is empty. – Is it? Hmm hmm. I'd better get another box **then**. I'd better get some from Boots, I think. – Yes because I've run out.*

When Speaker A tells Speaker B that the box is empty, Speaker B makes the assumption that they should get another box, i.e. perform an action. Speaker A confirms this and provides a reason – they have run out [of the contents of the box].

#### **5.4 Introducing additional information and presenting another aspect of the same topic**

The discourse markers *tada* and *then* are used in situations when additional information is introduced or new aspects of the same topic are presented. In such cases, the discourse markers *tada* and *then* can be compared to the temporal adverbials *tada* and *then*: as temporal adverbials *tada* and *then* express the temporal succession of events and as discourse markers they express the sequence of subjects (ideas) proceeding from one subject (idea) to another:

(61) *Yra ir kiti žodžiai pasakyti, bet reikia, toj pačioj laidoj iš pat karto aš tai pasakiau, kad tai reiškia, veiksmai teisėti Estijos, kad, reiškia, sprendžia savo kompetencijos klausimus, tą daro visiškai teisėtai, sutinkamai su tarptautinėm normom, ir kad, reiškia, mes pilnai palaikom tuos veiksmus. **Tada** dar buvo klausimas toksai: kaip, tarkim, Seimas reaguotų, jeigu Seimui reikėtų priimti atitinkamą rezoliuciją, palaikančią Estiją?*

‘There are other words that have been said, but we need, during the same show I immediately said that, that it means, that Estonia’s actions are legal, that, it means, it solves the questions of its competence and does it totally legally, according to international laws, and, it means, we totally support these actions. **Then** there was

one more question: how, let's say, the Seimas would react, if it would have to pass a certain resolution, supporting Estonia?'

- (62) *Nusikalstamumas didžiausias Malmö. Tada Gateborgas miestas irgi labai daug nusikalstamumo daro atvykėliai gyvenantys. Stokholmas, sostinė, tai ten gal griežčiau, aš nežinau, bet neskelbia <...>.*

'The crime rate is highest in Malmö. **Then** the city of Gothenburg – many crimes are committed there by the emigrants who live there. Stockholm, the capital, maybe it is stricter there, I don't know, but they don't declare <...>.'

- (63) *And erm we used to kick this tin down the hill and er as I say it would roll down and we would all go and hide anywhere, [unclear] back garden, front garden, over a wall, round a corner, anywhere like that you see. As I say the first one that was found had to, it was his turn to be on next. And then there was another game we used to play was called Peggy.*

- (64) *<...> with these posts as well, because it has actually stated we have employed an Environmental Officer. Yes, we know that. And then there are two further posts, two five's over the next twelve months.*

In (61), the following sequence of ideas is presented: the actions of Estonia are discussed, the question of the Seimas' reaction towards Estonia supporting the resolution is raised; in (62) the crime rate is highest in Malmö, it is also high in Gothenburg; in (63) the game "Hide and Seek" is remembered, a game called "Peggy" is remembered; in (64) two posts are mentioned, two more posts are mentioned. According to Schiffrin, such cases are two topics "successive in discourse time" (Schiffrin 1987, 252).

Examples (62–64) may be regarded as lists: in (61), towns with the highest crime rate are listed, in (63), the games played by the speaker when he was a child are listed, in (64), posts are listed. Since more information is given about the first position in the list, the discourse markers *tada* and *then* are used as a kind of a reminder, i.e. they refer backwards, so the hearer does not forget the main topic before the speaker mentions the next position.

In such cases, the Lithuanian connective *ir* may be used with *tada*. In English additional information is presented using the construction *and then there is/are/was/were...*, sometimes without *and*. E.g.

- (65) *So let's take a look at your three district managers. Three people, each representing a particular failure of yours. First of all, let's look at Barbara, who doesn't understand what she's supposed to be doing, because you've failed to tell her clearly what her responsibilities are. Then there's Bernard, who doesn't know*

*how well he's supposed to be doing because you failed to give him standards of performance that he could measure his efforts by. And finally, there's Tony, who's wasting a lot of his time because you haven't given him enough targets to keep him interested and to develop his potential, and to get the best out of him.*

In both languages – Lithuanian and English – *tada* and *then* are clause initial. As *tada* and *then* relate two discourse units and refer backwards, they are always used at the beginning of the second discourse unit.

### 5.5 The end or the beginning of a conversation, statement, etc.

This function of the discourse marker *then* is a common feature of spoken English. It could even be called a formula for the beginning of a conversation or a segment that needs to be emphasised:

- (66) *Now **then**, Gavin [unclear] You're not listening to a word we're saying, you've done sponge, that's good, now what else float?*
- (67) *Tha-- that's quite good for, for the biological stuff, it doesn't really [unclear] contain much sort of useful for the last three or four lectures, it doesn't contain much on sort of ocean circulation and the physics, you know [unclear] but it covers the biology [unclear] interactions quite well. And also it's quite useful for the [unclear] Right **then** we, we'll leave some of the physics and stuff that we've been doing behind now and just spend one lecture looking at some chemistry which I know will be equally popular.*

In (66), *then* is used to catch Gavin's attention, because he is not listening; in (67), *then* is used to change the topic from physics to chemistry. In both examples, *then* is used with another marker: *now then, right then*. In other cases, *then* is used to end the conversation:

- (68) *Right **then** and we'll talk. – About what? – See you later. – Talk about what? – Anything! I'm bored. – All right **then**. See you.*
- (69) *He looks like it, you can't work miracles get out of it, get on with that car – That looks like [unclear] – ta ra – Bye **then** – See you.*

In Lithuanian spoken discourse, *tada* is used to change the topic:

- (70) *<...> bet šiaip man atrodo, kuo mažiau alkoholio, tuo daugiau to dvasinio orumo, daug daugiau vietos tiem visiems reikalams, nu. – Supratau. Gerai, bet **tada, tada** gerai. Apie kitus dalykus. Tai ką Aras sakė.*  
'<...> but I think, that the less alcohol, the more spiritual dignity, much more space



for all these matters. – Got it. OK, but **then**, all right **then**. About other matters. So what did Aras say?’

- (71) <...> *gyveno toks karalius Liudvikas, kuris turėjo sūnų. – Ir jo internetinis nikas buvo Buzukas. – Ilga istorija. Gerai tada galim tiesiog pereit prie to, prie pokalbio su jumis.*

‘<...> there lived a king called Liudvikas, and he had a son. – And his nick in the internet was Buzukas. – Long story. OK **then**, we could proceed to the, to the conversation with you.’

In (70, 71), *tada* is used with the marker *gerai*.

The discourse marker *tada* is also used at the end of a conversation, when saying goodbye:

- (72) *Man jau laikas artėja į pabaigą. Buvo malonu šnekėti, labai čia prijuokinau, gal ir ne. Tai va tada viso gero visiems, gero vakaro ir labanaktis.*

‘My time is running out. It was a pleasure talking to you, I had so much fun, or maybe not. OK **then**, goodbye to everyone, have a great night and goodnight.’

## 6 Conclusions

The present semantic analysis of the Lithuanian word *tada* and corresponding English *then* allows me to draw the conclusion that both words are multifunctional and polysemic: they can function as temporal adverbials and as discourse markers. When *tada* and *then* lose their temporal functions and do not have any impact on the semantic content of an utterance, i.e. when their function of connecting discourse units is of primary importance, they then become discourse markers. Discourse markers are desemantised, their lexical meaning is diminished, but they have pragmatic meanings and functions.

Five main functions of *tada* and *then* have been outlined: as temporal adverbials *tada* and *then* can express simultaneity (1) and temporal sequence (2), as discourse markers they can express logical result (3), introduce additional information and present another aspect of the same topic (4), begin or end a conversation, statement etc. (5). The function of result has two modifications in both languages: *tada* and *then* as discourse markers may appear in hypothetical conditionals and *then*-clauses, as well as in non-hypothetical situations and assumptions (in requests for confirmation or for action). All the functions mentioned above are common in both Lithuanian and English, although some nuances may differ such as frequency of usage. Quantitative analysis was not the aim of this paper but it could be the object of future research. The undertaking of quantitative analysis may be able to verify the hypothesis that both words – *tada* and *then* – are more frequently used as discourse markers in spoken discourse than temporal adverbials.

The results of this cross-linguistic analysis show that in the Lithuanian language *tada* functions as a discourse marker in a similar manner to the corresponding English *then*. Nor is this an isolated phenomenon; on the contrary, such usage is widespread in Lithuanian spoken discourse. Adverbial cline is a common process in Lithuanian, which further confirms the hypothesis that this linguistic process may be universal and common to all languages. Lithuanian discourse markers that have developed from adverbs of manner or other adverbs merit more attention from linguists, the results of whose research could be reflected in future Lithuanian dictionaries.

### Data sources

- BNC *British National Corpus*. Available at: <http://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/>.
- CALD McIntosh, Colin, ed. 2013. *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. 4<sup>th</sup> edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CCLL *Corpus of the Contemporary Lithuanian Language*. Available at: <http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/tekstynas/>.
- DLKŽ Keinys, Stasys, vyr. red. 2012. *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas* [Dictionary of the contemporary Lithuanian language]. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
- LKŽ XV Ulvydas, Kazys, vyr. red. 1991. *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* [Dictionary of the Lithuanian language], vol. XV. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- MEDAL Rundell, Michael, ed. 2002. *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners*. International student edition. Oxford: Macmillan.
- OALD Hornby, Albert Sydney, Margaret Deuter, Jennifer Bradbery, Joanna Turnbull, eds. 2015. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. 9<sup>th</sup> edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ODE Soanes, Catherine, Angus Stevenson, eds. 2003. *Oxford Dictionary of English*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

### References

- Aijmer, Karin. 2007. The meaning and functions of the Swedish discourse marker *alltså*—Evidence from translation corpora. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 6, 31–59.
- Bartkutė, Darija. 2007. The role of patterns of cohesion in realising some discursive strategies in English and Lithuanian dialogue. *Žmogus ir žodis* 9 (3), 95–101.
- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education.

- Biber, Douglas, Susan Conrad, Randi Reppen. 1998. *Corpus linguistics. Investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bielinskienė, Agnė. 2009. Relevancijos teorija ir diskurso jungtukų bei jungiamųjų žodžių pragmatika. [Relevance theory and pragmatics of discourse connectives]. *Kalbų studijos* 15, 53–62.
- Biezma, María. 2014. The grammar of discourse: The case of *then*. *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 24, 337–394. Available at: <http://journals.linguisticsociety.org/proceedings/index.php/SALT/article/view/24.373/2147>. Accessed: 13 March 2016.
- Blakemore, Diane. 1987. *Semantic constraints on relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Blakemore, Diane. 1992. *Understanding utterances. An introduction to pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bras, Myriam, Anne Le Draoulec, Laure Vieu. 2001. French adverbial *puis* between temporal structure and discourse structure. Myriam Bras, Laure Vieu, eds. *Semantic and pragmatic issues in discourse and dialogue. Experimenting with current theories*. CRiSPI series 9. Amsterdam: Elsevier. 109–146.
- Brinton, Laurel J. 1996. *Pragmatic markers in English. Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Topics in English Linguistics 19. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Buitkienė, Janina. 2005. Once more on discourse and coherence. *Žmogus ir žodis* 7 (1), 95–101.
- Facchinetti, Roberta, Frank Palmer, eds. 2004. *English modality in perspective. Genre analysis and contrastive studies*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Fraser, Bruce. 1990. An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14, 383–395.
- Fraser, Bruce. 1996. Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics* 6 (2), 167–190.
- Fraser, Bruce. 1999. What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, 931–952.
- Halliday M. A. K., Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hinkel, Eli. 2014. *Second language writers' text. Linguistic and rhetorical features*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hurford, James R., Brendan Heasley, Michael B. Smith. 2007. *Semantics. A coursebook*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hussein, Miri. 2008. Two accounts of discourse markers in English. Available at: <http://semarch.linguistics.fas.nyu.edu/Archive/TljODdhM/DMs%20in%20English.pdf>. Accessed: 9 March 2016.
- Kennedy, Graeme. 1998. *An introduction to corpus linguistics*. London & New York: Longman.
- Klein, Wolfgang. 2009. How time is encoded. Wolfgang Klein, Ping Li, eds. *The expression of time*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 39–82.

- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1987. Pragmatics and the grammar of anaphora: A partial pragmatic reduction of binding and control phenomena. *Journal of Linguistics* 23, 379–434.
- Lyavdansky, Alexey. 2010. Temporal deictic adverbs as discourse markers in Hebrew, Aramaic and Akkadian. *Journal of Language Relationship* 3, 79–99.
- Marcinkevičienė, Rūta. 2010. *Lietuvių kalbos kolokacijos*. [Collocations of the Lithuanian language]. Monografija. Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas.
- Masaitienė, Dalia. 2003. Discourse markers in English and Lithuanian. *Kalbotyra* 53 (3), 64–70.
- McEnery, Anthony, Andrew Wilson. 2001. *Corpus linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Meyer, Charles F. 2002. *English corpus linguistics. An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Onodera, Noriko O. 2004. *Japanese discourse markers: Synchronic and diachronic discourse analysis*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Partington, Alan. 1998. *Patterns and meanings. Using corpora for language research and teaching*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Péter, Furkó Bálint. 2005. *The pragmatic marker-discourse marker dichotomy reconsidered – the case of well and of course*. Ph.D. dissertation. Debreceni Egyetem: Bölcsészettudományi Kar, Debrecen.
- Rundell, Michael, Sylviane Granger. 2007. From corpora to confidence. *MED Magazine*. Available at: [http://www.macmillandictionaries.com/MED-Magazine/August2007/46-Feature\\_CorporatoC.htm](http://www.macmillandictionaries.com/MED-Magazine/August2007/46-Feature_CorporatoC.htm). Accessed: 22 May 2016.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sinclair, John. 1991. *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smetona, Antanas, Aurelija Usonienė. 2012. Autoriaus pozicijos adverbialai ir adverbializacija lietuvių mokslo kalboje. [Stance adverbials and adverbialization in Lithuanian academic discourse]. *Kalbotyra* 64 (3), 124–139.
- Soltic, Jorie. 2013. Late Medieval Greek πάλιν: A discourse marker signalling topic switch. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 53, 390–419.
- Šimčikaitė, Alė. 2012. Spoken discourse markers in learner academic writing. *Kalbu studijos/Studies about Languages* 20, 27–34.
- Šiniajeva, Irina. 2005. *Discourse markers: Their functions and distribution across registers*. MA thesis. Vilnius: Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences.
- Šliogerienė, Jolita, Giedrė Valūnaitė-Oleškevičienė, Vilma Asijavičiūtė. 2015. Discourse relational devices of contrast in Lithuanian and English. *Santalka: Filologija, Edukologija/Coactivity: Philology, Educology* 23 (2), 92–100.

- Tognini-Bonelli, Elena. 2001. *Corpus linguistics at work*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1997 [1995]. *The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalization*. Paper presented at ICHL XII, Manchester, August 1995 (version of 11/97). Available at: <http://web.stanford.edu/~traugott/papers/discourse.ps>. Accessed: 3 April 2016.
- Usonienė, Aurelija. 2016. *Reikšmės pasaulis: tekstynais paremti semantiniai kalbų tyrimai*. [The world of meaning: Corpus-based semantic studies]. Vilnius: Akademinė leidyba.
- Verikaitė, Daiva. 2005. Jungtukų vartojimo ypatumai skirtingų žanrų tekstuose. [Variation of conjunctive discourse markers across different genres]. *Žmogus ir žodis* 7 (3), 68–75.
- Webber, Bonnie L. 1988. Discourse deixis: Reference to discourse segments. *Technical Reports (CIS)*. Paper 458. Available at: [http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1479&context=cis\\_reports](http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1479&context=cis_reports). Accessed: 1 June 2016.

Date of submission: November 2016