

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF PHILOLOGY

Katažyna Pavliukovič

Translating Court Rulings from Lithuanian into English: Expressions of Modal
Stance

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of MA in Language for
Specific (Legal) Purposes

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rita Juknevičienė

VILNIUS 2026

Content

ABSTRACT	3
ANOTACIJA	3
1. INTRODUCTION	4
2.2 LITERATURE REVIEW	6
2.1 The concept of Stance	6
2.2 The concept of Modality	7
2.3 Explaining the Concept of Evidentiality	8
2.4 Evidentiality vs. Modality	9
2.5 Modal Expressions in the Lithuanian language	10
2.6 Modality in Legal Discourse	11
2.7 Stance in Legal Discourse	11
2.8 Research on the Translation of Stance Expressions between English and Lithuanian	12
3.2. DATA AND METHODS	13
3.2. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	15
3.1. Most frequent Lithuanian modal stance markers	15
3.2. Types of the most frequent Lithuanian stance markers used in the subcorpus LECOLT	20
3.3. Most Frequent English Stance Markers Used in the Translation in the corpus LECOLT	26

3.4. Types of the most frequent English stance markers used in the translation of subcorpus LECOLT.....	30
3.5. Most Common Lexical Bundles Indicating Modal Stance and Their Equivalent Translation into English	34
3.6. The Lithuanian Language's Most Common Lexical Bundles Denoting Modal Stance and Their English Translations	38
4. CONCLUSIONS.....	43
SUMMARY OF THE STUDY IN THE LITHUANIAN LANGUAGE	45
SUMMARY OF THE STUDY IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE	46
REFERENCES	47

Katažyna Pavliukovič. *Translating court rulings from Lithuanian into English: expressions of modal stance*. Master's Thesis, supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rita Juknevičienė, Vilnius University, Faculty of Philology, 2026, 49 p.

Abstract

Stance markers are known as grammatical instrument to express a speaker's viewpoint regarding the status of the event. Such modals as provide difficulty to translators as it is an extensive phenomenon, requiring translators to choose equivalents that preserve the same legal meaning and impact, as their meanings can differ across languages. As a result, linguists and other scientists are becoming increasingly interested in this field. The particular topic is based on the investigation of a parallel Lithuanian–English corpus investigation towards the translation study of court rulings from Lithuanian into English. The analyzed stance markers are analyzed using quantitative and qualitative research methods. The study aims to explore how Lithuanian modal verbs and adverbs *gali* 'you can/you may', *pažymėtina* 'it should be noted/it is to be noted', *galėtų* 'could/would be able to', *turėtų* 'should/would have/would be supposed to', *galima* 'it is possible/one can/may', *būtina* 'it is necessary/must be', *pabrėžtina* 'it should be emphasized', and *akivaizdžiai* 'obviously/evidently/manifestly' are translated into English in court rulings. Firstly, the analysis focuses on the translation of isolated words and, secondly, the translation of 4–word lexical bundles containing the verbs and adverbs are analysed. Although, this study did not examine this issue completely due to its limited variety of research, but further studies should be carried out on this topic.

Key words: legal translation, court rulings, modal stance, epistemic, deontic, dynamic, lexical bundles.

Katažyna Pavliukovič. *Teismo sprendimų vertimas iš Lietuvių kalbos į Anglų kalbą: modalumo raiška*. Magistro darbas, vadovė – doc. dr. Rita Juknevičienė, Vilniaus Universitetas, Filologijos fakultetas, 2026, 49 p.

Anotacija

Požiūrio žymikliai yra žinomi kaip gramatinė priemonė, skirta išreikšti kalbėtojo požiūrį į įvykio statusą. Tokie modaliniai veiksmažodžiai irrieveksmiai kelia sunkumų vertėjams, nes tai yra

platus reiškiny, reikalaujantis iš vertėjų pasirinkti ekvivalentus, kurie išlaikytų tą pačią teisinę prasmę ir poveikį, kadangi jų reikšmės skirtingose kalbose gali skirtis. Dėl to lingvistai ir kiti mokslininkai vis labiau domisi šia sritimi. Ši tema grindžiama lygiagretaus lietuvių–anglų tekstyno tyrimu, skirtu teismo sprendimų vertimui iš lietuvių į anglų kalbą. Analizuojami požiūrio žymikliai tirti taikant kiekybinius ir kokybinius tyrimo metodus. Tyrimo tikslas – ištirti, kaip teismo sprendimuose į anglų kalbą verčiami lietuviški modaliniai veiksmažodžiai irrieveiksmiai *gali* ‘you can/you may’, *pažymėtina* ‘it should be noted/it is to be noted’, *galėtų* ‘could/would be able to’, *turėtų* ‘should/would have/would be supposed to’, *galima* ‘it is possible/one can/may’, *būtina* ‘it is necessary/must be’, *pabrėžtina* ‘it should be emphasized’, and *akivaizdžiai* ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’ verčiami į anglų kalbą teismo sprendimuose. Pirmiausia analizėje daugiausia dėmesio skiriama pavienių žodžių vertimui, o antra – analizuojamas 4 žodžių leksinių samplaikų, kuriuose yra veiksmažodžiai irrieveiksmiai, vertimas. Nors šiame tyrime šis klausimas nebuvo išnagrinėtas išsamiai dėl ribotos tyrimo apimties, tačiau šia tema reikėtų atlikti tolesnius tyrimus.

Raktažodžiai: teisinis vertimas, teismo sprendimai, požiūrio žymikliai, episteminis, deontinis, dinaminis, leksinės samplaikos.

1. Introduction

In both spoken and written communication, individuals must make numerous choices regarding content and expression (Biber et al. 2007: 2). Factors such as communicative purpose, context, audience, and mode of delivery influence the selection of vocabulary and language (ibid). Academic writing, in particular, holds a significant role within academic contexts. Academic language requires careful word selection to convey complex concepts to diverse audiences (Strongman 2013: 1). Writers establish credibility by aligning with readers, critically analyzing content, and acknowledging alternative viewpoints (Hyland 2005: 173). Effectively managing the degree of authorial presence is crucial for constructing persuasive arguments, as it enables authors to present an authentic representation of their work while engaging with readers and recognizing differing perspectives (Hyland 2005:174). Dirven (1998: 97) (as cited in Usonienė (2004: 19) states that modality is one grammatical tool used to convey a speaker’s perspective on the state of the event. Therefore, as observed on Šolienė (2016: 224–225), researchers have historically

identified three primary categories of modality: *epistemic*, *deontic*, and *dynamic*. However, there is no consensus regarding the number of modality types that may be identified (ibid.) According to Rozina & Karapetjana (2018: 207), an epistemic modality can convey a speaker's degree of knowledge, belief, or probability about a statement as well as their certainty or uncertainty about its truth value. The other type of modality, i.e. *dynamic*, according to Palmer (2001: 9–10), dynamic modality relates to a person's own capacity or willingness to act, whereas deontic modality deals with obligation and permission imposed by an outside authority. As a result, posture describes how a writer expresses their attitude, assessment, and dedication to the material in a writing.

A lot of research has been done through translation studies across different languages and disciplines (Nemickiene 2016; Pekūnas 2024; Ruskan 2016; Šinkūnienė 2016; Šolienė 2016; Usonienė 2004). Modality attracts linguists' attention because it is a complex and broad phenomenon (Usonienė 2004: 16). There is a disagreement even regarding the basic types of modality in language providing discussions on this topic continue to this day (ibid.) According to Nemickiene (2016: 197), when there are no equivalents in the target language, the translator must cope with a variety of translation issues. Earlier research shows that the Lithuanian language also lacks translational equivalents for modal verbs (ibid.) For example, stance markers serve as linguistic markers in the legal discipline. Pekūnas (2024: 48) states that the translation of legal texts accounts for a significant portion of the translation market. Among the legal documents most frequently translated into Lithuanian are European Union (EU) legal acts: regulations, directives, decisions, and the judgements, orders, and opinions of the Court of Justice of the European Union (ibid.) According to Tiersma (2006: 3) legal language is “wordy and redundant, pompous and dull, and either highly precise or maddeningly indeterminate”. This suggests that legal language is often overly worded, appears overly formal and boring, and depending on the circumstance, can be either extremely specific or painfully vague (ibid.) Therefore, translating a modal verb that would not have a semantic lack of expression or meaning is a challenge for the translator (Nemickiene 2016: 197). Modal verbs express modality, which is the semantic domain that relates to the aspects of meaning that language conveys (ibid.) Stance markers express author's perspective in the legal writings, although translators must select equivalents that maintain the same legal meaning and effect because the meanings of modals may vary between languages.

Although, there are many studies done on the translation study of modals across different languages and disciplines, a little research has been carried out on comparing the use of stance markers in court rulings across the Lithuanian and English languages. It is significant to provide a study on this area because it will show us interesting results which come up with distinctions and similarities of translation that are important to a better understanding of crosslinguistic differences. The current study takes a more exploratory approach by examining at the frequency, types, functions of stance markers and the analysis of lexical bundles denoting stance markers together with their translation equivalents of Lithuanian court rulings into English. Using the Lithuanian–English Corpus of Legal Texts (henceforth: LECOLT: Juknevičienė, Talačka: 2024), this analysis that simply sets out to answer the following research questions:

1. What modal stance expressions occur most frequently in the Lithuanian and English court rulings?
2. In what way are Lithuanian modal expressions of obligation, possibility, permission, and certainty translated into English?
3. To what degree are modal meanings maintained, enhanced, diminished, or altered in translation?
4. Which lexical bundles expressing modal stance are most commonly found in Lithuanian court rulings?
5. In what way are Lithuanian modal stance bundles rendered into English?

2.2 Literature review

2.1 The concept of Stance

Definition and Classification

Linguistic tools are essential in academic writing as they influence the interaction between the writer and the reader, a dynamic relationship known as stance (Chen 2025: 1). Controlling the degree of personality in a text becomes crucial to developing a compelling argument because writers try to provide a genuine image of themselves and their work by expressing solidarity with readers, assessing its content, and recognizing opposing viewpoints (Hyland 2005: 174). According to Biber et al. (1999: 958–961) using grammatical or lexical devices, such as adverbials and complement clauses with verbs and adjectives, speakers and writers frequently explicitly

convey attitude meanings. Two separate linguistic elements make up grammatical stance devices: one presents the stance and the other presents a proposition that is framed by stance; for instance, “*Unfortunately, we cannot do anything about it*” or “*It’s **amazing** that judges can get away with outrageous statements*” (ibid.) These examples show how writers can use stance markers to frame information through an evaluative perspective and expressing their own opinions. The stance markers are grouped into three main semantic categories: *epistemic*, *attitudinal*, and *style of speaking* (Biber et al. 1999: 964–967). Epistemic stance indicates certainty (or uncertainty), reality, accuracy, or restriction (*It was **definitely** a case of exploiting child labour*) whereas attitudinal stance describe person’s attitudes or emotions (***Fortunately** this did not stop women from trying*), and style of speaking stance presents remarks made by the writer or speaker regarding the communication itself (***Honestly**, I’ve got no patience whatsoever*) (ibid.) These categories demonstrate how stance markers help authors in expressing certainty, emotion, and commentary on the communication process itself. To conclude, this indicates that stance markers are essential for controlling assessment, commitment, and organizing the writer–reader interaction in academic discourse.

2.2 The concept of Modality

Definition and Classification

One of the most discussed topics in linguistics is modality, which is particularly rich in theoretical frameworks, definitions, and interpretations that have been put forth (Šolienė 2016: 224). Collins (2009: 11) defines modality as encompassing a range of semantic concepts such as possibility, necessity, permission, obligation, and ability. This highlights the main semantic functions through which modality expresses varying degrees of meaning. Kai von Fintel (2006: 1) states that there are many types of expressions with modal meanings; the following represents only a fraction of the diversity present in English. The main kinds are modal auxiliaries, semimodal verbs, adverbs, nouns, adjectives, conditionals (ibid.) According to Šolienė (2016: 224–225), there is no general agreement on the number of modality types that can be identified, but traditionally scholars identify three main types of modality: *epistemic*, *deontic*, and *dynamic*. Rozina & Karapetjana (2018: 207) explain that epistemic modality can express either the speaker’s certainty or uncertainty regarding the truth value of a given proposition and their level of knowledge, belief, or probability concerning the stated proposition. Furthermore, drawing on Palmer (2001: 9–10)

states that deontic modality concerns obligation and permission imposed by an external authority while dynamic modality refers to an individual's own ability or willingness to act. This description effectively differentiates the three primary types of modality, highlighting their distinct bases: epistemic in knowledge or belief, deontic in external authority, and dynamic in personal ability or willingness. Overall, modality is an important part of language that helps express personal opinions and links ideas about knowledge, obligation, and ability in communication.

To further clarify how modality operates in English, after defining modality and its types, it is essential to provide an overview of English modal auxiliaries. As stated by Depraetere & Reed (2006: 272) (cited in Šolienė (2016: 228) modal auxiliaries are classified into central and peripheral or semi-modals (marginal modals). The following group of central modal verbs are: *can, could, may, might, must, should, shall, will, and would*; peripheral auxiliaries: *dare, need, ought to*; and the last group is semi-modals: *have to, be able to, be going to, be supposed to, be bound to, and be about to* (ibid.) This classification offers a clear basis for analyzing the grammatical structure and functional variation of English modal verbs. According to Biber et al. (1999: 490), some modals express permission and possibility, but differ in multifunctionality, with *might* used exclusively to indicate logical possibility, *can* conveying permission, ability, and logical possibility, and *could, may* and *might* in academic writing primarily marking logical possibility. For instance, “*The two processes **could** well be independent*”; “*The only problem **may** be that the compound is difficult to remove after use*” (ibid.) Both instances demonstrate that in academic writing, *could* and *may* are used to indicate logical possibility rather than ability or permission. Overall, these observations highlight that understanding how modal auxiliaries are classified and used shows how important they are for expressing subtle shades of meaning, especially logical possibility, in different contexts of academic writing.

2.3 Explaining the Concept of Evidentiality

Definition of Evidentiality

The next step after discussing modality is to look at evidentiality. According to Aikhenvald (2006: 320), evidentiality is a grammatical category that primarily indicates the source of information, showing whether the speaker directly witnessed an event, inferred it from evidence, or learned about it from others. Furthermore, evidentiality is an independent verbal grammatical category that is not directly connected to the truthfulness of a statement, its validity, or the speaker's degree of

responsibility (ibid.) This indicates that evidentiality focuses on how information is obtained, not on its truth, highlighting the speaker's source and degree of knowledge. As Ruskan (2016: 180) notes in the past decade, many cross-linguistic studies have explored the formal and functional relationships between evidential and epistemic modal markers. The scientist claim that considerable attention has been given to the modal verbs *must* and *seem* as well as to epistemic and evidential adverbials and their counterparts in other Germanic, Romance, Baltic, and Slavic languages (ibid.) According to Haan (1999: 90) in Germanic languages, highly epistemic modal verbs, such as *must* are often employed to express evidential meanings. For instance, “*You must have been home last night*” explaining ‘*The available (direct) evidence compels me to the conclusion that you were home*’ (ibid.) This example that *must* expresses both strong certainty and inference from evidence, illustrates how epistemic modality and evidentiality overlap in Germanic languages. Contrastively, in the Lithuanian language, according to Šolienė (2012, 2015) (cited in Ruskan 2016: 179) elaborates that the translational equivalent of *likely* in the parallel corpus is a Lithuanian verbal form *tikėtina* ‘believable, likely’, which comes from the cognitive verb *tikėti* ‘believe, expect’. This contrast underlines Yang’s (2014: 581) point that the way modal auxiliaries are classified and used shows how important they are for expressing different meanings, especially logical possibility. This suggests that although evidentiality’s status as grammatical or semantic differs by language, modal auxiliaries are crucial for communicating notions like as logical possibility.

2.4 Evidentiality vs. Modality

Despite the aforementioned links, some scientists view evidentiality as distinct from modality (Haan 1999; Aikhenvald 2006; Gunji & Takubo 2008; Yang 2014). According to Gunji & Takubo (2008: 221), for many years, linguistic expressions of evidentiality and modality have been the focus of intense and interesting research, yet they nevertheless present difficulties in every branch of semantic theory. In general, there are two key areas of contention about evidentiality: whether it is a semantic or grammatical category, and what the semantic scope of evidentiality is (Yang 2014: 581). The statements highlight the continuing debate over evidentiality, emphasizing that its nature and scope remain unresolved issues in semantic. Drawing on Gunji & Takubo (2008: 221), it is unclear how they behave at the syntax–semantics interface, particularly when interacting with quantifiers and other operators or when calculating modal implicatures that are triggered in

embedding situations. For instance, (1) “If Alfonso comes to the party, will Jonna leave?” or (2) “Will Jonna leave?” Gunji & Takubo (2008: 223). The scholars demonstrate that modals lack a definitive meaning; rather, their understanding varies according to syntactic context. Furthermore, according to Haan (1999: 87) evidentiality and epistemic modality both deal with evidence, but they take different approaches to it. For instance, epistemic modality “evaluates” the available evidence and based on this assessment, expresses the speaker’s degree of confidence in their statement whereas an evidential “asserts” indicates that the speaker has some form of evidence for their statement but does not provide any interpretation or evaluation of that evidence (ibid.) For example, drawing on Sweetser (1990: 61) (as cited in Haan 1999: 91) “*You **must** have been home last night*”; paraphrased into “*The available (direct) evidence compels me to the conclusion that you were home last night*”. The “must” expresses the speaker’s high degree of certainty based on that evidence (ibid.) In general, the connection between evidentiality and modality is intricate and still unresolved.

2.5 Modal Expressions in the Lithuanian language

Moving from English to Lithuanian, similar to other languages, Lithuanian employs an array of grammatical and lexical tools to convey modality. Based on Holvoet (2009: 206) (as cited in Šinkūnienė 2016: 209) considers that in Lithuanian, there are two multifunctional modal verbs that can indicate both epistemic and non-epistemic modality, effectively encompassing the entire spectrum of modality from dynamic to epistemic. The verb *galėti* ‘can/could/may/might’ denotes various forms of modal possibility, while the verb *turėti* ‘have to’ encompasses all types of modal necessity (ibid.) This illustrates that Lithuanian modal verbs serve a diverse set of purposes, enabling speakers to convey not just ability or permission but also obligation and necessity within one linguistic framework. Additionally, Ruskan (2016: 180) in her study focuses on the epistemic use of the English modal marker *likely* and its equivalents in Lithuanian. The research identifies common patterns in the use of *likely* and examines corresponding Lithuanian structures, such as *tikėtina* ‘believable’ or *galima* ‘it is possible/one can/may’/‘possibly’ (ibid.) This analysis offers important understanding of how modality is linguistically represented in each language, highlighting that Lithuanian and English employ different grammatical methods to express similar shades of probability and uncertainty.

2.6 Modality in Legal Discourse

After presenting the general idea of modality, the focus now shifts to its significance in legal discourse. Tiersma (2006: 3) states that legal language is “wordy and redundant, pompous and dull, and either highly precise or maddeningly indeterminate”. This indicates that legal language frequently employs excessive wording, comes across as excessively formal and tedious, and can either be very specific or frustratingly ambiguous based on the situation. Based on Mommers and Voermans (2005: 147) legal concepts can serve as reference points within legal texts and can help to “enhance the understandability of legal documents”. Otherwise, Tiersma (2006: 31) warns that the law can certainly be articulated more clearly, but it is improbable that regular citizens will fully grasp it. Writing a law in simple terms would be meaningless if readers need to refer to court rulings to understand the true meaning of a statute (ibid.) In addition, it is important to note that although definitions may improve clarity, they cannot remove the inherent complexity embedded in legal frameworks. For instance, Krapivkina (2017: 306) claim that the verb *shall* is very important in legal discourse, because it serves to convey compulsory and mandatory actions, requirements, prohibitions, permissions, future actions, and more. For instance, “*I’m afraid I **shall** be late*”; “*She **shall** go to the holidays*”, “*He **shall** get his reward*”. This illustrates that *shall* serves various roles in legal language, conveying obligation as well as signifying the desired legal effect or status of a provision. In conclusion modality is crucial in influencing the accuracy and credibility of legal discussions.

2.7 Stance in Legal Discourse

Legal language frequently represents stance through terms that indicate obligation, possibility, certainty, or evaluation. Tiersma (2000) (as cited in Glogar 2023: 1082) acknowledges that “Our law is a law of words. Words are also a lawyer’s most essential tools”. Language is not only necessary to comprehend the law and its contents, but it also forms the basis of the law itself (ibid.) In other words, language itself functions as a significant and strong tool to use in the law. The academic language requires the careful choice of words to express complex ideas to different readers and audiences (Strongman 2013: 1). Di Carlo (2017) (as cited in Hamiti & Sopjani 2023: 2) claim that numerous studies have demonstrated that modal verbs are crucial in legal language, and thus, they should be used correctly when composing legislative documents. For instance, when expressing obligation, *shall* is used rather than *must* (Hamiti & Sopjani 2023: 79) Aside from these

practical considerations, the overuse of *shall* has mostly been observed in the target language to transmit many meanings since it is used with both performative and deontic values that reflect necessity, obligation, futurity, and permission (ibid.) It shows that the function of stance markers are significant in the legal language. Moreover, various discourses, ranging from academic to legal discourse, along with diverse text, have served as primary sources for exploring the frequency, structural, and functional characteristic of lexical bundles (Berūkštienė 2017: 10). According to Cambridge Dictionary (1995), *collocations* are “the combination of words formed when two or more words are often used together”, *idioms* are “a group of words in a fixed order that has a particular meaning”. Whereas *lexical bundles* are “extended collocations: bundles of words that show a statistical tendency to co-occur” (Biber et al. 1999: 989). According to Juknevičienė (2017: 51), *idioms* and *collocations* ‘share a common feature – their constituents are related through meaning’ while *lexical bundles* (also called *n-grams*, *clusters*, *chunks*, etc.) relate to ‘the new type of phrase, (...) often structurally and semantically incomplete, e.g., *in order to*, *the case of*, *you know*, etc.’ providing linguists analyse them in terms of structure and function in discourse. Moreover, lexical bundles “follow each other more frequently than expected by chance” (Hyland 2008: 6) to function interchangeably in a specific order. As a result, chunks are fixed sequences that have their specific function and structure in discourse.

2.8 Research on the Translation of Stance Expressions between English and Lithuanian

In recent decades, the field of research on language of science has expanded significantly, researchers have begun to examine not only scientific texts written in English, but also scientific discourse also produced in various other languages (Šinkūnienė 2016: 131). Many scientists (Nemickienė 2016; Pekūnas 2024; Ruskan 2016; Šinkūnienė 2016; Šolienė 2016; Usonienė 2004) analyzed different types of modals in the English language and its equivalents into the Lithuanian language and in different disciplines. The studies collecting and analyzing the findings from a large corpus, have revealed distinct patterns of modals usage. For example, in academic writing, English-speaking authors tend to use *should* more frequently in the medical field than in the humanities, whereas in Lithuanian academic writing, *privalėti* is rarely used (Šinkūnienė 2016: 131). Similarly, Šolienė (2016: 224) claim that her analysis reveals that *have to* (Lith. *turėti/reikėti*) is used twice as often as *must* (Lith. *turėti/privalėti*) in works of fiction, while constructions with *have got to* (Lith. *turėti/reikėti*) are relatively rare. It can be stated that there are significant

differences in translation from Lithuanian into English. Furthermore, translating modal verbs poses a challenge for the translator to ensure there is no semantic gap or loss of meaning (Nemickiene 2016: 197). For instance, Complement–Taking–Predicates and the adverbial *panašu* (Eng. *likely, it seems*) have similarities with *likely* and *tikėtina* (Eng. *believable, likely*) in conveying the author's level of probability (Ruskan 2016: 179). Moreover, *must* and other English modal verbs lack an equivalent set of modal verbs in Lithuanian, and different translation approached may be used when translating these verbs from English to Lithuanian (Nemickiene 2016: 204). For instance, *must* is translated as *privalo, tikriausiai, turėtų* 'should/would have/would be supposed to', *pridera, turi* (ibid.) The examples show how the translation of modals can be different between two separate languages as English and Lithuanian. Regarding the legal discipline, in English language EU legislation, deontic modality is most frequently express through lexical combinations containing the component *shall* (Pekūnas 2016: 65). The translation of lexical combinations containing *shall* depends heavily on whether the modal verb conveys obligations, duties, or other deontic meanings (ibid.) These examples of translations between languages (Lithuanian vs. English) demonstrate how translation can vary, ensuring precision in order to prevent misinterpretation of the content.

3.2.Data and Methods

For the purpose of this study, a parallel corpus of Lithuanian–English was used, i.e. LECOLT (Juknevičienė, Talačka 2024). The corpus consists of 60 court rulings compiled from Lithuanian Constitutional Court rulings and their officially published English translations. The court rulings date a time period from 2014 to 2021. Although it is not known how many individual translators contributed their translations of the court rulings, the official English translations represent legal texts publicly released on the website of the Constitutional Court of Lithuania and thus represent discourse associated with that court. The particular research employs the term **stance markers**, since the examination centers on particular linguistic elements that indicate stance within the text. All examples (both original Lithuanian sentences and their translations into English) given in this paper, if not stated otherwise, have been taken from LECOLT. All original Lithuanian examples are marked with the letter a (e.g. 1a, 2a, etc.) and the English translated sentences are marked as b (e.g. 1b, 2b, etc.).

The study aims to explore how Lithuanian modal verbs and adverbs *gali* ‘you can/you may’; *pažymėtina* ‘it should be noted/it is to be noted’, *galėtų* ‘could/would be able to’, *turėtų* ‘should/would have/would be supposed to’, *galima* ‘it is possible/one can/may’, *būtina* ‘it is necessary/must be’, *pabrėžtina* ‘it should be emphasized’, and *akivaizdžiai* ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’ are translated into English in court rulings. This section provides the Lithuanian verbs and adverbs chosen for analysis, with glossing in line with the Leipzig Glossing Rules. The glosses indicate the grammatical details embedded in every verb form, including person, number, tense, mood, and voice when applicable (Comrie et al. 2015). The following Table 1 presents the glossed verb forms according to Leipzig Glossing Rules as follows:

Table 1. Glossing of Lithuanian Verb Forms

No.	Lithuanian verb form	Segmentation	Leipzig gloss	English translation
1.	<i>gali</i>	gal-i	can-PRS.2SG	‘you can/you may’
2.	<i>pažymėtina</i>	pa-žymė-tin-a	PVB-mark-NEC-N	‘it should be noted/it is to be noted’
3.	<i>galėtų</i>	gal-ė-tų	can-PST-SBJV.3	‘could/would be able to’
4.	<i>turėtų</i>	tur-ė-tų	have-PST-SBJV.3	‘should/would have/would be supposed to’
5.	<i>galima</i>	gal-im-a	can-PTCP.PRS.PASS-N	‘it is possible/one can/may’
6.	<i>būtina</i>	bū-tin-a	be-NEC-N	‘it is necessary/must be’
7.	<i>pabrėžtina</i>	pa-brėž-tin-a	PVB-emphasize-NEC-N	‘it should be emphasized’
8.	<i>akivaizdžiai</i>	akivaizd-žiai	obvious-ADV	‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’

The computer program called AntConc (Anthony 2024) was used for the extraction of the most frequent stance markers in the Lithuanian and English languages. Moreover, the AntConc program was used to detect the most commonly used lexical bundles. The generated list of 4-word bundles was analyzed to identify such lexical bundles that express modal stance in the Lithuanian languages. Firstly, all selected parallel concordances of court rulings of Lithuanian and English languages were converted into text files (*.txt files), because the AntConc program does not read formats like from Microsoft Excel. Secondly, the program received the explicit stance markers of separate languages (at first, the Lithuanian concordance was analyzed, then the English one) containing stance markers from the most common to the least common, as well as the frequency with which each stance markers occurred and the number of rulings in which it was used.

The current research focused on selecting the most frequent stance markers from Lithuanian and English languages according to the types. They were categorized according to Palmer's distinction of modality into categories: *epistemic*, *deontic*, and *dynamic* (1990:3). After categorising the stance markers into categories, the analysis of translations of stance markers was produced. The analysis draws on Hyland's (2005: 177) stance model (hedges, boosters, attitude markers). A parallel corpus comparison was used to evaluate differences and similarities among Lithuanian and English languages.

In the same manner, the AntConc program was used to extract the frequency of lexical bundles indicating stance markers in the Lithuanian language. The n-gram size was chosen (throughout this case 4-gram). The present study aimed at investigating four-word lexical bundles because they are "far more common than five-word strings and offer a clearer range of structures and functions than three-word bundles" (Hyland 2008: 8).

3.2.Results and Discussion

3.1. Most frequent Lithuanian modal stance markers

After the data was processed and analyzed, it became evident to present the most used modal stance markers in the Lithuanian language. Eight stance markers were chosen for the analysis because they showed relatively higher frequencies therefore provided a sufficient number of examples for a purposeful survey. Less frequent than 30 instances were excluded, as their limited

occurrences would make it impossible to compare them reliably. The following Table 2 presents the top 8 stance markers in Lithuanian as follows:

Table 2. **Top 8 frequent stance markers in The Lithuanian language:**

No.	Type	Raw Frequency
1.	<i>gali</i> ‘you can/you may’	1,400
2.	<i>pažymėtina</i> ‘it should be noted/it is to be noted’	949
3.	<i>galėtų</i> ‘could/would be able to’	196
4.	<i>turėtų</i> ‘should/would have/would be supposed to’	182
5.	<i>galima</i> ‘it is possible/one can/may’	181
6.	<i>būtina</i> ‘it is necessary/must be’	178
7.	<i>pabrėžtina</i> ‘it should be emphasized’	48
8.	<i>akivaizdžiai</i> ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’	36

As it is seen from the table, the most frequent stance markers in the Lithuanian language are *gali* ‘you can/you may’, *pažymėtina* ‘it should be noted/it is to be noted’ *galėtų* ‘could/would be able to’. With a smaller frequency, but also frequently used modals are *turėtų* ‘should/would have/would be supposed to’, *galima* ‘it is possible/one can/may’, *pabrėžtina* ‘it should be emphasized’ and *akivaizdžiai* ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’. The most common stance markers in the Lithuanian language extracted from corpus highlight the linguistic elements that are crucial in conveying modal stance in judicial decisions. The following instances illustrate how authors can employ stance markers to present information with an evaluative viewpoint while conveying their individual opinions.

The following examples with stance markers as *gali* ‘you can/you may’, *galima* ‘it is possible/one can/may’ and *galėtų* ‘could/would be able to’ express possibility in the sentence:

- 1a. Suinteresuoto asmens Seimo atstovės Seimo Kaimo reikalų komiteto patarėjos Gintarės Dešukaitės rašytiniuose paaiškinimuose teigiama, kad sutarčių laisvės principas nėra absoliutus ir jis **gali** būti ribojamas siekiant, be kita ko, apsaugoti viešąjį interesą, užtikrinti sąžiningumą, teisingumą.
- 1b. 3. In the written explanations of Gintarė Dešukaitė, an adviser at the Office of the Committee on Rural Affairs of the Office of the Seimas, acting as the representative of the Seimas, the party concerned, it is stated that the principle of freedom of contract is not absolute and it **may** be limited, among other things, in order to protect public interest and ensure equitability and fairness.
- 2a. Lietuvos Respublikos planuojamos ūkinės veiklos poveikio aplinkai vertinimo įstatyme nustatyta, kad gauti leidimą vykdyti išsklaidytųjų angliavandenilių tiesioginį tyrimą ir (arba) gavybą, kai taikomas hidraulinis ardymas, **galima** tik atlikus privalomąją tokios veiklos poveikio aplinkai vertinimą (1 priedo 2.5 punktas) ir esant teigiamam atsakingos institucijos sprendimui dėl planuojamos ūkinės veiklos galimybių (3 straipsnio 4 dalis, 10 straipsnio 9 dalis).
- 2b. The Republic of Lithuania’s Law on Environmental Impact Assessment of the Proposed Economic Activity provides that permits for direct exploration and/or extraction of unconventional hydrocarbons by applying hydraulic fracturing **may** be issued only after a compulsory assessment of environmental impact of such activity is conducted (Paragraph 2.5 of Annex 1) and the respective institution adopts a decision permitting the pursuit of proposed economic activity (Paragraph 4 of Article 3, Paragraph 9 of Article 10).
- 3a. Tokia teisė ginčijamu teisiniu reguliavimu užtikrinta asmenims, kurie iki teisinio reguliavimo pakeitimo spėjo gauti leidimus laikyti (nešiotis) ginklą, nors objektyvių skirtumų, kuriais **galėtų** būti pateisintas šioms asmenų grupėms nustatytas skirtingas teisinis reguliavimas, nėra.
- 3b. The impugned legal regulation guarantees such a right to persons who, prior to the amendment of the legal regulation, were able to obtain permits to hold (carry) weapons,

although there are no objective differences that **can** justify the different legal regulation established for these groups of persons.

Stance markers clearly function in the sentences (1a) and (2a) to express possibility: (...) *jis gali* ‘you can/you may’ *būti ribojamas siekiant, be kita ko, apsaugoti* (...) ; (...) *kai taikomas hidraulinis ardymas, galima* ‘it is possible/one can/may’ *tik atlikus privalomąjį tokios veiklos poveikio aplinkai vertinimą* (...) and (...) *spėjo gauti leidimus* (...) , *kuriais galėtų* ‘could/would be able to’ *būti pateisintas* (...) Otherwise, in English language translated sentences preserve the stance markers *may* and *can*. *Gali* and *galima* are both translated into *may*, whereas *galėtų* into *can*.

The examples (4a) and (5a) with stance markers *turėtų* ‘should/would have/would be supposed to’ and *būtina* ‘it is necessary/must be’ function in the sentence in a similar way. In other words, the particular stance markers express obligation in the sentence. The stance markers show that something is required or obligatory. For instance, (...) *generalinis prokuroras turėtų* *atsiskaityti įstatymų leidžiamajai ir (arba) vykdomajai valdžiai* (...) or *Būtina* *informuoti kompetentingas institucijas apie šios veiklos metu naudojamus medžiagas* (...) Otherwise, in English, Lithuanian stance markers are translated as *would* and *it is necessary* which shows that the original meaning is preserved in the translated sentences.

- 4a. Negali būti nustatytas ir toks teisinis reguliavimas, pagal kurį generalinis prokuroras **turėtų** įstatymų leidžiamajai ir (arba) vykdomajai valdžiai už prokuratūros veiklą vykdančias Konstitucijoje nustatytas funkcijas, o įstatymų leidžiamoji ir (arba) vykdomoji valdžia galėtų svarstyti generalinio prokuroro jai pateiktą prokuratūros veiklos ataskaitą ir priimti sprendimą, ar pritarti šiai ataskaitai, ar jai nepritarti.
- 4b. It is also not permitted to establish any such a legal regulation that **would** oblige prosecutors to submit accounts on the activity of the Prosecution Service in performing the functions established in the Constitution to the legislative and (or) executive authorities, whereas the legislative and (or) executive authorities could consider the activity report of the Prosecution Service submitted to it and adopt a decision on whether to approve this report or not to approve it.
- 5a. **Būtina** informuoti kompetentingas institucijas apie šios veiklos metu naudojamus medžiagas, įskaitant radioaktyvias, toksiškas ar pavojingas žmonių sveikatai ar aplinkai

medžiagas, jų tikslią sudėtį ir kieki, taip pat apie kiekvieną išsklaidytųjų angliavandenilių naudojimo hidraulinio ardymo būdu atvejį, tikslią šio ardymo metu panaudotų medžiagų sudėtį ir kieki.

- 5b. **It is necessary** to inform the competent institutions about the substances that are used during such activity, including radioactive or toxic substances, or substances dangerous to human health or environment, the precise composition and amount of such substances, as well as about every instance of exploiting unconventional hydrocarbons by way of hydraulic fracturing and the precise composition and amount of substances used for such fracturing;.

In the sentence (6a) and (7a), modal *pažymėtina* ‘it should be noted/it is to be noted’ and *pabrėžtina* ‘it should be emphasized’ highlights important information:

- 6a. 20.1. **Pažymėtina**, kad įmonių tarpusavio nesąžiningos prekybos praktikai maisto tiekimo grandinėje skirtų Europos Sąjungos teisės aktų nėra.
- 6b. 20.1. **It should be noted** that there are no legal acts of the European Union intended for unfair commercial practices between establishments in the food supply chain.
- 7a. Šios bylos kontekste **pabrėžtina** ir tai, kad skirtingas tradicinių Lietuvoje ir kitų bažnyčių bei religinių organizacijų, kaip kolektyvinių teisės subjektų, konstitucinis statusas nepaneigia Konstitucijos 29 straipsnyje įtvirtinto draudimo diskriminuoti asmenis ir teikti jiems privilegijas inter alia dėl tikėjimo, taigi pagal Konstituciją bažnyčių bei religinių organizacijų tradiciškumas nėra pagrindas jų narius, inter alia dvasininkus, konstitucinių pareigų vykdymo aspektu traktuoti skirtingai negu kitus piliečius.
- 7b. In the context of this case, **it should also be emphasised** that a different constitutional status between the churches and religious organisations that are traditional in Lithuania and other churches and religious organisations as collective legal entities does not deny the prohibition, enshrined in Article 29 of the Constitution, on discriminating against individuals and on granting them privileges, inter alia, on the grounds of religion; thus, under the Constitution, the fact that certain churches and religious organisations are considered traditional does not provide a basis for treating their members, inter alia, priests, differently from other citizens in terms of the fulfilment of their constitutional duties.

The adverbial *pažymėtina* ‘it should be noted/it is to be noted’ in the sentence (6a) highlights significant information what is not regulated by the EU law. Whereas, stance marker *it should be noted* in the sentence (6b) emphasize different constitutional status. Furthermore, the English stance markers *it should be noted* and *it should be emphasized* preserve the translation of original meaning.

The last sentence (8a) provides different function with the help of adverbial *akivaizdžiai* ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’.

8a. 18.2. Konstitucinis Teismas taip pat yra konstatavęs, jog proporcingumo principas reiškia, kad įstatyme nustatytos priemonės turi atitikti teisėtus ir visuomenei svarbius tikslus, kad šios priemonės turi būti būtinos minėtiems tikslams pasiekti ir kad jos neturi varžyti asmens teisių ir laisvių **akivaizdžiai** labiau, negu reikia šiems tikslams pasiekti (inter alia 2009 m. gruodžio 11 d., 2014 m. vasario 14 d., 2019 m. rugsėjo 19 d. nutarimai).

8b. 18.2. The Constitutional Court has also held that the principle of proportionality means that the measures provided for by law must be in line with legitimate objectives that are important to society, that such measures must be necessary in order to reach the said objectives, and that such measures must not restrict the rights and freedoms of a person **clearly** more than necessary in order to reach the said objectives (inter alia, the Constitutional Court’s rulings of 11 December 2009, 14 February 2014, and 19 September 2019).

The function of the modality *akivaizdžiai* ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’ in the sentence shows a strong confidence of the statement (...) jos neturi varžyti asmens teisių ir laisvių **akivaizdžiai** labiau, negu reikia šiems tikslams pasiekti (...) The Lithuanian stance marker *akivaizdžiai* ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’ is translated into English as *clearly*.

3.2. Types of the most frequent Lithuanian stance markers used in the subcorpus

LECOLT

According to Šolienė (2016: 224—225), there is no general agreement on the number of modality types that can be identified, but traditionally scholars identify three main types of modality: *epistemic*, *deontic*, and *dynamic*. From the list of the most frequently used stance markers extracted

from the corpus, the classification into types were identified. The following examples below present classification of Lithuanian stance markers into types as follows:

The first category that is going to be discussed is *epistemic modality*. It may indicate the speaker's confidence or doubt of the truth value of a specific proposition, as well as their degree of knowledge, belief or likelihood related to the mentioned proposition (Rozina & Karapetjana (2018: 207). The sentences (9a), (10a), and (11a) present the function of particular type:

- 9a. Pasak pareiškėjos, neįmanoma nustatyti darbo užmokesčio tremtyje, dėl to tremtiniam mokama senatvės pensija yra mažesnė, taigi nukentėjusiųjų asmenų valstybinė pensija tremtiniam **gali** būti laikoma sudedamąja jų senatvės pensijos dalimi.
- 9b. According to the petitioner, it is impossible to establish the work remuneration received by persons in the places of deportation, therefore, the old-age pension paid to deportees is lower; thus, the state pension of victims **may** be considered a constituent part of the old-age pension of deportees.
- 10a. Lietuvos Respublikos planuojamos ūkinės veiklos poveikio aplinkai vertinimo įstatyme nustatyta, kad gauti leidimą vykdyti išsklaidytųjų angliavandenilių tiesioginį tyrimą ir (arba) gavybą, kai taikomas hidraulinis ardymas, **galima** tik atlikus privalomąją tokios veiklos poveikio aplinkai vertinimą (1 priedo 2.5 punktas) ir esant teigiamam atsakingos institucijos sprendimui dėl planuojamos ūkinės veiklos galimybių (3 straipsnio 4 dalis, 10 straipsnio 9 dalis).
- 10b. The Republic of Lithuania's Law on Environmental Impact Assessment of the Proposed Economic Activity provides that permits for direct exploration and/or extraction of unconventional hydrocarbons by applying hydraulic fracturing **may** be issued only after a compulsory assessment of environmental impact of such activity is conducted (Paragraph 2.5 of Annex 1) and the respective institution adopts a decision permitting the pursuit of proposed economic activity (Paragraph 4 of Article 3, Paragraph 9 of Article 10).
- 11a. Rekomendacijoje suformuluoti principai, kuriais remdamosi valstybės narės **galėtų** žvalgyti ir išgauti gamtines dujas iš skalūnų telkinių ir kurie kartu užtikrintų aplinkos ir klimato apsaugą, efektyvų išteklių naudojimą ir visuomenės informavimą (preambulės 5 konstatuojamoji dalis, 1.1 punktas).

- 11b. The Recommendation lays down the principles that **support** Member States in the exploration and production of natural gas from shale formations and ensure that the climate and environment are safeguarded, resources are used efficiently, and the public is informed (Recital 5 of the Preamble, Paragraph 1.1).

The stance markers *gali* ‘you can/you may’, *galima* ‘it is possible/one can/may’, and *galėtų* ‘could/would be able to’ identify “the information that reflects the author’s assessment or judgement regarding the accuracy or authenticity of the truth of the proposition (Usonienė 2004:40). A significant distinction in the translations of sentences from Lithuanian into English language is preserved. The Lithuanian stance markers which express epistemic modality *gali* ‘you can/you may’, *galima* ‘it is possible/one can/may’, and *galėtų* ‘could/would be able to’ are translated into English as *may* and *support*. For instance, the modality is translated in a close way in the sentence (1) (...) **gali** būti laikoma sudedamąja jų senatvės pensijos dalimi (...) is translated into English as (...) **may** be considered a constituent part of the old-age pension of deportees (...). In the sentence (2) the Lithuanian part (...) **galima** tik atlikus privalomąjį (...) vertinimą (...) ir esant teigiamam (...) sprendimui (...) is translated in English as (...) **may** be issued only after (...) is conducted (...) and the respective institution adopts a decision permitting the pursuit of proposed economic activity (...). The Lithuanian modal *galima* ‘it is possible/one can/may’ express possibility but translated into English as *may be issued* that sounds more formal and fixed than *galima* ‘it is possible/one can/may’. The sentence (11a) expresses the biggest difference among modals that is boosting. This becomes particularly evident in following parts of the sentences, in the Lithuanian (...) principai, kuriais remdavosi valstybės narės **galėtų** žvalgyti ir išgauti (...) ir kurie kartu užtikrintų (...) and translated into English language as (...) principles that **support** Member States in the exploration and production (...) and ensure that the climate and environment are safeguarded (...). The presented part of sentences show how English part is translated into *support* that expresses a strong formulation than Lithuanian *galėtų* ‘could/would be able to’.

Another category that is important to present is *deontic modality*. As Palmer (2001: 9–10) explains deontic modality relates to obligations and permissions dictated by an outside authority. The sentences (4) and (5) present the following type of modality:

- 12a. Konstitucijos 29 straipsnio 1 dalyje įtvirtintas asmenų lygiateisiškumo principas **turėtų** būti aiškinamas kartu su šio straipsnio 2 dalies nuostatomis.

12b. 2. The principle of the equality of the rights of persons, which is enshrined in Paragraph 1 of Article 29 of the Constitution, **should** be interpreted in conjunction with the provisions of Paragraph 2 of the same article.

13a. 3.1. Suinteresuoto asmens atstovai nurodo, kad Lietuvoje veikia vienas kasacinės instancijos teismas, kurio paskirtis – formuoti vienodą bendrosios kompetencijos teismų praktiką aiškinant ir taikant įstatymus bei kitus teisės aktus, kuri yra **būtina** sąlyga asmenų lygybei prieš įstatymą užtikrinti, teisinio tikrumo ir saugumo, pasitikėjimo teise ir teisingumu garantas.

13b. 3.1. The representatives of the party concerned point out that there is one court of cassation instance in Lithuania, the purpose of which is to form uniform case law of courts of general jurisdiction in interpreting and applying laws and other legal acts; uniform case law **is a necessary** condition for ensuring the equality of persons before the law, and is a guarantor of legal certainty and legal security, as well as of confidence in law and justice.

The stance markers *turėtų* ‘should/would have/would be supposed to’ and *būtina* ‘it is necessary/must be’ refers to the nature of the relationship between the main participant in the situation and the action or process in question (Usonienė 2004: 36). The sentences (12a) and (13a) exhibit this specific type of modality: (4) (...) lygiateisiškumo principas **turėtų** būti aiškinamas kartu su šio straipsnio 2 dalies nuostatomis; (...) bendrosios kompetencijos teismų praktiką aiškinant ir taikant įstatymus bei kitus teisės aktus, kuri yra **būtina** sąlyga asmenų lygybei prieš įstatymą užtikrinti, (...)

There are notable distinctions in the translations into Lithuanian and English. The Lithuanian stance markers which express deontic modality *turėtų* ‘should/would have/would be supposed to’ and *būtina* ‘it is necessary/must be’ are translated into English language as *should* and *necessary*. The Lithuanian modal *turėtų* ‘should/would have/would be supposed to’ is translated into *should*, (...) lygiateisiškumo principas **turėtų** būti aiškinamas kartu su šio straipsnio 2 dalies nuostatomis (...) into **should** be interpreted in conjunction with the provisions of Paragraph 2 of the same article (...) It is evident from translation that presented stance markers are expressing a deontic stance in the same way. Similarly, the Lithuanian *būtina* ‘it is necessary/must be’ is translated as *necessary*, (...) **būtina** sąlyga asmenų lygybei prieš įstatymą užtikrinti, (...) a **necessary** condition for ensuring

the equality of persons before the law, (...) Thus, in these two particular items, the translations remain incredibly devoted.

The third category that will be presented is *dynamic modality*. It indicates the presence of internal and external factors influencing an agent concerning the fulfillment of the action conveyed in the main predicate (Usonienė 2004: 36). The sentences (14a), (15a), and (16a) demonstrate this kind of modality:

- 14a. 2.1. **Pažymėtina**, kad iki 2011 m. vasario 28 d. galiojusio Ginklų ir šaudmenų kontrolės įstatymo (2002 m. sausio 15 d. redakcija) 6 straipsnio (2007 m. gruodžio 4 d. redakcija) 1 dalyje buvo nustatyta, kad dujiniai pistoletai (revolveriai), šaunamieji ginklai, kurie atitinka kitų kategorijų kriterijus, tačiau joms nepriskiriami dėl nedidelės nukaunamosios galios, ir kurių sviedinio kinetinė energija yra nuo 2,5 J iki 7,5 J, senoviniai šaunamieji ginklai priskiriami D kategorijos ginklams, kurie įsigijami, laikomi ir nešiojami be leidimų.
- 14b. 2.1. It **should** be noted that Paragraph 1 of Article 6 (wording of 4 December 2007) of the Law on the Control of Weapons and Ammunition (wording of 15 January 2002), valid until 28 February 2011, prescribed: gas pistols (revolvers) and firearms that meet the criteria for other categories, but are not classified in those categories because of their low hitting power, and the kinetic energy of whose projectiles is between 2.5 J and 7.5 J, as well as antique weapons, are classified in category D; the said weapons may be acquired, held, and carried without a permit.
- 15a. Tačiau, jo nuomone, **pabrėžtina** ir tai, kad pagal KŽĮ 19 straipsnio 3 dalį galima 'it is possible/one can/may' perduoti tik tokią išslaptintą kriminalinės žvalgybos informaciją, kuri turi korupcinio pobūdžio nusikalstamos veikos požymių, o Lietuvos Respublikos nacionalinio saugumo pagrindų įstatymo priedėlio „Lietuvos nacionalinio saugumo pagrindai“ 4 skyriuje „Svarbiausios nacionalinį saugumą užtikrinančios Lietuvos vidaus politikos nuostatos“ (su 2008 m. birželio 12 d. pakeitimu) įtvirtinta, kad kova su korupcija yra vienas didžiausių prioritetų užtikrinant šalies nacionalinį saugumą.
- 15b. However, in his opinion, it **should** also be emphasised that, according to Paragraph 3 of Article 19 of the Law on Criminal Intelligence, only such declassified criminal

intelligence information that has detected the characteristics of a corruption criminal act may be transmitted, whereas Chapter 4, titled “Principal Provisions of Lithuania’s Domestic Policy Ensuring National Security” (as amended on 12 June 2008) of the Appendix, titled “The Basics of National Security of Lithuania”, to the Republic of Lithuania’s Law on the Basics of National Security states that the fight against corruption is one of the highest priorities in ensuring the national security of the country.

- 16a. Konstituciniai teisingumo, teisinės valstybės principai suponuoja ir tai, kad už teisės pažeidimus valstybės nustatomos poveikio priemonės turi būti proporcingos (adekvačios) teisės pažeidimui, jos turi atitikti siekiamus teisėtus ir visuotinai svarbius tikslus, neturi varžyti asmens **akivaizdžiai** labiau, negu reikia šiems tikslams pasiekti; tarp siekiamo tikslo nubausti teisės pažeidėjus ir užtikrinti teisės pažeidimų prevenciją ir pasirinktų priemonių šiam tikslui pasiekti turi būti teisinga pusiausvyra (proporcingumas).
- 16b. The constitutional principles of justice and a state under the rule of law also imply that the measures established by the state for violations of law must be proportionate (adequate) to the violation of law, they must be in line with the legitimate and generally important objectives sought, they may not restrain a person **clearly** more than necessary in order to reach these objectives; there must be a fair balance (proportionality) between the pursued objective to punish the violators of law and to ensure the prevention of the violations of law and the measures chosen for reaching this objective.

The stance markers *pažymėtina* ‘it should be noted/it is to be noted’, *pabrėžtina* ‘it should be emphasized’, and *akivaizdžiai* ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’ perform the obligation which indicates the presence of external social conditions that necessitate an agent to perform the required action (Usonienė 2004: 36). The sentences (14a), (15a), and (16a) exhibit this particular kind of modality: (14a) **Pažymėtina**, kad iki 2011 m. vasario 28 d. galiojusio Ginklų ir šaudmenų kontrolės įstatymo (...) priskiriami D kategorijos ginklams, kurie įsigijami, laikomi ir nešiojami be leidimų. (15a) (...) jo nuomone, **pabrėžtina** ir tai, kad pagal KŽĮ 19 straipsnio 3 dalį galima ‘it is possible/one can/may’ perduoti tik tokią išslaptintą kriminalinės žvalgybos informaciją (...) (16a) (...) neturi varžyti asmens **akivaizdžiai** labiau, negu reikia šiems tikslams pasiekti (...)

The translations of original Lithuanian sentences into English show notable differences. The Lithuanian stance markers which express dynamic modality *pažymėtina* ‘it should be noted/it is to be noted’, *pabrėžtina* ‘it should be emphasized’, and *akivaizdžiai* ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’ are translated into English as *should* and *clearly*. For instance, the stance markers in the sentence (6) is translated very closely. The Lithuanian part of sentence – **Pažymėtina**, kad iki 2011 m. vasario 28 d. galiojusio Ginklų ir šaudmenų kontrolės įstatymo (...) 1 dalyje buvo nustatyta, kad (...) English extract would be: It should be noted that Paragraph 1 of Article 6 (...) valid until 28 February 2011, prescribed (...) Both modals are similar since they consider the following details to be crucial, although they differ in *pažymėtina* ‘it should be noted/it is to be noted’ is an impersonal form whereas, English *it should be noted* is a modal–passive construction. In the second example, provides different differentiations among translations. *Pabrėžtina* ‘it should be emphasized’ is translated into English as *it should be emphasized that*. Both expressions highlight the following details of the sentence that are particularly crucial: (...) **pabrėžtina** tai, kad pagal KŽĮ 19 straipsnio 3 dalį galima ‘it is possible/one can/may’ perduoti tik tokią išslaptintą kriminalinės žvalgybos informaciją, (...) into (...) it **should** also be emphasised that, according to Paragraph 3 of Article 19 of the Law on Criminal Intelligence, only such declassified criminal intelligence information (...) The last example, the sentence (8) presents translation of modal stance *akivaizdžiai* ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’ into *clearly*. In following parts of the sentences English is a little less naturally translated, but the meaning remains the same: (...) neturi varžyti asmens **akivaizdžiai** labiau, negu reikia (...) into (...) they may not restrain a person **clearly** more than necessary (...)

3.3. Most Frequent English Stance Markers Used in the Translation in the corpus

LECOLT

Following the processing and analysis of the data, it was clear that the most frequently used modal stance markers in the English language must be presented. Table 3 below displays the 8 most prominent stance markers in English as outlined:

Table 3. Top 8 frequent stance markers in the English language:

No.	Type	Raw Frequency
1.	may	2,348
2.	should	1,892
3.	must	1,575
4.	would	1,087
5.	shall	1,038
6.	could	598
7.	can	252
8.	will	251

The particular results show that the translations from corpus LECOLT exhibit a greater occurrence of explicit stance markers, which could indicate a tendency in translation to be preserved. The translations can maintain the stance markers, but particularly they can be expressed also using different words or constructions in the translation.

The following sentences preserve the modals *must*, *should* and *shall* express obligation in the sentence.

17b. Thus, the laws establish that when economic operators purchase raw milk, they **must** conclude a written contract.

17a. Taigi įstatymuose yra nustatyta, kad ūkio subjektai, pirkdami žalią pieną, **privalo** sudaryti rašytinę sutartį.

18b. 4.2. Jūratė Šovienė noted that with regard to the principle of free negotiations of contracting parties consolidated in Article 148 (4) of the Regulation, the conditions **should** be created for the purchasers and sellers of raw milk to establish their own purchase price of raw milk or the criteria for the establishment of this price.

18a. 4.2. J. Šovienė pažymėjo, kad, paisant Reglamento 148 straipsnio 4 dalyje įtvirtinto sutarčių šalių laisvų derybų principo, žalio pieno pirkėjams ir pardavėjams turėtų būti

sudaromos sąlygos patiems nustatyti žalio pieno pirkimo kainą ar jos nustatymo kriterijus.

19b. In the aforementioned petition, the petitioner requests an investigation, inter alia, into the compliance of the provision “The Prosecutor General **shall** account for the activity of the Prosecution Service to the President of the Republic and the Seimas” of Paragraph 3 of Article 4 (wording of 30 June 2011) of the Law on the Prosecution Service (wording of 22 April 2003) with Paragraph 3 of Article 118 (wording of 20 March 2003) of the Constitution and the constitutional principle of a state under the rule of law.

19a. 1.3. Minėtame prašyme pareiškėja prašo ištirti inter alia Prokuratūros įstatymo (2003 m. balandžio 22 d. redakcija) 4 straipsnio (2011 m. birželio 30 d. redakcija) 3 dalies nuostatos „Už prokuratūros veiklą generalinis prokuroras **atsiskaito** Respublikos Prezidentui ir Seimui“ atitiktį Konstitucijos 118 straipsnio (2003 m. kovo 20 d. redakcija) 3 daliai, konstituciniam teisinės valstybės principui.

In the sentences (17b), (18b) and (19b), the English stance markers have the following correspondences in the source text. The following modals *may*, *can* and *could* express possibility or ability.

20b. Paragraph 2(c)(i) of Article 148 of the Regulation specifies that the price payable for the delivery of raw milk is calculated by combining various factors set out in the contract, which **may** include market indicators reflecting changes in market conditions, the volume delivered, and the quality or composition of the raw milk delivered. Meanwhile, Item 1 of Paragraph 3 of Article 3 of the Law prescribes an exhaustive list of conditions that are observed when establishing the same purchase price of raw milk for the sellers of raw milk that are attributed to the same group.

20a. Reglamento 148 straipsnio 2 dalies c punkto i papunktyje yra nurodyta, kad žaliavos pristatymo kaina apskaičiuojama atsižvelgiant į įvairius sutartyje nurodytus veiksnus, prie kurių **gali būti** priskirti rinkos sąlygų pokyčius atspindintys rinkos rodikliai, pristatyto žalio pieno kiekis, jo kokybė ar sudėtis.

21b. Temporary removal from office is applied only where this measure is necessary for the speedier and more impartial investigation of a criminal act or in order to prevent the

suspected person from the possibility of committing new crimes; in the same way as other procedural coercive measures, this measure is aimed at collecting the data significant for the investigation and consideration of the case in a court; temporary removal from office **can** be applied only in cases where the suspected person has committed a criminal act while in office.

- 21a. Laikinas nušalinimas nuo pareigų taikomas tik tada, kai tai būtina, kad būtų greičiau ir nešališkiau ištirta nusikalstama veika ar užkirsta įtariamajam galimybė daryti naujas nusikalstamas veikas; juo, kaip ir kitomis procesinėmis prievartos priemonėmis, siekiama surinkti tyrimui ir bylos nagrinėjimui teisme reikšmingus duomenis; laikinas nušalinimas nuo pareigų **gali būti** taikomas tik tais atvejais, kai įtariamasis nusikalstamą veiką padaro eidamas tam tikras pareigas. Tad šiame kontekste baudžiamajame procese svarbu tik tai, kad asmuo yra įtariamasis, bet nėra svarbu, kokias konkrečiai pareigas jis eina.
- 22b. A professional military serviceman shall not have the right, either in person or through other persons, to take part in such commercial actions that are related to his/her service or **could** give rise to a conflict between private or service–related interests.
- 22a. Profesinės karo tarnybos karys pats ar per kitus asmenis neturi teisės dalyvauti tokiuose komercijos tikslais daromuose veiksmuose, kurie turi ryšį su jo tarnyba ir gali tapti jo privačių bei tarnybos interesų konflikto priežastimi.

In the sentences below, stance markers *will* and *would* express prediction or future reference.

- 23b. If legal certainty, legal security, and the protection of legitimate expectations are not ensured, the trust of persons in the state and law **will** not be secured, either.
- 23a. Neužtikrinus asmens teisėtų lūkesčių apsaugos, teisinio tikrumo ir teisinio saugumo, nebūtų užtikrintas asmens pasitikėjimas valstybe ir teise.
- 24b. Thus, it is not possible to establish such a legal regulation, under which the institutions of the state power **would** be granted the powers having implemented which preconditions would be created for the restriction of independence of prosecutors, interference with their activity, and for making influence when they are implementing their functions established in the Constitution.

24a. Todėl negali būti nustatytas toks teisinis reguliavimas, pagal kurį valstybės valdžios institucijoms būtų suteikti tokie įgaliojimai, kuriuos įgyvendinus **būtų** sudarytos prielaidos suvaržyti prokurorų nepriklausomumą, kištis į jų veiklą, daryti įtaką jiems vykdant Konstitucijoje nustatytas funkcijas.

3.4. Types of the most frequent English stance markers used in the translation of subcorpus LECOLT

As it was discussed earlier, the main types of modals are *epistemic*, *deontic*, and *dynamic*. The following classification of English stance markers that have following correspondences of the source text were distinguished accordingly to particular types. The sentences below, present the *epistemic* type:

25b. The transfer of collected data for the purpose of mutual communication for the purpose of coordinating protection against said dangers (threats) does not of itself imply a change of purpose, but **must be** based on lawful use of data and only for internal coordination of tasks between federal and Laender authorities.

25a. Surinktų duomenų perdavimas abipusio bendravimo, vykdomos apsaugos nuo minėtų pavojų (grėsmių) koordinavimo tikslais pats savaime nereiškia tikslo pakeitimo, tačiau tai turi būti pagrįsta teisėtu duomenų naudojimu ir **gali būti** daroma tik užduočių vykdymo vidinio koordinavimo tarp federalinių ir žemių institucijų tikslais.

26b. Since a minister's personal responsibility for the internal administration of the ministry (a public administration entity) is distinguished, the material liability of a minister for damage caused in carrying out such internal administration **must be** legally regulated.

26a. Kadangi išskiriama ministro asmeninė atsakomybė atliekant ministerijos (viešojo administravimo subjekto) vidaus administravimą, **turi būti** teisiškai sureguliuota ir materialinė ministro atsakomybė už atliekant tokį vidaus administravimą padarytą žalą.

27b. In this context, the petitioner also notes that state funds and other resources **must be** used transparently, which is why it is in the interest of all society not to use state budget funds unreasonably and to compensate the state for damage.

27a. Šiame kontekste pareiškėjas pažymi ir tai, kad valstybės lėšos, kiti ištekliai **turi būti** naudojami skaidriai, dėl to visa visuomenė yra suinteresuota, kad valstybės biudžeto lėšos nebūtų naudojamos nepagrįstai ir kad valstybei padaryta žala būtų atlyginta.

In the presented sentences, stance markers *must be* is applied “to assertions and indicates the extent to which the speaker is committed to the truth of the proposition” (Usonienė 2004:38). For example, (...) dangers (threats) does not of itself imply a change of purpose, but **must be** based on lawful use of data <...>; (...) the material liability of a minister for damage caused in carrying out such internal administration **must be** legally regulated.; (...) state funds and other resources **must be** used transparently, <...>

Noticeable variations exist between the English stance markers correspondences from the LECOLT and Lithuanian original texts. The English epistemic stance markers *must be* correspondence into Lithuanian is *turi būti*. In the sentence (...) does not of itself imply (...) but **must be** based (...) and only for internal coordination (...) in Lithuanian original text (...) pats savaime nereiškia (...) tačiau tai **turi būti** pagrįsta (...) ir gali būti daroma tik (...) English *must be* states a fact and Lithuanian *turi būti* preserves the meaning with a modal. Similarly with other sentences they are very similarly expressing the important information without changing the main ideas:

28b. Since a minister’s personal responsibility for the internal administration of the ministry [...] is distinguished, the material liability of a minister for damage [...] **must be** legally regulated.

28a. Kadangi išskiriama ministro asmeninė atsakomybė atliekant ministerijos (...) vidaus administravimą, turi būti teisiškai sureguliuota ir materialinė ministro atsakomybė už (...) padarytą žalą.

29b. (...) state funds and other resources **must be** used transparently, which is why it is in the interest of all society not to use state budget funds unreasonably and to compensate the state for damage.

29a. (...) valstybės lėšos, kiti išteklių **turi būti** naudojami skaidriai, dėl to visa visuomenė yra suinteresuota, kad valstybės biudžeto lėšos nebūtų naudojamos nepagrįstai ir kad valstybei padaryta žala būtų atlyginta.

Deontic type of modality as it was discussed, focuses on the speaker. In other words, it is defined by the relationship between the main participant in the situation and the nature of the action or process being described (Usonienė 2004:44). The following sentences (30b), (31b), and (32b) present this classification.

- 30b. Before taking such a decision, the head of the principal criminal intelligence institution **must** obtain the consent of the prosecutor for declassifying the above-mentioned information and using it for investigating misconduct in office.
- 30a. Prieš priimdamas tokį sprendimą kriminalinės žvalgybos pagrindinės institucijos vadovas **turi** gauti prokuroro sutikimą dėl minėtos informacijos išslaptinimo ir panaudojimo tiriant tarnybinius nusižengimus.
- 31b. In this connection, it **should** be noted that, in the context of the impugned legal regulation, the concept of an act with the characteristics of a corruption criminal act must be interpreted in accordance with the provisions of the Law on the Prevention of Corruption.
- 31a. Šiame kontekste **paminėtina**, kad korupcinio pobūdžio nusikalstamos veikos požymių turinčios veikos samprata ginčijamo teisinio reguliavimo kontekste aiškintina atsižvelgiant į Korupcijos prevencijos įstatymo nuostatas.
- 32b. An official penalty **shall** be imposed taking into account the guilt of the official who committed the misconduct in office, the causes, circumstances, and consequences of the misconduct in office, the performance of the official before the misconduct in office was committed, circumstances mitigating or aggravating official liability, and the information provided in the cases and according to the procedure laid down in the Law on the Prevention of Corruption and the Law on Criminal Intelligence.
- 32a. Tarnybinė nuobauda **skiriama** atsižvelgiant į tarnybinių nusižengimų padariusio pareigūno kaltę, tarnybinio nusižengimo padarymo priežastis, aplinkybes ir padarinius, į pareigūno veiklą iki tarnybinio nusižengimo padarymo, tarnybinę atsakomybę lengvinančias ir sunkinančias aplinkybes, į Korupcijos prevencijos įstatyme ar į Kriminalinės žvalgybos įstatyme nustatytais atvejais ir tvarka pateiktą informaciją.

Significant differences are seen between the English correspondences of stance markers into the Lithuanian language. The English stance markers *must* and *shall* are correspondences in Lithuanian as *turi*, *paminėtina*, and *skiriama*. The English language is preserved correctly into the Lithuanian language. However, *must* sounds more academic than *turi* providing less formality in the sentence. In the sentence (31b), English stance markers *should* in the Lithuanian language functions as *paminėtina* what preserves some distinctions. In English sentence an argumentative statement is expressed, whereas in Lithuanian through impersonal necessity expression as

paminėtina what makes it more formal. The English modal *shall* is possessed in the Lithuanian present tense *skiriama*, but preserving the same level of translation and expressing obligation in the sentence.

Dynamic type of modality presents the possibility or probability states. The following stance markers *may*, *can*, *could*, *will* and *would* present the possibility.

33b. Information concerning the private life of a person **may** be collected only upon a justified court decision and only according to the law.

33a. Informacija apie privatų asmens gyvenimą **gali** būti renkama tik motyvuotu teismo sprendimu ir tik pagal įstatymą.

34b. Legal acts **can** also establish a prelitigation procedure for settling disputes; however, it is not permitted to establish any such legal regulation that would deny the right of a person who believes that his/her rights or freedoms are violated to defend his/her rights or freedoms before a court (inter alia, the Constitutional Court's rulings of 2 July 2002, 17 August 2004, and 16 January 2006).

34a. Teisės aktais **gali būti** nustatyta ir ikiteisminė ginčų sprendimo tvarka, tačiau negalima 'it is possible/one can/may' nustatyti tokio teisinio reguliavimo, kuriuo būtų paneigta asmens, manančio, kad jo teisės ar laisvės pažeistos, teisė ginti savo teises ar laisves teisme (inter alia 2002 m. liepos 2 d., 2004 m. rugpjūčio 17 d., 2006 m. sausio 16 d. nutarimai).

35b. The ECtHR did not find a violation of Article 6 of the Convention in this case and stressed that the national courts **could**, inter alia, analyse thoroughly the reasons for the revocation of the security clearance and the applicant had had the opportunity to present his arguments in writing and was heard in the proceedings before a court.

35a. EŽTT šioje byloje nenustatė Konvencijos 6 straipsnio pažeidimo ir pabrėžė, kad nacionaliniai teismai **galėjo** inter alia nuodugniai išanalizuoti minėto leidimo panaikinimo priežastis, o pareiškėjas turėjo galimybę raštu pateikti savo argumentus ir buvo išklausytas teisme.

36b. who considers that he/she cannot and **will** not be able to pay the debts ordered by a court order arising from the criminal acts committed by him/her.

36a. jis **negali** ir negalės sumokėti teismo nutartimi priteistų skolų, susidariusių dėl jo padarytų nusikalstamų veikų.

37b. **would** be able to avoid the obligation to compensate for material and/or moral damage.

37a. nusikalstama veika **padarę** materialinę ir (arba) moralinę žalą.

The English stance markers have following correspondences in the source text that can be significantly similar. The English modals *may*, *can*, *could*, *will* and *would* is acknowledged in the Lithuanian language as *gali*, *galėjo*, *negali* and *padarę*.

In the sentence (33a) English stance markers *may* is acknowledged in Lithuanian as *gali* ‘you can/you may’ what make a perfect translation non-variation in the following sentences: In the sentence (34b), the English stance marker *can* in the Lithuanian language is seen as *gali* providing the sentences function similarly. In the sentence (35b) *could* has equivalent in the Lithuanian language as *galėjo* that expresses the same ability or possibility in the sentence. In the sentence (35b) *will* is seen in the Lithuanian language as *negali* that expresses dynamic modality due to the individual’s current and future incapacity to settle the debts. Although, in the sentence (36b) *would* correspondence in the Lithuanian language is *padarę*, that functions as an omission of the modal.

3.5. Most Common Lexical Bundles Indicating Modal Stance and Their Equivalent

Translation into English

After the data was processed and analyzed, it became evident to present the most used lexical bundles with modal stance markers in The Lithuanian language and its equivalent translation into English. The following Table 4 presents the lexical bundles with top 8 mostly used stance markers in The Lithuanian language.

Table 4. **The Most Frequent Lexical Bundles Signifying Modal Stance in the Lithuanian language**

No.	Stance markers	Lexical Bundles expressing Modal Stance
1.	gali	<i>gali 'you can/you may' būti išslaptinama ir; gali 'you can/you may' laisvai pasirinkti darbą; ir tai gali 'you can/you may' lemti; gali 'you can/you may' kreiptis dėl valstybės</i>
2.	pažymėtina 'it should be noted/it is to be noted'	<i>pažymėtina 'it should be noted/it is to be noted' ir tai kad; pažymėtina 'it should be noted/it is to be noted' kad kaip minėta; pažymėtina 'it should be noted/it is to be noted' kad pagal konstituciją; pažymėtina 'it should be noted/it is to be noted' kad iš konstitucijos</i>
3.	galėtų 'could/would be able to'	<i>galėtų 'could/would be able to' būti padarytos išvados; galėtų 'could/would be able to' būti sudarytos prielaidos; galėtų 'could/would be able to' pagrįstai pasitikėti valstybės; galėtų 'could/would be able to' žinoti ko iš</i>

4.	turėtų 'should/would have/would be supposed to'	<i>turėtų 'should/would have/would be supposed to' būti jam skirta; turėtų 'should/would have/would be supposed to' būti nustatyta ir; turėtų 'should/would have/would be supposed to' būti gauta kiek; turėtų 'should/would have/would be supposed to' būti jiems skirtos</i>
5.	galima 'it is possible/one can/may'	<i>galima 'it is possible/one can/may' tik jeigu tokį; galima 'it is possible/one can/may' dėl to kreiptis; galima 'it is possible/one can/may' eilinių seimo rinkimų; galima 'it is possible/one can/may' grėsme valstybės saugumui</i>
6.	būtina 'it is necessary/must be'	<i>būtina 'it is necessary/must be' ir proporcinga priemonė; būtina 'it is necessary/must be' teisingumo įgyvendinimo sąlyga; būtina 'it is necessary/must be' prielaida žmonėms pasitikėti; būtina 'it is necessary/must be' atsižvelgti į konkrečias</i>
7.	pabrėžtina 'it should be emphasized'	<i>pabrėžtina 'it should be emphasized' kad pagal konstituciją; pabrėžtina 'it</i>

		<i>should be emphasized’ ir tai kad; pabrėžtina ‘it should be emphasized’ jog tai kad; pabrėžtina ‘it should be emphasized’ kad kaip yra</i>
8.	akivaizdžiai ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’	<i>akivaizdžiai ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’ labiau negu reikia; akivaizdžiai ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’ galėjo sužinoti apie; akivaizdžiai ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’ neteisingą kartu ir; akivaizdžiai ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’ buvo diskriminuojamos dėl</i>

In the provided Table 3 are presented most frequent Lithuanian and stance markers and their lexical bundles which express modal stance. The table presents 8 stance markers and lexical bundles that convey particular modals as *gali* ‘you can/you may’, *pažymėtina* ‘it should be noted/it is to be noted’, *galėtų* ‘could/would be able to’, *turėtų* ‘should/would have/would be supposed to’, *galima* ‘it is possible/one can/may’, *būtina* ‘it is necessary/must be’, *pabrėžtina* ‘it should be emphasized’ and *akivaizdžiai* ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’. The results were useful, because they show how the most frequent Lithuanian stance markers and the lexical bundles that correspond with them in order to determine the dominant modal stance markers in the corpus. The findings were crucial as they provide which lexical bundles conveying modal stance are expressing the preferable types of modality as *epistemic*, *deontic*, and *dynamic*.

The second aspect of the analysis that is important to mention is the translation of Lithuanian into English examples of the LB (lexical bundles). The following Table 4 presents the most frequent lexical bundles realising stance markers and its and their corresponding translation into English.

3.6. The Lithuanian Language's Most Common Lexical Bundles Denoting Modal Stance and Their English Translations

Numerous examples that are significant to provide in this paper were found during the investigation of the Lithuanian language's the most common lexical bundles indicating modal stance and their English translations in the current study. The table below provides examples.

Table 4. The Most Frequently Occurring Lexical Bundles in the Lithuanian language Signifying Modal Stance and Their English Translations

The most frequent Lithuanian lexical bundles	English Translations of Lexical Bundles
<i>gali 'you can/you may' būti išslaptinama ir</i>	<i>may be declassified only;</i> <i>can be declassified and;</i> <i>may be declassified by;</i> <i>shall be imposed taking</i>
<i>gali 'you can/you may' laisvai pasirinkti darbą</i>	<i>may freely choose a job;</i> <i>has the right to decide freely</i>
<i>ir tai gali 'you can/you may' lemti</i>	<i>this could result in</i>
<i>gali 'you can/you may' kreiptis dėl valstybės</i>	<i>may request state recognition;</i> <i>may apply for state recognition</i>
<i>pažymėtina 'it should be noted/it is to be noted' ir tai, kad</i>	<i>it should also be noted</i>
<i>pažymėtina 'it should be noted/it is to be noted' kad, kaip minėta</i>	<i>it should be noted that, as mentioned</i>

<i>Pažymėtina 'it should be noted/it is to be noted', kad pagal konstituciją</i>	<i>it should be noted that, under the Constitution;</i> <i>it needs to be noted that, according to the Constitution;</i> <i>it should be noted that, according to the Constitution</i>
<i>Pažymėtina 'it should be noted/it is to be noted', kad iš konstitucijos</i>	<i>it should be noted that the Constitution;</i> <i>it should be noted that in the Constitution</i>
<i>galėtų 'could/would be able to' būti padarytos išvados</i>	<i>could draw the conclusion;</i> <i>could lead to the conclusion</i>
<i>galėtų 'could/would be able to' būti sudarytos prielaidos</i>	<i>the preconditions [...] would be created;</i> <i>the preconditions [...] could be created;</i> <i>could create the preconditions</i>
<i>galėtų 'could/would be able to' pagrįstai pasitikėti valstybės</i>	<i>could reasonably trust state officials;</i> <i>could reasonably trust in state servants/officials</i>
<i>galėtų 'could/would be able to' žinoti ko iš</i>	<i>are aware of the</i>
<i>turėtų 'should/would have/would be supposed to' būti jam skirta</i>	<i>to be imposed on him/her;</i> <i>to impose the [...] on him/her</i>
<i>turėtų 'should/would have/would be supposed to' būti nustatyta ir</i>	<i>should ensure that and;</i> <i>should also establish;</i> <i>should be established</i>
<i>turėtų 'should/would have/would be supposed to' būti gauta, kiek</i>	<i>how much [...] will be received</i>

<i>turėtų 'should/would have/would be supposed to' būti jiems skirtos</i>	<i>to be imposed on them; to be imposed on him/her</i>
<i>galima 'it is possible/one can/may' tik jeigu tokį</i>	<i>is possible only if; it would be possible to</i>
<i>galima 'it is possible/one can/may' dėl to kreiptis</i>	<i>may request</i>
<i>galima 'it is possible/one can/may' eilinių seimo rinkimų</i>	<i>the earliest possible day for a regular election to the Seimas; the earliest possible day for the publication of the final results of a runoff voting in an election to the Seimas</i>
<i>galima 'it is possible/one can/may' grėsme valstybės saugumui</i>	<i>a possible threat to national security</i>
<i>būtina 'it is necessary/must be' ir proporcinga priemonė</i>	<i>as necessary and proportionate measure</i>
<i>būtina 'it is necessary/must be' teisingumo įgyvendinimo sąlyga</i>	<i>an indispensable condition for the administration of justice; a necessary condition for the administration of justice; a necessary condition for administering justice; a necessary condition for the implementation of justice</i>
<i>būtina 'it is necessary/must be' prielaida žmonėms pasitikėti</i>	<i>a necessary precondition for people to have trust; the transparency of state service is also a necessary precondition for people for trusting;</i>

	<i>a necessary precondition for people to have confidence in</i>
<i>būtina 'it is necessary/must be' atsižvelgti į konkrečias</i>	<i>it is necessary to take into account concrete; account must be taken of concrete</i>
<i>Pabrėžtina 'it should be emphasized', kad pagal konstituciją</i>	<i>it needs to be emphasised that, under the Constitution; it should be emphasised that, under the Constitution</i>
<i>pabrėžtina 'it should be emphasized' ir tai, kad</i>	<i>it should also be emphasised that; it should also be stressed that</i>
<i>Pabrėžtina 'it should be emphasized', jog tai, kad</i>	<i>it should be emphasised in; it needs to be emphasised that</i>
<i>pabrėžtina 'it should be emphasized', kad, kaip yra</i>	<i>it should be emphasised that, as; it needs to be emphasised that, as</i>
<i>akivaizdžiai 'obviously/evidently/manifestly' labiau, negu reikia</i>	<i>clearly more than necessary</i>
<i>akivaizdžiai 'obviously/evidently/manifestly' galėjo sužinoti apie</i>	<i>apparently could become aware</i>
<i>akivaizdžiai 'obviously/evidently/manifestly' neteisingą, kartu ir</i>	<i>would be obliged to adopt a manifestly unfair and; would have to adopt a manifestly unfair and</i>

<i>akivaizdžiai</i> ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’ <i>buvo</i> <i>diskriminuojamos dėl</i>	<i>were clearly discriminated on the grounds</i>
---	--

After the data was processed and analyzed, it became obvious that there are some variations between Lithuanian and English translation of lexical bundles which represent stance markers. In the table below are presented 8 stance markers (*gali* ‘you can/you may’, *pažymėtina* ‘it should be noted/it is to be noted’, *galėtų* ‘could/would be able to’, *turėtų* ‘should/would have/would be supposed to’, *galima* ‘it is possible/one can/may’, *būtina* ‘it is necessary/must be’, *pabrėžtina* ‘it should be emphasized’, and *akivaizdžiai* ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’) indicated in the most preferable lexical bundles in court rulings. The following Table 4, also presents the translations in the most frequently occurring lexical bundles in which they are used in the court rulings. Table 4, also presents the translations of lexical bundles into the English language. It is evident from the table that the biggest part of Lithuanian lexical bundles were translated in many different ways into English. For example, *gali būti išslaptinama* was translated into *may be declassified only; can be declassified and; may be declassified by; shall be imposed taking*. It is interesting that one Lithuanian lexical bundle could be translated into 3 different stance modals as *may*, *can*, and *shall*. Moreover, the biggest part of examples of Lithuanian stance modals are translated into *should* or *needs to*. For instance, stance modals as *pažymėtina*, *turėtų*, and *pabrėžtina* preserve mostly this type of translation implementing that different stance modals in Lithuanian language could be translated into one main modal *should* or semi-modal *needs to*. Otherwise, *galėtų* is translated into mainly English stance modal *could*. As my study shows, the Lithuanian language preserves fixed phrases that can be preserved different in the English language. That indicates that translating demands translators select alternatives that maintain the same legal significance and effect.

In fact, lexical bundles are fixed sequences that have their specific function and structure in the discourse. Legal terminology often conveys position through words that express obligation, possibility, certainty, or assessment. Tiersma (2000) (as stated in Glogar 2023: 1082) recognizes that “Our law is a law of words. Words are also a lawyer’s most essential tools”. In addition to being essential for understanding the law and its provisions, language serves as the foundation for

the law itself (ibid.) All in all, the choice of vocabulary, especially stance markers, is crucial for legal language and its translation to other languages.

4. Conclusions

The aim of this paper was to analyze whether there are any commonalities and variations among two separate languages Lithuanian and English in the use of stance markers in the court rulings. The analysis of the data of court rulings from the LECOLT corpus (Juknevičienė, R. & M. Talačka: 2024). The corpus includes 60 court rulings compiled from Lithuanian Constitutional Court rulings and their officially published English translations. The particular variety of court rulings used to make a better contrast and analyze similarities and differences through Lithuanian and English languages in a better scope. The current study takes a more exploratory approach by examining at the frequency, types, functions of stance markers and analysis of lexical bundles denoting stance markers together with their translation equivalents in court rulings from Lithuanian into English languages. Firstly, the frequency of analyzed stance markers from the Lithuanian language were detected these modals: *gali* ‘you can/you may’, *pažymėtina* ‘it should be noted/it is to be noted’, *galėtų* ‘could/would be able to’, *turėtų* ‘should/would have/would be supposed to’, *galima* ‘it is possible/one can/may’, *būtina* ‘it is necessary/must be’, *pabrėžtina* ‘it should be emphasized’ and *akivaizdžiai* ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’. In the English language, the most frequent stance markers were *may*, *should*, *must*, *would*, *shall*, *could*, *can*, and *will*. Secondly, the classification into types of stance markers, into *epistemic*, *deontic*, and *dynamic* were detected in both languages. In the Lithuanian language. The stance markers *gali* ‘you can/you may’, *galima* ‘it is possible/one can/may’, and *galėtų* ‘could/would be able to’ denote “the information that represents the author’s evaluation or opinion about the truthfulness or validity of the proposition (Usonienė 2004:40). Stance markers *turėtų* ‘should/would have/would be supposed to’ and *būtina* ‘it is necessary/must be’ denote the nature of the connection between the primary participant in the situation and the action or process involved. Stance markers *pažymėtina* ‘it should be noted/it is to be noted’, *pabrėžtina* ‘it should be emphasized’, and *akivaizdžiai* ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’ fulfills an obligation that indicates the existence of external social conditions requiring the agent to perform the necessary action (Usonienė 2004: 36). In terms of English classification stance markers into types had also interesting results. The modals *must*, *should*, and *shall* indicate obligation in the examples. *May*, *can*, and *could* convey possibility or ability, whereas *will* and

would signify prediction or future reference. Thirdly, the Lithuanian stance markers provided significant similarities and differences in translation into English. The selected examples indicated in the survey showcased the primary tendencies in expressing modal stance. These instances illustrate how modal stance meanings were maintained or diminished in the translated sentences. The table prior that displayed the most common lexical bundles that indicate modal stance. The findings indicate which bundles are most frequently seen in the Lithuanian court rulings and how they are translated into English. After consideration, the translations show the primary patterns of modal stance bundle preservation and change. Different methods were used to translate Lithuanian modal stance bundles into English. In certain instances, they were translated literally, and the modal significance was maintained. In different instances, they were altered or rephrased. In general, the translations primarily sought to preserve the legal implications and modal strength of the source text, though certain shifts were noticeable. Even though my survey was restricted by time and space, I have been unable to investigate further into specific similarities and distinctions of stance markers in translation from Lithuanian into English across court rulings in better detail or to examine a bigger scope of research with larger corpus throughout to get genuine data. Also, the established evidence is extremely broad, and further studies should be carried out including the important similarities and differences of translation from Lithuanian into English across court rulings. Nevertheless, this study remains rather limited, as it sought to address only the most common instances of modal expression. In the future, it would be interesting to select a larger sample of expressions and expand the study. Modality plays an important role in legal language, so such studies would contribute to improving the quality of translation.

Summary of the study in the Lithuanian language

Modalumas yra gramatinė raiškos priemonė, skirta išreikšti kalbėtojo požiūrį į sakinyje aptariamus įvykius. Modalumas yra sudėtingas dėl to, kad jo raiška gali būti įvairiai interpretuojama, todėl vertėjai susiduria su sunkumais. Jiems tenka, pasirinkti tokius atitikmenis, kurie išlaikytų tą pačią teisinę prasmę ir potekstę, o tarpkalbiniai modalumo raiškos skirtumai apsunkina vertėjų darbą. Dėl to kalbininkai ir kiti mokslininkai vis labiau domisi šia sritimi. Ši konkreti tema grindžiama lygiagrečiojo lietuvių ir anglų kalbos tekstyno LECOLT medžiaga. Tekstyną sudaro 60 teismo sprendimų, surinktų iš Lietuvos Konstitucinio Teismo nutarčių ir jų oficialiai paskelbtų vertimų į anglų kalbą. Teismo sprendimai apima laikotarpį nuo 2014 iki 2021 metų. Analizei pasirinkti aštuoni dažniausiai lietuviškoje tekstyno dalyje nustatyti modalumo reikšmės atvejai: *gali* ‘you can/you may’, *pažymėtina* ‘it should be noted/it is to be noted’, *galėtų* ‘could/would be able to’, *turėtų* ‘should/would have/would be supposed to’, *galima* ‘it is possible/one can/may’, *būtina* ‘it is necessary/must be’, *pabrėžtina* ‘it should be emphasized’, and *akivaizdžiai* ‘obviously/evidently/manifestly’. Tyrime išnagrinėti šių modalumo priemonių vertimas į anglų kalbą, siekiant iliustruoti pagrindinius modalumo raiškos panašumus ir skirtumus lietuvių ir anglų kalbose ir vertėjų parinktus vertimo atitikmenis. Taip pat, antroje tyrimo dalyje bandyta tirti, kokiose pasikartojančiose leksinėse samplaikose vartojami dažniausiai modalumą reiškiantys žodžiai ir kaip tos samplaikos verčiamos į anglų kalbą. Tyrimo rezultatai rodo, kad vertimuose, matyti pagrindiniai modalinių pozicijų grupių išsaugojimo ir pokyčių modeliai. Vertinant lietuviškas modalinių pozicijų grupes į anglų kalbą buvo taikomi įvairūs metodai. Kai kuriais atvejais jos buvo verčiamos pažodžiui, išlaikant modalinę reikšmę. Kitais atvejais jos buvo keičiamos arba reformuluojamos. Apskritai vertimuose pirmiausia buvo siekiama išsaugoti originalo teksto teisinės pasekmės ir modalinį stiprumą, nors pastebimi tam tikri pokyčiai. Vis dėlto šis tyrimas išlieka gana ribotas, nes jame siekta aptarti tik dažniausius modalumo raiškos atvejus. Ateityje būtų įdomu pasirinkti didesnę raiškos priemonių imtį ir tyrimą išplėsti. Teisės kalboje modalumas atlieka svarbią funkciją, todėl tokie tyrimai prisidėtų prie vertimo kokybės tobulinimo.

Summary of the Study in the English Language

Modality is a grammatical device used to express the speaker's attitude toward the events described in a sentence. Modality is complex because its expression can be interpreted in various ways, which poses challenges for translators. They must choose equivalents that preserve the same legal meaning and subtext, and cross-linguistic differences in the expression of modality complicate the translators' work. Consequently, linguists and other scholars are taking an increasing interest in this field. This specific topic is based on material from the LECOLT parallel Lithuanian-English corpus. The corpus consists of 60 court decisions, compiled from rulings of the Constitutional Court of Lithuania and their officially published translations into English. The court decisions cover the period from 2014 to 2021. Eight instances of modal meaning most frequently identified in the Lithuanian part of the corpus were selected for analysis: *gali* 'you can/you may', *pažymėtina* 'it should be noted/it is to be noted', *galėtų* 'could/would be able to', *turėtų* 'should/would have/would be supposed to', *galima* 'it is possible/one can/may', *būtina* 'it is necessary/must be', *pabrėžtina* 'it should be emphasized', and *akivaizdžiai* 'obviously/evidently/manifestly'. This study examines the translation of these modal expressions into English in order to illustrate the main similarities and differences in the expression of modality between Lithuanian and English, as well as the translation equivalents chosen by translators. In addition, the second part of the study sought to examine the recurring lexical combinations in which words expressing modality are most frequently used, and how those combinations are translated into English. The results of the study show that the translations reveal the main patterns of preservation and change in modal position groups. Various methods were applied when translating Lithuanian modal position groups into English. In some cases, they were translated literally, preserving the modal meaning. In other cases, they were altered or rephrased. Overall, the translations primarily sought to preserve the legal consequences and modal strength of the original text, although certain changes are noticeable. Nevertheless, this study remains rather limited, as it sought to discuss only the most common instances of modal expression. In the future, it would be interesting to select a larger sample of expressive means and expand the study. Modality plays an important role in legal language, so such studies would contribute to improving the quality of translation.

References

Primary source

LECOLT – Lithuanian–English Corpus of Legal Texts. Compiled at the Institute of Applied Linguistics, Vilnius University. Project team: R. Juknevičienė and M. Talacka.

Secondary sources

Aikhenvald, A. 2006. Evidentiality in Grammar. *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics* 320 – 325.

Berūkštienė, D. 2017. A corpus-driven analysis of structural types of lexical bundles in court judgements in English and their translation into Lithuanian. *Kalbotyra*. 70(1): 7–31.

Biber, D., Conrad & G. Leech. 2007. *Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.

Biber, D., Conrad & G. Leech. 2007. *Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.

Biber, D., S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad & E. Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Chen, S. 2025. A corpus-based study of stance markers in academic thesis writing by L2 undergraduates. *Acta Psychologica* 259(1): 1—9.

Collins, P. 2009. *Modals and quasi-modals in English*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.

Glogar, O. 2023. The Concept of Legal Language: What Makes Legal Language ‘Legal’?. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*. 36(3): 1–27.

Gunji, T. & Y. Takubo. 2008. Modality and Evidentiality. *Journal in Semantics*: 25(3): 221—227.

Haan, F. 1999. Evidentiality and epistemic modality: Setting boundaries. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 18(1): 83—101.

Hamiti, V. & V. Sopjani. 2023. Are modal verbs a lexical characteristic of legal terminology? *XLinguae*. 16(1): 70–91.

- Hylad, K. 2005. Stance and engagement: a model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse studies* 7(2): 173–191.
- Hyland, K. 2005. *Metadiscourse*. London: Continuum.
- Hyland, K. 2008. *Genre and Academic Writing in the Disciplines*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Juknevičienė, R. 2017. *English Phraseology and Corpora: An Introduction to corpus-based and corpus-driven phraseology*. Vilnius: Vilniaus Universiteto leidykla.
- Krapivkina, A., O. 2017. Semantics of the verb shall in legal discourse. *Jezikoslovlje*: 18(1): 305—317.
- Mommers, L. & W. Voermans. 2005. Using Legal Definitions to Increase the Accessibility of Legal Documents. In Marie-Francine Moens, and Peter Spyns (eds.) In *Legal Knowledge and Information Systems JURIX 2005: The Eighteenth Annual Conference*. Amsterdam: IOS Press: 147—156.
- Nemickienė, Z. 2016. The Comparative Analysis of English – Lithuanian Equivalents of *Must* in *The Witch of Portobello*. *Mokslo Taikomieji Tyrimai*. 12(1): 197–205.
- Palmer, F. R. 1990. *Modality and the English modals* (2nd ed.). Routledge: Longman.
- Palmer, F. R. 2001. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pekūnas, Ž. 2022. Deontinio modalumo raiška Europos Sąjungos teisės aktų vertime į lietuvių kalbą. *Vertimo studijos*. 15(1): 47–66.
- Rozina, G. & I. Karapetjana. Epistemic modality in professional communication. *Language Meaning and Form* 9(1): 203—213.
- Ruskan, A. 2016. Epistemic qualifications of the English marker “likely” and its equivalents in Lithuanian. *Kalbotyra* 69: 179—204.
- Šinkūnienė, J. 2015. Nonepistemic modality in English and Lithuanian academic discourse: quantitative and qualitative perspectives. *Kalbotyra*. 67(1): 131–154.

- Šinkūnienė, J. 2017. The modal verb galėti ‘can/could/may/might’ in academic Lithuanian: distribution, frequency and semantic properties. *Kalbotyra* 69: 205—222.
- Šolienė, A. 2016. (Non)epistemic modality: English must, have to, and have got to and their correspondences in Lithuanian. *Kalbotyra* 69: 223—245.
- Strongman, L. 2013. *Academic Writing*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Tiersma, P. 2005. Some myths about legal language. *Journal of Law, Culture and Humanities* 2(1): 29—50.
- von Fintel, K. 2006. Modality and Language. Borchert, D. (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA.
- Yang, L. 2014. Evidentiality in English Research Articles of Applied Linguistics: From the Perspective of Metadiscourse. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 5(3): 581—591.
- Comrie, B., Haspelmath, M., Bickel, B. 2015. *The Leipzig Glossing Rules: Conventions for Interlinear Morpheme-by-Morpheme Glosses*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology and University of Leipzig.
- Anthony, L. 2024. AntConc v. 4.3.1x. Available at: <https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software/antconc/>