Russian Converb Constructions Corresponding to Swedish Purposive *för att* 'in order to' + Infinitive Constructions

Simone Mellquist

1. Introduction and previous research

In Russian, 'purpose' is generally expressed with the conjunction *čtoby* '[in order] to' + infinitive.[1] However, many other ways of expressing this meaning exist, including the use of bare infinitives, or example *idëm tuda čaj pit'* 'let us go there to drink tea', prepositions + deverbal nouns, for example *sprosit' dlja očistki sovesti* 'ask in order to clean one's conscience', or prepositions and non-deverbal nouns, for example *Marja Maksimovna šla na kuxnju za buločkami* 'Marya Maksimovna went to the kitchen for (to fetch) bread'.[2]

One means of expressing 'purpose' that has been disputed in the literature is through the use of converb constructions, i.e., non-finite verb forms used for adverbial subordination. It has been argued that this meaning is incompatible with Russian converbs because Russian converbs denote 'simultaneity' or 'anteriority', a fact that would rule out 'consecutive' and 'purposive' meanings which rely on an interpretation of 'futurity' (Weiss 1995: 250–251). In the same vein, König (1995: 82) argues that English and Spanish converb constructions that are frequently identified as 'purposive' denote clearly entailed eventualities, whereas purposive clauses need to be non-veridical: "Purposive clauses are not factual, i.e., they are not entailed by the relevant combined sentences (…)". Another argument that has been proposed to rule out the possibility of purposive converb meaning is that such meanings depend on the lexical verb meaning alone, whereas the converb form merely expresses 'simultaneity' (c.f. Apresjan (1983: 334); Rappaport (1984: 185); König (1995: 82)).

Based on investigations made by Akimova and Kozinceva (1987) and Rjabova (1992), the present study demonstrates that, despite their low frequency, purposive interpretations of Russian converbs are attested and accounted for. A contrastive investigation between Swedish 'purposive' *för att* '[in order] to' + infinitive constructions

---

[1] For reasons of clarity, the term *purpose* is used over terms like *final, target, end,* or *goal,* which are used to refer to temporal or spatial relations or position in sentences.

[2] Unless otherwise stated, the sentence examples used in this paper were extracted from the Russian National Corpus, RNC (ruscorpora.ru).

and Russian converb constructions was performed to further explore the contexts that give rise to 'purposive' interpretations of Russian converbs. (See Section 3.)

The literature review on this topic brings together relevant empirical and theoretical observations that place the 'purpose' meaning expressed by converbs into perspective. Section 1.1 discusses purposive converb constructions described in the Russian grammatical literature. Section 1.2 presents definitions of purpose in typological research, which are further specified in Sections 1.3. and 1.4. Section 1.5. is devoted to the concept of 'pseudo-simultaneity', which serves to problematise specific claims about 'simultaneity' and 'veridicality' as crucial meaning components. In Section 1.6., I present several properties of certain verbal situations that strengthen the hypothetical quality of purposive constructions, specifically 'conation' and 'distant purpose'. Section 1.7. concludes the introductory section with a brief summary.

This Introduction is followed by 2. Data and methodological considerations, 3. Results, and 4. Conclusions.

1.1 Purposive converb constructions described in the Russian grammatical literature

Rjabova (1992) lists three types of Russian converb constructions that express a purposive meaning (*deepričastija celi*). These types are:

(I) According to Rjabova (1992: 17ff), the first type of construction contains an imperfective converb with a lexical meaning of 'wishing', 'intending', or 'striving' that occurs together with an infinitive that specifies what the participant denoted by the Subject wishes/strives/intends to do by performing the eventuality denoted by the matrix verb [converb + infinitive]. Typical converbs are *želaja* 'wishing' and *stremjas'* 'striving'. [3] These constructions are referred to as *analytic purpose constructions* in this paper text.[4] Example sentence (1) illustrates this type of construction:

(1)   Russian (Rjabova 1992: 17, italics altered, English translation added)
       Лейтенант ухватился за эфес сабли, *намереваясь выхватить ее из ножен.*
       (Новиков-Прибой)
       'The lieutenant grabbed the hilt of his sabre, *intending to snatch it from its sheath.*'

(II) According to Rjabova (1992), the second type of converb construction contains an imperfective converb with a lexical meaning of 'striving for a result' but without an infinitive. This construction type can express the same meaning as the sequence of [converb + infinitive] as in Type 1. The eventuality associated with the construction is

---

[3] Although *želaja* means 'wishing', it may be glossed as *wanting* since it is neutral in meaning. The converb for the corresponding verb *xotet'* 'to want', e.g. *xotja* 'although, though', has been grammaticalized as a concessive marker, see Lavrov (1941: 115–127).

[4] Ideally, the term *converb construction* should refer to the relation between matrix verb clause and converb clause, c.f. Rjabova (1992: 7). The purposive meaning emerges as a relation between something expressed in the matrix clause and something expressed in the converb clause. For the sake of convenience, the term *converb construction* will be used as an equivalent to the Russian locution *deepričastnyj oborot* 'converb phrase', encompassing the converb and its dependents. It should be kept in mind however, that a converb construction with a specific meaning presupposes a semantic relation with a finite matrix verb (or non-finite verb form that in its turn depend on a finite verb).

entailed, but the result, which is the ultimate purpose, is not. This construction type is represented by (2):

(2)   Russian (Rjabova 1992: 19, italics altered, English translation added)
Было ясно, что самолет где-то поблизости, что он кружит над лесом, то ли что-то *высматривая*, то ли *ища* места для посадки (Полевой).
'It was clear that the plane was somewhere nearby, that it was circling over the forest, either looking for something or looking for places to land.'

The converb form *išča* 'searching' is understood as meaning approximately *namerevajas' najti* 'intending to find'. The imperfective verb *vysmatrivat'* 'locating by eye, spying out' may have the meaning 'search for somebody/something by looking attentively' ((…) *vsmatrivajas' iskat' kogo-l, čego-l,* (…) Kuznecov (2000)).

(III) Rjabova's (1992) third construction type consists of any imperfective converb that expresses the meaning of 'being the purpose for bringing about the matrix verb eventuality'. The converb denotes an eventuality that functions as both the purpose and the result of the matrix eventuality. This construction type is represented by (3):

(3)   Russian (Rjabova 1992, 19, italics altered, English translation added)
Убивая время, я изучаю фотографии лучших людей цеха. (Борнычева)
'Killing time, I'm studying photos of the section's best people.'

Rjabova remarks that the purposive meaning of the third construction type is vague and may be conflated with other meanings, mainly 'simultaneity' (*odnovremennost'*) (1992: 20).

The two non-infinitival construction types introduced above will be referred to as *synthetic purpose constructions* in the following discussion.

Akimova and Kozinceva (1987: 266, 271) mention purposive interpretations of both analytic and synthetic construction types, mainly in contexts involving speech acts. In addition, they also mention a qualifying-modal (*kvalifikativno-modal'nye*) interpretative use of converb constructions which may have inter alia a 'purposive' interpretation. The interpretative status of such uses is marked by comparative particles, such as *kak by* 'as if' or *slovno* 'like'. The comparative particles are used as a means of signalling the Speaker's insecurity or subjective judgement of the protagonist's purpose:

(4)   Russian (Akimova and Kozinceva (1987: 266). Italics and translations added)
Гм! — промычал Обноскин, *как будто желая подразнить ещё более дядю.* (Ф. Достоевский);
'Hm! — muttered Obnoskin, *as if wanting to tease his uncle even more.*'

(5)   Russian (Akimova and Kozinceva (1987: 266). Italics and translations added)
... но вдруг Федя обратился к Илюше и, *как бы возобновляя прерванный разговор*, спросил его (...). (И Тургенев)
'But suddenly Fedya turned to Ilyusha and, *as if to continue* [lit: 'renewing'] the interrupted conversation, asked him (…).'

Examples (4) and (5) demonstrate that interpretative markers can be added to analytic [converb + infinitive] and to synthetic [converb] purposive converb constructions. Both provide guesses regarding the protagonists' intentions.

1.2 Definitions of 'purpose'

Two broad typological studies have previously investigated purpose relations in the world's languages. In these studies, the characteristics of the constructions are given with minimal reference to language-specific structural elements. Cristofaro (2003) defines 'purpose' as a relation that links "two S(tates) o(f) A(ffair)s, one of which (the main one) is performed with the goal of obtaining the realisation of another one (the dependent one)". (Cristofaro, 2003: 157). Similarly, Schmidtke-Bode (2009: 20) offers the following functional definition of purpose clauses: "Purpose clauses are part of analytical sentences which encode that one verbal situation, that of the matrix clause, is performed with the intention of bringing about another situation, that of the purpose clause."[5]

For the present investigation, which deals with purposive interpretations (or implicatures) of Russian converbs, valuable insight has been garnered from Schmidtke-Bode's observations and predictions about purposive *inferences* of certain construction types. As is the case in Russian converbs, these constructions are not specifically designated to express purpose relations. In his typological study, Schmidtke-Bode presents serial verb constructions, quotative constructions, coordinate constructions, and ambiguous adverbial constructions that may all give rise to a 'purpose' interpretation in certain contexts. Furthermore, Schmidtke-Bode (2009: 108) identifies some tentative features that contribute to purposive inferences. These features include (i) a dynamic instead of a static aspectual construal of both the matrix and (potential) purpose clause; (ii) the role of the antecedent Subject is typically animate and agentive; and (iii) both clauses should contain the same Subject. As the examples I provide demonstrate, the third condition is fulfilled by Russian converbs. The two other features are also important parameters in analysing the material I present in this paper.

1.3 Delineations from other causal meaning relations

'Purpose' and 'reason' can be defined as a subtype of causal relations. Verstraete (2008) notes that 'purpose' and 'reason' can be differentiated from other causal relations since they represent *mental states*. The following two pairs of examples represent different temporal orderings of the (denoted) eventualities. In the first pair, (6), the eventualities denoted by the matrix verbs occur before the eventualities denoted by the dependent verbs (subordinate clauses):

> (6)   English (Verstraete, 2008: 761, tags added).
> a. He left the door open, so that the plumber could get in. ('purpose')
> b. He left the back door open, so (that) the burglars had no difficulty getting in. ('result')

In the second pair, (7), the eventualities denoted by the matrix verbs occur after the eventualities denoted by dependent verbs (subordinate clauses).

---

[5] I follow Schmidtke-Bode (2009: 19) in using the term 'clause' in a way that is non-committal to specific grammatical frameworks or national traditions, hence the term 'clause' covers both the 'infinitive phrases' (Swedish *infinitivfras*) and the converb phrases (Russian *deepričastnyj oborot*) that are described in this paper.

(7) English (Verstraete, 2008: 761, tags added).
    a. Julia killed her husband because he cheated on her. ('reason')
    b. Julia arrived late because she was stuck in a traffic jam. ('cause')

In (6a) the Agent of the main clause is volitionally involved in establishing the relation between the expressed eventualities. Leaving the door open so that the plumber could get in is an intentional decision, not a mere result caused by circumstances. Similarly, in (7a), there is no natural cause-effect relation between the husband's cheating and his wife's killing him. In both (6a) and (7a), the relation between the two eventualities is based on the Agent's mental state, corresponding to a volitional decision to perform the eventuality in the matrix clause. The matrix clause eventualities are motivated by those in the subordinated clauses, i.e., the plumber's possibility of getting in (6a) and the husband's cheating (7a) In (6b) and (7b), no corresponding decision or intention can be discerned. In (6b), leaving the door open was not intended to help the burglars enter. Likewise, in (7b), the traffic jam did not motivate Julia to arrive late but merely caused it.

According to Verstraete (2008: 760), the dependent clauses in (6a) and (7a) characterise the mental state of the Subjects (Agents) in the clauses, not of the Speaker's attitude. In relation to these observations, we note that analytic Russian purposive converb constructions, as in (1) or (4), make explicit reference to mental states, as in the converbs *namerevajas'* 'intending' and *želaja* 'wishing', whereas the mental states remain implicit in synthetic constructions.[6]

Verstraete argues that the mental states belong to the Agent in the sentence and not to the Speaker. Speakers "have evidential categories at their disposal to associate themselves with, or dissociate themselves from, propositions they report from other parties" (Verstraete, 2008: 756). Given this, we observe that the comparative markers in (4) and (5) can be seen as evidential markers used by the Speaker to dissociate themself from the mental states in the purpose constructions. The comparative markers fulfil the task of expressing assumed evidentiality: The Speaker does not have access to the mental state of the person whose behaviour they report on, but from appearances, it looks as if or seems like they intend/are about to, e.g., tease their uncle (as in 4) or renew the conversation (as in 5).[7] In fiction, such markers may lend the composition a more documentary character, as if the protagonists were not fictitious but actually observed.

---

[6] The same-Subject requirement of Russian converbs makes converbal expression of sentences like (6a) or (7a) impossible, but these sentences can be rephrased by verbs like *pozvoljaja/davaja vozmožnost'* santexniku vxodit' '*letting* the plumber in' and *obnaruživ* čto muž izmenil ej '*having revealed* that her husband cheated on her'.

[7] Akimova and Kozinceva (1987) refer to the function of the comparative markers as 'modal' *(kvalifikativno-modal'nye)*. Evidentiality and epistemic modality (and specifically inferential epistemic modality) are often viewed as overlapping (Plungian and van der Auwera 1998). Verstraete (2008: 759) refers to the mental states as 'modal attitudes', but an anonymous reviewer pointed out that 'intensional attitude' may be a better term. 'Intensional attitudes' and 'mental states' are further discussed in Section 3.2 and 3.3 along with the presentation of the results of the present study.

1.4 Further delineation between 'purpose' and 'result'

The 'result' meaning in (6b) denotes an unintended consequence, but intended eventualities may also have attained outcomes. Padučeva (1994: 5) makes a distinction between 'unintended consequences' (*posledstvie*), — which corresponds to Verstraete's (2008) term 'result' — and 'intended results' (*rezul'tat*). Rjabova's (1992) third group, e.g., as illustrated in (3), may be understood as an instance of an 'intended result'. Andersson and Spenader (2014) investigated the distinction between 'purpose' and 'intended result' in English matrix clauses and dependent clauses marked by the connectives *so* and *so that*. Their investigation into clauses containing finite verbs revealed that 'purpose' clauses were often marked with the modal auxiliaries *can* or *could* followed by an infinitive, c.f., (6a). One of their most robust results was that the 'purpose' meaning seems to hinge on *non-veridicality*; an observation that echoes König's (1995) remark that 'purpose' clauses must not be entailed by the complex sentences (c.f., the quote in Section 1). Although Andersson and Spenader have confirmed this observation in their corpus investigations, their experimental investigations have shown that constructions without non-veridicality markers may also be interpreted as expressing 'purpose'. In this context, note that Croft (2010) and Schmidtke-Bode (2009: 108) have described 'unmarked purpose'. Despite a strong association with non-veridicality, the decisive criterion used in Andersson and Spenader's (2014) investigations was the dependent clauses' paraphrasability into *in order to* + infinitive or *with the intention of*.

Kortmann (1991) refutes the claim that expressions that denote 'purpose' must be hypothetical (or 'putative', i.e., non-veridical) rather than factual. Instead, he argues that an "additional component of volition on behalf of the agent" distinguishes 'result' from 'purpose', Kortmann (1991: 126).

In summary, a 'purpose' relation is characterised by an eventuality that is performed in order to bring about another eventuality. It can be distinguished from a 'reason' relation in that a purpose refers to a non-preceding eventuality, whereas a reason refers to a preceding (already happened) eventuality. 'Purpose' can further be distinguished from an (unintended) 'result' in that it is accompanied by a mental state of intending that mediates between the first and the second eventuality. The border between 'purpose' and 'intended result/consequence' seems to be somewhat fuzzier. There seems to be a connection between the marking of attained results and non-intentional eventualities on the one hand, and between the marking of non-attained results and intentional eventualities on the other hand. But this connection is not absolute. It is assumed here that the semantic core of 'purpose' (as stated by, e.g., Schmidtke-Bode (2009)) lies in the relation between two situations, where the first unfolds in order to intentionally bring about the second. Non-veridicality may be seen as a feature of the grammatical marking of 'purpose', used as a technical device to emphasise the intention rather than the result, and not as an essential feature of the semantics of 'purpose'. The essential feature is *intention*.

In the characterisation of 'purpose' (as opposed to 'reason'), it is important to speak of a non-preceding situation rather than of a future situation. In example (3), (4), and (5), the dependent eventualities (i.e., converb, purpose) are not clearly futuritive. Instead, they seem to be simultaneous events. However, this is not merely any type of simultaneity but pseudo-simultaneity. This concept is the subject of Section 1.5.

1.5 Pseudo-simultaneity

The concept of pseudo-simultaneity contributes to the understanding of purposive uses of Russian converbs and specifically helps to refute the claim that purposive uses of converbs express mere simultaneity (Apresjan, 1983: 334; König, 1995: 82). The concept of pseudo-simultaneity has been widely discussed in the field of philosophy under the name of the *Anscombe thesis* or the *Anscombe-Davidson thesis* (see Goldman, 1970; Botting, 2010: 66; Sæbø, 2018: 9). The idea is that a single eventuality can have several different descriptions even though only one concrete eventuality takes place, (c.f. Anscombe, (2000 [1957, 1963]: 45ff)):

> Are we to say that the man who (intentionally) moves his arm, operates the pump, replenishes the water supply, poisons the inhabitants, is performing *four* actions? Or only one?

The killing of time in (3) is not merely co-temporaneous with the studying of photographs but *consists* of the studying of photographs. Various terms have been used to denote various facets of this phenomenon, including *intrinsic duality* (Ryle, 2009 [1949]: 237), *act-generation* or *level-generation* (Goldman, 1970), *complementary coincidence* (*komplementäre Koinzidenz*, Růžička, 1980), *pseudo-simultaneity* (*psevdo-sovremennost'*) (Poljanskij, 1987), *quasi-duality* (Kearns, 2003), and *event-integration* (Haug et al., 2012).

The Anscombe-Davidson thesis has been discussed previously in terms of act-individuation vs identity (see Botting, 2010 and Sæbø, 2008, 2018 for recent discussions). The Anscombe-Davidson thesis is typically refuted because of the asymmetry of the descriptions; for example, one can kill time by studying photographs, but it is not as feasible to say that one can study photographs by killing time. Haug et al. (2012: 168) have argued that this asymmetry "is guaranteed by the asymmetrical *Cause* relation". Notwithstanding this clear asymmetry, there is a clear reciprocity between 'purpose' and 'means'.[8] Kortmann (1991: 126) notes that "A complex sentence lending itself to a representation by the propositional schema '*by* p q' may be convertable into one of 'p *in order to* q' (Pusch 1980: 97)". Pusch (1980:66) uses this convertibility as a test to distinguish 'manner' (*modal*) meaning in converbs from a 'means' (*instrumental*) meaning, c.f., *he walked limping > *he limped to walk*; *he arrived (by) walking > he walked to arrive*.

In Russian, this convertibility can be exemplified without augmentation, i.e., with bare converbs, since either type can be expressed without adding special markers like English *by*. Examples like *ubival vremja, igraja* 'killed time (by) playing' or *ubival vremja, čitaja* 'killed time (by) reading' are attested in the Russian National Corpus.

I suggest that pseudo-simultaneous situations complement each other like the two sides of a coin.[9] As pointed out by Poljanskij (1987) and Sæbø (2008, 2018), the important

---

[8]The notion of *means* is also referred to as *instrumental* in the framework of Haug et al. (2012). Other terms used are *instrumental manner*, *manner* and *method*.

[9]More elaborated analyses of related phenomena are suggested by Sæbø (2008, 2018) and Haug et al. (2012). However, the present analysis will not focus on the details of the formal analyses presented in these works, nor will any stance regarding the Anscombe-Davidson thesis be taken. This paper is mainly concerned with

factor is *abstraction*: an abstract purpose is obtained by a concrete means. The means:purpose (means:end) complementarity may be seen as an effect of the manner:result complementarity described in work by Levin and Rappaport Hovav (e.g., Levin and Rappaport Hovav, 2013). The manner:result complementarity was originally formulated as a lexicalisation constraint for verb (root) meaning: only one of these can be lexicalised for a single verb root. The complementary distribution of these meaning facets induces a need of specification which may be fulfilled by converbs. Killing time is manner-neutral and needs a manner (means) specification. This phenomenon has been thoroughly described for converbs with 'instrumental' i.e., 'means' meanings (Pusch, 1980; Kearns, 2003; Sæbø 2008, 2018, Haug et al., 2012 among others), or 'interpretative meanings' (Boguslavskij 1977, Růžička 1980). 'Purpose' meanings, on the other hand, are less frequently described in the literature on converbs (Akimova and Kozinceva, 1987; Rjabova, 1991 (for Russian); Kortmann, 1991 (for English)).[10] Manner-specified eventualities do also sometimes need specification. Diessel (2013: 351) observes that certain matrix clauses remain incomplete without a 'purpose' clause. A 'call for an explanation' may be seen as a motivation for 'purpose' clauses. For what good are the airplane circling over the forest in (2)? For what purpose do I study the photographs of the section's best people in (3)? The answers, or guesses, i.e. purpose specifications, are given by converb constructions.

Phenomena characterised by pseudo-simultaneity has been mentioned in the literature on converbs by Boguslavskij (1977: 271), Růžička (1980), Poljanskij (1987: 250), König (1995: 67), and Haug et al. (2012: 132ff), among others. One important point of consensus that is relevant for the present study is that pseudo-simultaneous eventualities are distinct from clearly simultaneous, i.e., parallelly ongoing, eventualities. Even the leading proponent of "act-separation" (or rather "level-generation", to quote his own term), Goldman (1970: 22), has emphasised this point:

> The criterion of co-temporality is the correctness of saying that one of the acts is done "*while also*" doing the other. It is correct to say that S wiggled his toes "*while also*" strumming a guitar; hence these two acts are co-temporal. But it is incorrect to say that S checkmated his opponent "*while also*" moving his queen to king-knight-seven (or vice versa), and it is incorrect to say that S turned on the light "*while also*" flipping the switch (or vice versa). Hence, neither of these pairs of acts is co-temporal. Pairs of acts are related by level-generation only if they fail to be co-temporal.

Anscombe (2000 [1957, 1963]) and Goldman (1970) refer interchangeably to "*by*"-relations and "*in order to*"-relations throughout their work. In the quote above, S may move his queen to king's knight seven *in order to* checkmate his opponent, or he may checkmate his opponent *by* moving his queen to king's knight seven.

---

empirical observations. For the sake of convenience, I refer to relations between 'eventualities' or 'acts' instead of relations between 'descriptions'.

[10] Růžička 1980 briefly mentions an example of a purposive (*Finalität*) meaning relation in his treatment of 'complementary coincidence'.

For the context of example (3), it would be incorrect to paraphrase it as **Ja izučaju fotografii, v to vremja kak ja takže ubivaju vremja* 'I study photographs while I also kill time' This paraphrase, which captures both the meaning of addition and simultaneity, that is manifest in the English expression "while also", is judged as incoherent by native Russian informants.[11]

1.6 Conation and distant purpose: partial pseudo-simultaneous overlap

While pseudo-simultaneity can involve a complete overlap between two situations in a 'purpose' relation (as in (3)), the overlap can also be partial. In certain instances, a 'purpose' construction can be said to be separable into a process part and a result part so that the process part is simultaneous with the matrix eventuality, whereas the result may be hypothetical. This characteristic is true of the analytic construction in (1) *namerevajas' vyxvatit' eë iz nožen* 'intending to snatch it from its sheath', where the intending is (pseudo-)simultaneous with the matrix verb but the resulting unsheathing is hypothetical. Likewise, for the synthetic construction in (2), *vysmatrivaja* 'locating by eye/spying out', the looking is pseudo-simultaneous with the matrix verb, whereas the result is still not asserted. This partial pseudo-simultaneity relates to the concept of 'conation'.

Conation (from Lat. *conatus* 'attempt') in Russian verbs has been treated by Hamburger (1983), Townsend (1989), Zaliznjak and Šmelëv (2007: 20), Mustajoki (2005), Padučeva (2008), Šatunovskij (2015), Kozera (2018: 20), and Sonnenhauser (2017), among others. (See Vincent (2013) for a comprehensive account of other usages of the term 'conation' or 'conative' in linguistics.) For Russian, the term has been used to refer to a specific aspect opposition and for verbs of trying (referred to as 'conative auxiliaries' in Hamburger (1970: 124)).

Maslov (2004 [1948]: 73) has described the aspectual opposition residing in conative verbs as matching the following frame(s): Vipf *da ne* 'but not' Vpfv; Vipfv *i nakonec* 'and at last' Vpfv; and Vipfv *poka ne* 'until' Vpfv:

> (8)   Russian (Maslov 2004 [1948]: 73)
> *Ловил,   да   не   поймал;   ловил   и   наконец*
> chased:ipfv: but   not   caught:pfv:m chased:ipfv:m   and   at.last
> *поймал;   ловил,   пока не поймал*
> caught:pfv:m   chased:ipfv:m   until   caught:pfv:m
> 'He chased but did not catch; he chased and at last caught, he chased until he caught'.

---

[11] This observation must be seen as preliminary. The investigations in this paper are based on corpus data and not native speaker assessments. A thorough investigation of different Russian equivalents of "*while also*" would require an extensive semantic analysis with several native speaker informants. Rjabova (1992: 20) mentions examples in which the 'purpose' (*cel'*) meaning is conflated with 'simultaneity' (*odnovremennost'*), in such examples paraphrases with *pritom* 'besides' or *odnovremenno* 'simultaneously' are possible. The additive nuance is, however, not present in all instances of converb constructions with purposive meanings. A paraphrase with *kogda* 'when' is infelicitous since *when*-clauses generally are anaphorical and refer to given information whereas 'purpose' refers to new information.

Various lists of aspectual minimal pairs that match these frames have been proposed in the literature, the most extensive in Glovinskaja (1982: 89ff).[12] For imperfective verbs, a verb like *try* is sometimes added in Russian-English dictionaries (e.g., *otyskivat'* 'try to find' or *dobivat'sja* 'try to get', *dokazyvat'* 'to argue, try to prove' in Wheeler et al. (2020)).

What unites the conative verbs is that they are not 'inertial', in the sense that there is no general expectance that a continuation of an action leads to the intended result (c.f., PaduČeva (1994: 4, 11) *nepolnyj kontrol' sub'jekta nad kauzirujemoj situaciej* 'the Subject's incomplete control of the caused situation' as opposed to *glagoly postepennogo nakoplenija rezul'tata* 'verbs of gradual accumulation of result').[13] Interestingly, this feature is also mentioned in connection with verbs occurring in pseudo-simultaneous constructions. Kearns (2003: 630) identifies 'causative upshot' predicates in English that exhibit a similar non-inertial feature, e.g., as in *cure* and *convince*. Padučeva (2004) notes that 'actions with accent on the result' (*dejstvija s akcentom na rezul'tate*) need a separate lexeme to denote the action that leads up to the outcome, i.e., you are not "arriving" to arrive, but rather walking, for example.[14] Typical conative verb pairs are often suppletive, employing different lexemes for purposive actions and for outcomes, *lovit'/pojmat'* '(try to) catch/catch', *iskat'/najti* 'search/find'. Note that the latter is not considered a real aspectual pair, although there is an intuitive feeling that they are related (c.f. Zaliznjak and Mikaėljan, 2016). Other verbs like *otyskivat'/otyskat'* '(try to) seek out/seek out' exhibit derived imperfective morphology; such verbs may also have manner specified roots. In certain instances, an imperfective conative verb does not specify *how* the attempt to bring about the intended outcome is carried out, instead it has the character of an attempt. Unlike verbs like *pisat'/napisat'* 'to write', which with certain strengthening contexts can fit the frame in (8), the verb *lovit'/pojmat'* '(try to) catch/catch' does not specify a method or manner. Padučeva (1992: 74) place verbs like *rešat'* '(try) to solve' *ugovarivat'* '(try) to talk somebody into something', *dobyvat'sja* '(try) to obtain something', *dožidat'sja* 'to wait for', *dokazyvat'* '(try) to prove' into a special class of 'attempt verbs' (*klass POPYTOK*).

A related phenomenon pertaining to 'purpose' meanings is verbs with *distant purposes* (c.f. PaduČeva and Rozina (1993) and Padučeva (1994: 10) *dal'njaja cel'*). The verb *prjatat'sja/spjratat'sja* 'to hide' denotes an eventuality of being in a designated place, but the perfective verb does not entail the attainment of the ultimate purpose, i.e., not to be seen. Similarly, a verb like *sprašivat'/sprosit'* 'ask' denotes the eventuality of presenting a question, whereas the ultimate purpose is to obtain an answer. In such instances, there

---

[12] The converb form *vysmatrivaja* 'locating by eye, spying out' is not present in Glovinskaja's (1982) list, but *vysmatrivat'/vysmotret'* is attested as matching the conativity frame proposed by Maslov (2004[1948]), (8) in the RNC.

[13] Plungian (2001) suggests that conativity is scalar and that aspect pairs like *otkryvat'/otkryt' okno* 'open a window' and *pisat'/napisat' knigu* 'write a book' can be used conatively with a supporting context. See also Padučeva (2004: 11).

[14] Padučeva (1992) mentions similar phenomena in relation to various features of verbal semantics, e.g. 'verbs of secondary nomination' (*glagoly vtoričnoj nominacii*) which must be supplemented by other lexemes indicating a 'primary action' (*pervičnoje dejstvie*). In relation to this Padučeva (1992: 76) refers to Goldman (1970) erroneously as "Goodman"; PaduČeva (2004: 41, 479) mentions 'abstraction' (*abstraktnost'*) along with the manner:result complementarity of Levin and Rappaport-Hovav.

is a nuance of attempt regardless of the verb's aspect. Presumably, this is the type of verb that Apresjan (1983) and König (1995) had in mind when they stated that purposive converb interpretations depend on lexical meaning alone. They mentioned verbs like *ždat'* 'wait' and *search*.

In instances of conation and distant purpose in synthetic constructions and analytic constructions, the pseudo-simultaneous overlap is partial since the attainment of the purpose remains hypothetical.

1.7 *Brief summary of previous research*

'Purpose' relations hold between one verbal situation (expressed by a matrix, i.e., a finite verb form) and another verbal situation (expressed by a dependent converb or an infinitive) in such a way that the first situation is performed with the intention of bringing about the second. The relation between these situations constitutes a mental state of intending or wishing that is not necessarily explicit. Russian converbs may express this relation analytically (with converbs that explicitly refer to the mental state, e.g. *želaja* 'wishing' together with an infinitive form that denotes the eventuality to be brought about) or by synthetic converb constructions that can be analysed as being dependent on either complete or partial pseudo-simultaneity with the matrix clause. Partial pseudo-simultaneity in synthetic converb constructions can be an effect of conation or distant purpose. Verb classes relevant to pseudo-simultaneity and conation share certain features such as non-inertness, emphasis on the outcome, or manner-neutrality. In the synthetic constructions, pseudo-simultaneity seems to have an instrumental nuance in the sense that the matrix clause is intended as a means of bringing about the purpose denoted by the converb. This instrumental nuance is not inherently present in the analytic constructions. In analytic constructions, the eventuality expressed in the matrix clause can be conceived of as an enabling step, as well as a means of obtaining a purpose. The "*while also*" (Russian: *v to vremja kak…takže*) test shows that purposive constructions can express something beyond mere simultaneity.

2.   *Data and methodological considerations*

In the present study, I have used Swedish purposive [*för att* '(in order) to' + infinitive] constructions as a means of eliciting purposive Russian converb constructions in bilingual searches in the Russian National Corpus, RNC. (ruscorpora.ru, see Savčuk et al., 2024).[15] Swedish is a suitable language because, unlike, e.g., English, it lacks distinct converb forms with a distribution similar to Russian converbs.[16]

---

[15] The examples with imperfective converbs were downloaded in September 2022. The examples with perfective converbs were downloaded in May 2023. My data are available here: https://doi.org/10.5878/9td4-d139.

[16] Some uses of Swedish present participles are reminiscent of Russian purposive converb use, e.g., as specifications of speech acts like *sa han frågande*. However, this example denotes 'manner' rather than 'purpose' and should be glossed 'he said *questioningly*' instead of 'he said *asking*'. In the material included in this study, the form *frågande* corresponds to *voprositel'no*, e.g., in the following examples:

Russian (Bulgakov, 1925) *Nikolka voprositel'no vperil vzor v polkovnika (…)*

Swedish (Blomqvist, 2015) *Han såg frågande på överste (…)*

The contexts of the resulting Russian converb constructions are explored to gain further insight into the field of Russian converbs, 'purpose' relations, 'pseudo-simultaneity', and 'conation'. These investigations are usage-based and rely on corpus data. Importantly, the frequency of the correlation is not estimated because the correspondence is actively elicited. The frequency of correlation is presumably low, but the size of the Swedish parallel part of the RNC is large enough to elicit a body of examples that is large enough to base generalisations on.[17]

Although the searches always initially started out from Swedish purposive [*för att* '(in order) to' + infinitive] constructions, the searches were carried out in both translation directions, i.e., Russian converb constructions translated both from and into Swedish purposive [*för att* '(in order) to' + infinitive] constructions. According to Andersson and Spenader (2014: 7), the most reliable criterion for judging whether a construction expresses 'purpose' is its paraphrasability using *in order to* or *with the intention of*. In the present investigation, this criterion informed the selection of every example that I discuss in this paper since I used analogous paraphrasability as a criterion in each corpus query.

The parallel corpora in the RNC are not checked for homonymy, and there were many false hits for non-converbal forms, like *xotja* 'though', *moja* 'my'. There were also non-purposive occurrences of [*för att* + infinitive], including verb collocations with *för*, e.g., *anklaga för (att ha gjort något)* 'accuse of (having done something)'. Note, too, that the matches in the RNC are based on text excerpts and not word-level correspondences. Consequently, the converb occurrences often correlate with something else in the excerpts besides a Swedish purposive [*för att* + infinitive] construction.

There is an obvious caveat to examining translation correspondences since they should not automatically be taken as face-value evidence of semantic or grammatical equivalence. There are always many ways to express a certain meaning, some of which may avoid a purposive nuance. The translators may also add more complexity in the depiction, inducing an additive nuance. The examples may differ in the pureness of the 'means:purpose' or 'concrete:abstract' complementarity. Some occurrences of the correspondence were rejected since the apparent correspondence was not clear, e.g., in Russian converbs preceded by the conjunction *i* 'and' or in examples where the Swedish purposive *för att* '(in order) to' constructions included verbs of trying. Such examples were translated with converb forms of verbs of trying, e.g., *för att försöka* 'in order to try' translated as *pytajas'* 'trying'.

Regrettably, the Swedish parallel part of the Russian National Corpus is not balanced in the sense that there are more Swedish source texts than Russian source texts. The Swedish material is also more diverse in terms of text types and their chronology. This lack of balance resulted in a much larger number of Russian target texts than Russian source texts.

On the other hand, corpus-based material that primarily consists of Russian target text examples can also be seen as an advantage in the context of the present study. Any specific

---

'Nikolka looked *inquiringly* at the colonel's gaze (…).'

[17] When I accessed the Swedish parallel partition of the RNC (https://ruscorpora.ru/s/ax1oB) in September 2022, it consisted of 787 texts comprising 16,520,159 words.

meaning relation (i.e., a relation that is more informative than simultaneity or anteriority) expressed by Russian converbs is implicit and needs to be considered as an inference drawn from the context. In the case of converb constructions correlating to Swedish purposive [*för att* + infinitive] constructions in Russian target texts, the direction is from the explicit to the implicit. Consequently, the meaning relations are not based on inferences made by the translators. Since the meanings are explicit in Swedish, there is no need for interpretation on behalf of the translator. In contrast, these meanings are implicated by the translators, provided that the purposive meaning is successfully transferred from Swedish to Russian. This circumstance allows the researcher to study implicature and ask: *In which contextual circumstances is it possible to implicate a purpose relation using a Russian converb construction?*

The corpus examples were annotated according to their structural type (analytic or synthetic converb constructions) and the aspect of the matrix verbs and infinitives. In addition, a semantic classification was conducted in order to identify the most frequent meanings of the verbal situations in the matrix and converb contexts. The resulting classification is partly informed by the thematic verb meaning classifications in Levin (1993), Babenko (1999), and the system of verb meaning classification in the RNC (Rachilina et al., 2009). Unmodified, none of these classifications had a suitable granularity for the material included in this study. The resulting classification I present is data-driven and primarily based on observations of the empirical material.

The research questions that this study addresses were formulated as open questions:

- What converb constructions corresponding to Swedish purposive *för att* + infinitive constructions are attested in the Russian National Corpus?

- What features in the matrix clause and converb clause contexts in converb constructions corresponding to Swedish purposive *för att* + infinitive constructions give rise to purposive relations?

3. Results

The examination of the examples taken from the corpus shows that analytic [converb + infinitive, e.g. *želaja pokazat'* 'wishing to show'] and synthetic converb constructions [converb, e.g., *pokazyvaja* 'showing'] correlate with Swedish purposive [*för att* '(in order) to'+ infinitive] constructions.

As an initial overview of the example material, I provide a selection of examples in truncated form, as matrix-purpose pairings. In some cases, these examples have been stripped of various Subject pronouns, Object nouns, or adverbials in the Swedish and Russian examples and the English glosses. Source language examples are given before target language examples. Complete examples are provided in the subsequent sections (Sections 3.1–3.16). The English glosses of the constructions reflect the formal features of both the Swedish and the Russian constructions. The examples represent every outcome type categorised for converb clauses (see Section 3.5., Table 7). In contrast, the matrix clause categories are not systematically represented in Table 1 since only the most frequent types are represented in the table. The examples are ordered in pairs to show the similarity between analytic and synthetic Russian converb constructions. The pairs are

marked with Roman numerals to distinguish them from the non-truncated examples in this paper.

Analytic constructions	Synthetic constructions
i.	**i′.**
sa jag	han skriver brev på brev
för att övertyga honom	*för att förmå mig att resa*
сказала я,	он шлет письмо за письмом,
стараясь убедить его	*уговаривая поехать*
'I said,	'He sends letter after letter
(trying) to convince him.'	to persuade/persuading me'
ii.	**ii′.**
sände han en blick kring bordet	рыскал по лесам,
för att finna brorsonen	*отыскивая крестьянские табуны*
окинул взглядом стол,	genomströvade skogarna
желая отыскать племянника	*för att få tag i hästhjordar*
'He glanced around the table,	'scoured the forests
(wanting) to find his nephew.'	tracking/to track down peasant herds'
iii.	**iii′.**
желая показать, что ему не стыдно,	jag nickade
кричал	*för att visa att jag hade förstått*
för att visa dem, att han inte alls skämdes,	я кивнула,
skrek han argt	*показывая, что понимаю*
'(Wanting) to show that he was not ashamed,	'I nodded
he shouted.'	to show/showing that I had understood.'
iv.	**iv′.**
gnuggade sig i ögonen	tittade sig skyggt omkring, antagligen
för att förvissa sig om att han inte drömde	*för att kontrollera att jag inte kom efter*
Протирал себе глаза,	огляделась вокруг,
желая увериться, не во сне ли?	*будто проверяя, не иду ли я следом?*
'rubbed his eyes, (wishing) to assure himself,	'looked around,
that he wasn't dreaming'	as if to check/checking, was I following?'
v.	**v′.**
Jag rycker till	började brottas med henne
för att slå mig fri	*för att komma loss*
я рвалась,	начала бороться с ней,
пытаясь высвободиться	*вырываясь из объятий*
'I wince(d),	'started to fight with her,
(trying) to get free'	to break/breaking free'
vi.	**vi′.**
gjorde en rörelse med handen,	ler
som för att gömma den	*för att dölja besvikelsen*
сделала движение,	улыбнулась,
стараясь спрятать руку	*скрывая разочарование*
'made a movement,	'smiled,
(trying) to hide her hand'	to hide/hiding her disappointment'
vii.	**vii′.**
прервал я,	начал я,
желая переменить разговор	*переменяя разговор*
avbröt jag,	började jag
för att byta samtalsämne	*för att ändra samtalsämne*
'I interrupted,	'I began,
(wanting) to change the conversation.'	changing/to change the conversation'

viii.
bröt sig upp genom rymden
för att nå ända till himlen
прорывается через космос,
желая достичь небес
'penetrates through cosmos,
(wanting) to reach the heavens'

viii′.
krälade fram på gatan som djur
för att nå de efterlängtade brunnarna
ползли на четвереньках, как звери,
добираясь до желанных колодцев
'crawled on all fours, like animals,
to reach/reaching the wells'

ix.
andades på den
för att få den torr igen
дуть на нее,
пытаясь высушить
blew on it,
(trying) to dry it

ix′.
viftade med handen
för att släcka tändstickan
махнула рукой,
гася спичку
'waved her hand,
 to extinguish/extinguishing the match'

x.
satte händerna i sidorna
som för att staga upp sig själv
уперла руки в боки,
стараясь удержать равновесие
'placed her hands on her hips,
(trying) to keep her balance'

x′.
tog stöd mot dörren
för att hålla balansen
оперся о дверь,
удерживая равновесие
'leaned against the door,
to hold/holding his balance'

xi.
точно желая передразнить его,
загудел ветер
liksom för att härma den
började också vinden tjuta
'as if (wanting) to mock it,
the wind roared'

xi′.
kompletterar med ett mörkare streck
för att imitera söm
проводят более темную полоску,
имитируя шов
'draw a darker stripe,
 to imitate/imitating a seam/stitching'

xii.
böjde mig lite ner mot gallret
för att höra
Склонился вниз к решетке ,
желая услышать
'leaned down to the grate,
(wanting) to hear'

xii′.
böjde sig över dem
för att lyssna
 склонилось к ним,
как бы прислушиваясь
'leaned toward them,
as if to listen/listening attentively'

xiii.
var ständigt på min vakt
för att förekomma det

Постоянно на страже,
пытаясь предотвратить это «что-то»

'was constantly on guard,
(trying) to prevent (this)'

xiii′.
fanns på plats
för att bevaka att inga onödiga skärmytslingar uppstod

находятся на местах,
*предотвращая
возникновение нежелательных стычек*

'were/are on site,
to prevent/preventing the occurrence of
unwanted clashes'

Table 1. Examples of Russian converb constructions corresponding to Swedish purposive [*för att* '(in order) to' + infinitive] constructions

The following subsections present a thematic presentation of the results of this study as per the heading used for each subsection.

3.1 Aspect

My search for converbs that specifically correspond to Swedish purposive [*för att* '(in order) to' + infinitive] constructions in the Russian National Corpus revealed a marked preponderance for imperfective Russian converbs.

Aspect	Correlations in the Russian source texts		Correlations in the Russian target texts		Total
	analytic	synthetic	analytic	synthetic	
perfective	1	1	4	13	19
imperfective	38	84	232	265	619

Table 2. Frequencies of Russian perfective and imperfective converb constructions corresponding to Swedish purposive [*för att* '(in order) to' + infinitive] constructions in Russian source and target texts

The aspect form of the converbs in the analytic constructions does not influence the interpretation of the analytic constructions as either resultative or non-resultative since the presence of the infinitive renders the analytic construction hypothetical:

(9)   a. Russian (Достоевский, 1859)
Мы было и пошли, но дядя воротился, *пожелав представить меня сначала капитоновским мужикам.*
b. Swedish (Backhoff-Malmquist, 1960)
Vi började just gå bort därifrån, när farbror vände *för att föreställa mig för bönderna från Kapitonovka.*
'We went on, but my uncle turned back, [wishing to/in order to] introduce me to the Kapitonovsky peasants.'

In contrast to (9), in the synthetic constructions, a distinction in aspect may be of relevance to how a sentence is interpreted. Perfective converb forms are typically mentioned in relation to 'result', i.e. consequence' (*sledstvie*) relations as well as the meaning of 'resultant state' (*rezul'tativnoe sostojanie*), c.f., Akimova and Kozinceva (1987: 260, 273). In (10b), the perfective form of the converb may imply that the barricade is already in place, whereas it remains unclear whether the barricade is completed or merely prepared in (10a).

(10)   a. Swedish (Hermansson, 2005)
Kwådd hade ställt till en ordentlig oreda därinne och dragit fram en massa skräp *för att barrikadera öppningen.*
b. Russian (А. Анваер, 2011)
Квод устроил там жуткий беспорядок, *завалив вход всяким хламом.*
'Kwådd had made a terrible mess there, [to barricade/blocking] the entrance with all sorts of junk.'

As can be seen from Table 2, perfective converbs corresponding to Swedish purposive [*för att* '(in order) to' + infinitive] constructions are attested, but the imperfective converbs are much more frequent. The analysis in this paper will focus on the imperfective examples.

Mixeev (1971) examines the 'consequence' (*sledstvie*) meaning of Russian converbs, which encompasses both non-intentional and intentional results. Mixeev (1971: 125) states that the consequential meaning is generally expressed by perfective converbs. Imperfective converbs are considerably less frequent. Mixeev (1971: 122) further states that when rephrasing a subordinate clause initiated by *tak čto* 'so that' with a converb, there is often a need to change an imperfective verb into a perfective verb, because perfective verbs "(…) more naturally convey the meaning of consequence-result (…)".[18]

---

[18] "При замене следственный союз или союзное слово и подлежащее, если оно имеется, опускаются, а глагол/сказуемое заменяется деепричастием, причем от глаголов несовершенного вида нередко

In English, the use of a verb with a Result participant in the progressive gives rise to the 'imperfective paradox', c.f. Dowty (1991 [1979]: 133). The use of the progressive *in John was drawing a circle* does not entail 'John drew a circle' whereas *John was pushing a cart* does entail 'John pushed a cart'. In Russian, the phenomenon of 'the imperfective paradox' cannot be attributed to every use of the imperfective aspect since the Russian imperfective aspect allows many other uses besides the 'actual' use (which mirrors the English progressive).[19]

Padučeva (2001: 7) notes that the 'actual' meaning (*značenie aktual'no protekajuščej dejatel'nosti* 'meaning of actual ongoing activity') cannot be used with certain verbs with semantic Result participants (*učastnik Rezul'tat*). For some verbs, the use of (finite) imperfective with Result participants forces a historical present, perfect, or habitual reading while blocking the 'actual' reading.

Padučeva states, however, that for verbs of creation of material objects (*glagoly sozdanija material'nogo ob''ekta*) a Result participant may be present in the form of an image of Result or a non-finished Result (2001: 18, 2004: 492). Padučeva further notes that for verbs of mental influence (*glagoly mental'nogo vozdejstvija*), an 'actual' reading is possible in the presence of an Instrumental form which does not express a Result which *completes* the activity of the Agent, c.f. (11a), but rather an instrumental action of which the Agent's activity *consists*, c.f. (11b):

(11) Russian (Padučeva, 2001: 11, English glosses and example 'c.' added).
      a. Сторож стуком колотушки доказал, что он не спит.
      'The watchman proved.pfv that he didn't sleep, with a knock of his mallet.
      b. Сторож стуком колотушки доказывал, что он не спит.
      The watchman, was proving.ipfv that he didn't sleep, with a knock of his mallet.
      c. сторож стучал колотушкой, доказывая что он не спит.
      'The watchman knocked with his mallet, proving that he didn't sleep.'

The 'actual' reading of the imperfective is possible in (11b). This instrumental activity that provides evidence is a clear instance of pseudo-simultaneity. The use of the imperfective emphasises the connection between the instrumental eventuality and the eventuality denoted by the imperfective verb instead of stating the result. The pseudo-simultaneous synthetic converb constructions in this study seem to function similarly. The analysis of (11b) can be carried over to (11c) which is invented following the pattern of the examples of synthetic converb constructions in the present investigations (i.e., a manner specified

---

приходится образовывать деепричастия совершенного вида, поскольку они естественнее передают значение следствия-результата (...)". (Mixeev 1974: 122).

[19] The Russian imperfective may permit iterative, habitual, and factual readings, among others. Many factors affect the aspectual interpretations. Case marking may affect the interpretations of Russian sentences. Genitive of negation or partitive genitive alter with accusative case and may affect the resultativity, as well as plurality. The absence of definiteness markers in Russian makes it difficult to draw exact parallels to English. The converb use of imperfective does, moreover, not necessarily function like the 'actual' use of finite imperfective verbs. The present study does not attempt to resolve the question of result attainment, which appears to be underspecified in the context of imperfective converbs in the present material. The contrastive material does not illuminate this issue since Swedish *för att* +infinitive constructions do not exclude nor entail results, but see (21) and (22) in which success and failure, respectively is described in adjacent context.

matrix clause followed by a manner neutral converb clause in the imperfective aspect). Padučeva denies that the 'actual' uses of the imperfective form of verbs of mental influence in the presence of a Result participant can denote "to act with a purpose" (*dejstvovat' s celju*). In such instances, the Result is de-emphasised, and emphasis is placed on the Instrumental link between two eventualities.

3.2 Structural distribution

Tagging the sentence examples collected for this paper, I identified two distinct structural classes, namely, synthetic and analytic expressions. Their distribution is shown in Table 3:

Structural type	Russian source texts		Russian target texts			Total
synthetic	84	69%	265	53%	349	56%
analytic	38	31%	232	47%	270	44%
Total	122	100%	497	100%	619	100%

Table 3. Distribution of imperfective converb construction types corresponding to Swedish purposive [*för att* '(in order) to' + infinitive] constructions in Russian source- and target texts

It is evident that Russian translators translate Swedish *för att* + infinitive constructions into Russian analytic converb constructions. In such instances, 'conative auxiliaries' (c.f. Hamburger (1980: 124)) show a distribution similar to purpose markers, e.g., Russian *čtoby* '(in order) to, Swedish *för att* '(in order) to' or English (in order) to. The lexical variation of the converbs in the analytic constructions is shown in Table 4, Section 3.3.
The word order showed the same pattern in both structural types: 94% matrix > converb and 6% converb > matrix.

Table 3 shows that synthetic constructions are somewhat more frequent than analytic constructions. This tendency is more marked for the Russian source texts.[20] This asymmetry can be explained by the fact that the translation of an analytic Russian converb construction, e.g., *želaja pokazat'* 'wishing to show' using a Swedish [*för att* 'in order) to'+ infinitive] construction involves a semantic reduction. Presumably, Swedish translators want to retain the meaning of 'trying', 'wishing', or 'intending' and, therefore, chose to use Swedish constructions that preserve these meanings (*eftersom hon ville* 'because she wanted'; *i önskan att* 'with the desire to'; and *i avsikt att* 'with intention to', etc.).

In this paper, the two different synthetic constructions identified by Rjabova (1992) (see Section 1.2.) are not differentiated in the tables because certain factors obscure the distinction between the two. The instrumental connection that is present in pseudo-simultaneity tends to de-emphasise the result, c.f. Padučeva (2001: 11). In many instances, pseudo-simultaneity and conative nuances co-occur. The verbs in (3) *ubivaja* 'killing', and (11) *dokazyvaja* 'proving', which serve to illustrate phenomena related to pseudo-simultaneity, are frequently mentioned as conative verbs (See Maslov 2004 [1948]: 84 and

---

[20] The results are statistically significant, Pearson's Chi-squared test with Yates' continuity correction = 8.9883, df = 1, p-value = 0.003. The effect size, Cramer's V, is however low: 0.125. The importance of the frequency differences should not be overemphasised.

Glovinskaja 1982: 89, respectively). As suggested by Plungian (2001), conation is a scalar notion that is highly context dependent.

3.3 Converbs in analytic constructions

The converbs used in the analytic constructions are displayed in Table 4.

Converb	Number of examples	%	Ipm for lemma in RNC
желая 'wishing'	98	36.2%	213.77
пытаясь 'attempting'	66	24.4%	165.42
стараясь 'trying'	39	14.4%	211.09
собираясь 'preparing/intending'	28	10.4%	167.94
намереваясь 'intending'	16	5.9%	13.9
стремясь 'striving'	8	3.0%	84.94
надеясь 'hoping/expecting'	4	1.5%	133.38
готовясь 'preparing'	4	1.5%	61.05
силясь 'trying [hard]'	2	0.7%	8.5
сбираясь 'preparing/intending' (arch.)	2	0.7%	3.83
помышляя 'pondering'	1	0.4%	8.36
боясь 'fearing'	1	0.4%	276.61
рассчитывая 'counting on [obtaining]'	1	0.4%	51.85
Total	270	100%	

Table 4. Russian lexemes occurring as converbs in analytic converb constructions corresponding to Swedish purposive [*för att* '(in order) to' + infinitive] constructions in the Swedish parallel partition of the RNC[21]

The analytic constructions clearly depend on the lexical meaning of the converbs. In this respect, Apresjan (1983: 334) and König (1995: 82) are correct in their analysis. However, the analytic constructions do not denote eventualities that are contemporaneous with the eventualities denoted by the matrix clauses in an additive way. The mental states of wishing, intending, etc., do not take place independently of the eventualities denoted by the matrix clauses. Instead, there is a strong implicature of purpose, allowing us to assign intent to both clauses and specifically to the design of the relation between them.

The converb *želaja* 'wishing' is the most frequent converb that appears in the material, appearing in more than a third of the examples. Verbs of trying are also frequent; *pytajas'* and *starajas'* together comprise almost 40% of the analytic constructions. Verbs of trying are often mentioned in the context of conation (Hamburger 1983: 124; Šatunovskij 2015)

---

[21] As a recommendation from an anonymous reviewer, frequency rates for the lemmas of the converbs has been added. This column shows frequency per million words in the *main partition* of the RNC, which is a balanced corpus. The first columns, by contrast show frequencies of converb forms in constructions correlating to to Swedish purposive för att + infinitive constructions in the *Swedish parallel partition* of the RNC. (The ipm figures are not available for the parallel partitions, and the Swedish partition is not balanced). As can be seen from a comparison of the frequencies in the columns, some frequency differencies of the converbs may be attributed to overall frequency, for example between the near synonyms *starat'sja* 'try'and *silit'sja* 'try hard, make an effort', but not all frequecy differencies are due to overall frequencies. The converb *bojas' 'fearing'* is a consequence of an occasional polarity transformation. This converb does function as an avertive marker, similar usages are attested in the RNC, but the present study does not include negative occurrences, due to the chosen query design.

but are not mentioned by Akimova and Kozinceva (1987) or Rjabova (1992) in relation to 'purpose'.

The verbs in Table 4 all mean something more than the Swedish *för att* '(in order) to', which is neutral in meaning and merely signals that the following infinitive has a purposive reading. Given that, we observe that the Russian translators have added nuances of volition, intentionality, or preparation to their translation of the Swedish sentences.

Of the infinitives in the analytic converb constructions, the majority (94%) showed perfective aspect.

There are distributional differences among the converbs in the analytic constructions. The converbs can mark different degrees of integration between the eventualities denoted by the matrix verb, the converb and the infinitive. For example, the verb *sobirajas'* 'preparing' can signify that the eventuality denoted by the matrix verb does not overlap with the eventuality denoted by the infinitive. Furthermore, we note that verbs of attempt may denote a degree of involvement in the progression towards the outcome, whereas verbs of wishing or intending do not necessarily specify a degree of involvement. There are also differences in observability between the eventualities denoted by the verbs in table 4. Some verbs, such as *želaja* 'wishing' or *namerevajas'* 'intending', clearly denote mental states, whereas others may also denote observable actions, or an observable progression towards the outcome. In usage, however, there is probably a large overlap between verbs denoting clearly mental states on the one side and observable actions on the other side. In relation to the findings reported in Table 5. note the English *tryna*-construction, which in certain varieties of English conflates the meanings of trying and wanting (c.f., Lane (2014)).

Grano (2011), following Sharvit (2003), notes the affinity between the English verb *try* and, on one side, 'propositional attitude verbs' or 'intensional attitude verbs' like *want* or *expect*, and, on the other side, between *try* and the (English) progressive aspect. Sharvit (2003: 407) states:

> It seems that for *NP try S* to be true in a world *w* there must be an ongoing event in *w* which potentially develops—in the relevant accessible worlds—into an *S*-event. No such requirement holds of *NP wants/expects/believes S*. To put it slightly differently, the semantics of *try* seems to have an extensional component (i.e. the requirement for a potential *S*-event to be going on in the actual world) in addition to its intensional component. Other attitude verbs lack the extensional component: they do not 'talk about' actual events.

Grano (2011) follows Sharvit (2003: 407) in noticing the additional activity that is understood together with the attitude. He proposes the term 'mental action' for *try*. As mentioned in Section 1.3, Verstraete (2008: 260) analyses 'purpose clauses' as containing 'mental states'. If the observations of Grano (2011) are synthesised with those of Verstraete (2008), we may conclude that Russian purposive converb constructions include 'mental states' or 'mental actions.'

In addition, the affinity with the progressive is also illuminated by the results of the present study, although the differences between the English progressive and the Russian

imperfective should be kept in mind (see Section 3.1), as well as the phenomenon of 'conation' (see Section 1.6). Grano (2011: 435) observes that the verb *try* largely overlaps with the progressive regarding the (potential) progression of the eventuality in question, but that *try*, unlike the progressive, may entail only a 'preparatory stage': "(…) *try* requires merely that the event be realized to any arbitrary degree above zero." (Grano, 2011: 438).

3.4 Evidential markers

Evidential markers are present in 20% of the material. Table 5 lists the Russian evidential markers included in this study. As shown, many of these markers (but not all) are comparative markers (c.f. Akimova and Kozinceva (1987: 266)).

Marker	Analytic	Synthetic	Total
словно 'as if, like, as'	33	41	74
как бы 'as if, as though'	4	16	20
будто 'as if, as though, apparently'	6	5	11
точно 'indeed'	5	4	9
словно бы 'as if, like if,'	-	3	3
не то, не то 'either, or else'	-	2	2
видимо 'evidently, apparently'	1	1	2
очевидно 'obviously, evidently'	2	-	2
как будто 'as if, as though, apparently'	1	-	1
может быть 'maybe, perhaps'	-	1	1
вероятно 'probably'	1	-	1
быть может 'maybe, perhaps'	1	-	1
как видно 'as evidently, apparently'	1	-	1
Total	55 (20%)	73 (21%)	128 (21%)

Table 5. Evidentiality markers occurring before analytic and synthetic Russian converb constructions correlating with Swedish purposive [*för att* '(in order) to' + infinitive] constructions

As can be seen from Table 5, certain examples, e.g., *očevidno* 'obviously, evidently' and *vidimo* 'evidently, apparently', explicitly emphasise the external appearance of the expressed situations and the Speaker's role of observer.

As suggested in Section 1.3, comparative markers can serve as evidentiality markers. A small number of instances with inanimate Subjects, (e.g., (xi.) in Table 1) have the characteristics of similes with purposive nuances. Evidentiality markers are occasionally added or omitted in target texts.

Evidentiality markers are shown in (2), (4), (5) in the introduction; in (14), (17), (18b), (23) in Sections 3.6–3.14 and in (iv′.), (vi.), (x.), (xi.), and (xii′) in Table 1.

3.5 The dynamics of the matrix-converb combinations and semantic categories of the contexts

When one examines the matrix verb phrases and converb constructions as separate groups, it becomes apparent that they show considerable differences. The matrix verb clauses codify concrete, observable movements to a high degree; in fact, approximately 56% express movement. Other notable groups of matrix clauses express perception and

speech. In contrast, the converb clauses most often denote expected outcomes expressed by manner-neutral abstract verbs.

The classification of semantic context types for the matrix and converb clauses is partly informed by existing verb meaning classifications, such as Levin (1993), Babenko (1999), which are very fine-grained, and the RNC's semantic tags, which are more coarse-grained (c.f. Rachilina et al., 2009).[22] However, in order to achieve a suitable granularity and to accommodate the classification to the relevant observations, my classification deviates considerably from such classifications.

The resulting classification of matrix semantic contexts is coarse-grained and semi-thematical and is aimed at providing a descriptive overview. An important factor to consider is that many of the relevant contextual features are generated at the clause level, not only in response to the verb's lexical meaning. The meaning of 'effort' can be generated by stacking many verbs together or using different phraseological constructions. The meaning of manner in the category labelled 'manner' is often expressed by manner adverbials instead of verbs. The different matrix clause types are presented in Table 6.

The converb clause types can be best accounted for as codifying various types of fairly abstract and/or manner-neutral (intended) outcomes. These include certain effects that are intended. The categorisation of the converb clauses is aimed at capturing features such as the type of intended outcome instead of specific thematic spheres (like *speech*, *perception*, or *possession*). To some degree, the outcome types are based on the participant types of the entities intended to be affected (self, other, objects), directions (towards/away), and, to a limited degree, force dynamics (c.f. Talmy, 1988). The classification achieves a manageable granularity but also preserves prominent categories.

The classification of converb clause types presented here should be seen as a first approximation. Certain sentence examples are difficult to classify since there are possible overlaps between the categories. Moreover, the examples occasionally differ in the source and target texts. An expression like *želaja uznat'/uznavaja* could correspond to *finding out* (the truth) or *verifying* (whether a preconceived alternative holds or not).

---

[22]The semantic annotation system of the RNC consists of tags of different types. It would be desirable to combine thematic tags and other tags in order to capture the relevant parameters. For example, *pokazyvat'* 'show' can be classified as 't:perc (perception) ca:caus (causative)' as in *cause to see*. Unfortunately, for many verbs, this approach seems to be an uncertain endeavour, at least without an established practice. Thus *izobražat'* 'depict, represent' could be tagged as 't:impact:create' (if a physical depiction is referred to) or perhaps 't:be:appear' (if the depiction is more abstract). The word *zaščitit'* 'defend, protect' is likewise difficult to characterize by tags other than 't:impact' and, perhaps, 't:be:exist' as in 'having impact on the continuing existence of something', but these choices do not seem very clear. As noted by Rachilina et al. (2009), the annotation system in the RNC corpus does not pretend to provide a comprehensive inventory of semantic primitives or meaning components that would cover every lexical meaning in a systematic manner. Levin (1993) was informative for establishing the 'object toward self' outcome category, c.f. *verbs of obtaining* (Levin, 1993: 141), and Babenko (1999) was used to create the 'person out of circumstances' category, c.f. *glagoly izbavlenija* (verbal group for deliverance) in Babenko et al. (1999: 233). In contrast to the other categories 'person out of circumstances' allows both other and self as objects. This is motivated by observation of 'the self divided' in 'force dynamics', c.f, Talmy (1988: 69). In other categories the difference between self and others is more decisive, the 'self control' category does mostly not contain the same verbs as the 'influence on other' category.

The categories do not distinguish between purposes (results) that are entailed by a corresponding perfective verb and distant (ultimate) purposes (c.f. Padučeva and Rozina (1993: 6) *dal'njaja cel'*)). The term *outcome* is chosen in response to Gisborne (2010: 106) to cover both 'result' and 'purpose'. This term also avoids confusion with aspectual notions, such as 'result' or the 'Result participant' mentioned by Padučeva (2001). See Section 3.1.

Selected categories are presented in more detail below, along with examples and a discussion of how the categories combine with each other and relate to the structural types (analytic and synthetic converb constructions).

In Table 6 and Table 7, the semantic classes of the matrix and purpose clauses are displayed, respectively.

Matrix categories	Analytic		Synthetic		Total	
'movement (body)' *покачала головой*[23]	59	22%	86	25%	145	23%
'movement (object)' *приподнимать*	29	11%	44	13%	73	12%
'movement (locomotion)' *отошла*	30	11%	42	12%	72	12%
'perception/cognition' *смотрели, подумали*	29	11%	36	10%	65	11%
'movement (contact, other)' *коснулась*	28	10%	30	9%	58	9%
'communication' *писал, сказал, закричал*	26	10%	29	8%	55	9%
'effort' *изо всех сил, надсаживался*	34	13%	15	4%	49	8%
'inhibited action' *задержала дыхание*	5	2%	23	7%	28	5%
'manipulation/interaction' *вооружаются*	12	4%	10	3%	22	4%
'manner' *торопливо, сутулясь, громко*	12	4%	7	2%	19	3%
'existence/position' *стояла, торчала*	3	1%	15	4%	18	3%
'gesture' *улыбнулась, кивнул*	3	1%	12	3%	15	2%
Total	270	100%	349	100%	619	100%

Table 6. Frequencies of lexical meaning of Russian matrix verb clauses used in Russian analytic and synthetic converb constructions corresponding to Swedish [*för att* + infinitive] constructions in Russian source and target texts.

---

[23] The examples in the table serve as an illustration, representing most frequent lexemes, but they are not exhaustive for each category. The English glosses are: *покачала головой* 'shook (her) head'; *отошла* 'moved off'; *приподнимать* 'lift'; *посмотрел* 'looked'; *подумали* 'thought'; *коснулась* 'touched'; *писал*, 'wrote'; *сказал* 'said'; *закричал* 'shouted'; *изо всех сил* 'with all one's might'; *надсаживался* 'strained himself'; *задержала дыхание* 'held her breath'; *вооружаются* 'are getting armed'; *торопливо* 'hastily'; *сутулясь* 'slouching'; *громко* 'loudly'; *стояла* 'was standing'; *торчала* 'was hanging'; *улыбнулась* 'smiled'; and *кивнул* 'nodded'. The instances that fall under the category 'gesture' are differentiated from 'movement' since gestures are expressed by dedicated lexemes.

Outcome categories	Analytic (infinitives)		Synthetic (converbs)		Total	
'influence on other' *уговаривая*[24]	43	16%	63	18%	106	17%
'object towards self', *пытаясь найти*	41	15%	55	16%	96	16%
'information status of other' *показывая*	27	10%	55	16%	82	13%
'information status of self' *проверяя*	37	14%	43	12%	80	13%
'person out of circumstances' *спасаясь*	18	7%	28	8%	46	7%
'object away from self' *отгоняя, пряча*	15	6%	28	8%	43	7%
'meta-communication' *перекрикивая гул*	14	5%	15	4%	29	5%
'self towards/from place' *собираясь уйти*	22	8%	6	2%	28	5%
'self-control' *сдерживая смех*	15	6%	12	3%	27	4%
'change in object' *наполняя их бокалы*	16	6%	11	3%	27	4%
'relation object/reality', *имитируя*	9	3%	13	4%	22	4%
'perceptual activity' *наблюдая*	5	2%	15	4%	20	3%
'time management' *предотвращая*	8	3%	5	1%	13	2%
Total	270	100%	349	100%	619	100%

Table 7. Frequencies of lexical meaning of Russian outcome clauses used in Russian analytic and synthetic converb constructions corresponding to Swedish [*för att* + infinitive] constructions in Russian source and target texts. The semantic classification pertains to infinitives of analytic constructions and converbs of synthetic constructions.

As can be seen in Table 6 and Table 7, most categories are distributed evenly across the two structural types (analytic and synthetic). Notable exceptions (where the differences are larger than 4%) are marked by shadings in the tables and include 'effort' and 'inhibited action' among the matrix clause categories and 'information status of other' and 'self towards/from place' among the outcome clause categories.

The category of 'self towards/from place' (5%) is not as frequent as would be expected considering that it represents a prototypical purpose meaning (c.f. the PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS metaphor by Lakoff and Johnsson (1980)). Most of the examples of 'destination' ('self towards/from place') have analytic structure and occur with matrix clauses encoding locomotion or body movement, e.g., (12), (But see also (viii′.) in Table 1).

(12)   a. Swedish (Bergman, 1987)
    Jag hör min gnälliga röst, jag låter som en skadad hund. Jag reser mig ur stolen *för att gå ut genom fönstret.*
    b. Russian (А. Афиногенова, 1989)
    Я слышу свой жалобный, как у побитой собаки, голос и встаю, *намереваясь выйти через окно.*
    'I hear my whiny voice; I sound like an injured dog. I get up from my chair [to go/intending to go] out the window.'

The matrix clause category 'effort' occurs more frequently with analytic converb constructions). This is particularly the case with the meanings associated with *trying* or *striving*.

---

[24] The Russian words are intended as examples to provide a quick impression of the content of the category. Note that many other lexemes may fall under each category. See Table 1 for further examples. The glosses of the Russian words in Table 7 are: *уговаривая* 'persuading'; *доставая* 'obtaining'; *проверяя* 'verifying, controlling'; *показывая* 'showing'; *спасаясь* 'escaping'; *отгоняя* 'chasing away'; *пряча* 'hiding'; *перекрикивая*, 'shouting over' *собираясь уйти* 'preparing to leave'; *наполняя их бокалы* 'filling their glasses'; *сдерживая смех* 'supressing laugh'; *имитируя* 'imitating'; *наблюдая* 'observing'; and *предотвращая* 'preventing'.

(13) a. Swedish (Westö, 2002)
      Han hade hållit möten med sin producent och sina förläggare, han hade tagit
      nätterna till hjälp *för att komma igång med en ny bok.*
      b. Russian (Мария Людковская, 2005)
      Он ходил на встречи с издателями и продюсером, не спал по ночам, *пытаясь*
      начать наконец новую книгу, (…).
      'He went to meetings with his publishers and producers, stayed up at night,
      [to finally start/trying to finally start] a new book, (...).

In (13), the two juxtaposed clauses create an impression of effort.

In contrast to 'effort', 'inhibited action' does not correlate with an explicit attempt (which is denoted by analytic constructions that includes *starajas'* 'trying' or *pytajas'* 'attempting'), but it is more frequently correlating with synthetic constructions, as in (14).

(14) a. Swedish (Lagerlöf, 1925)
      Hon satt tyst ett par ögonblick *liksom för att tänka efter vad hon skulle säga.*
      b. Russian (Ф. Золотаревская, 1989)
      Некоторое время она сидела молча, *словно обдумывая, что ей сказать.*
      'She sat silently for a while, as if [to consider/considering] what to say.'

The category of 'inhibited action' differs from the other categories in that it includes matrix verbs that may seem less dynamic. However, such matrix verbs often involve some kind of suppressed motion that calls for an explanation as to why the motion was suppressed, (c.f., Diessel (2013: 351)). Among the matrix categories in the present material particularly the categories of 'inhibited action', 'effort' and 'manner' are particularly prone to call for explanation.

The rest of the matrix clauses and purpose categories are evenly distributed across the two structural groups.

3.6 *Prominent matrix + outcome categories*

Several different combinations of matrix + outcome categories were observed in the corpus material. In addition to calculating their raw frequencies, I used Pearson residuals (standardised residuals) to analyse the corpus data to identify combinations that deviated from what was expected from their relative frequencies, not only in terms of their total frequencies. The combinations that demonstrated the highest Pearson residuals are listed in Table 8.

Matrix category > purpose category	Number of tokens	Pearson residual
'gesture' > 'information status of other'	12	7.7
'perception cognition' > 'information status of self'	28	7.7
'effort' > 'time management'	7	6.2
'communication' > 'influence on other'	24	5.5
'movement (contact other)' > 'influence on other'	24	5.2
'movement (body)' > 'object away from self'	24	5.2
'perception cognition' > 'object towards self'	21	4.0
'communication' > 'meta-communication'	9	3.6

Table 8. Combinations of semantic matrix and outcome categories with high Pearson residuals

There are some categories with higher raw frequencies which did not show similarly high Pearson residuals, e.g., 'movement (body)' > 'information status of other' was represented

by 24 tokens with a much lower Pearson residual of 1.2. This can be explained by the fact that both of these categories are relatively frequent. The 'movement (body)' category includes various body movements interpreted as gestures. In the classification, I have separated the matrix meanings from their outcomes. Consequently, only lexicalised gestures have been categorised as 'gestures', c.f. *nod* vs. *make a quick downward motion with one's head.*

3.7 'Gesture' > 'information status of other'

Many examples in the corpus data denote different types of communicative acts, an observation also made by Akimova and Kozinceva (1987: 271ff), who describe 'purpose' meanings in converbs for communicative acts in particular. The communicative acts in the data differ considerably, depending on whether the message is constructed as a means or as a purpose. If the message is the purpose (intended outcome), then the example is included in the 'information status of other category'.

The verb *pokazyvaja/pokazat'* 'showing/to show' appears very frequently in the material. These verbs (or constructions containing these verbs) express the information status of the interlocutor as a distant purpose. In the Russian National Corpus *pokazyvat'* 'to show' is tagged as 't:perc (perception) ca:caus (causative)' as in *cause to see*, thus amounting to an outcome which consists in the reception, so called 'uptake' in Speech Act Theory (c.f., Sbisà (2009)). Gisborne (2010: 106, 112) classifies the English verb *to show* as conveying an 'outcome' relation, more specifically a 'purpose' relation. In the corpus data, *pokazyvaja/pokazat'* 'showing/to show' is among the most frequent lexical items with 19 and 12 tokens, respectively. For verbs like *govorja/skazat'* 'saying/to say', *pokazyvaja/pokazat'* 'showing/to show', and *rasskazyvat'/rasskazat'* 'telling/to tell', the intended uptake (i.e., the purpose of obtaining a change in someone's information status) is an implicit, distant purpose, whereas locutions like *davaja ponjat'/dat' ponjat'* 'letting/to let [give] to understand' renders the intended uptake explicit.[25] These verbs are often construed without Indirect Objects that denote the person(s) whose information status is targeted, e.g., (15), but in some instances, e.g., (16), an Indirect Object is present:

(15)   a. Swedish (Holmqqvist, 2006)
   Jag nickade *för att visa att jag hade förstått*, (…)
   b. Russian (Е. Хохлова, 2010)
   Я кивнула, *показывая, что понимаю*, (…)
   'I nodded, [to show/showing] that I understood, (...)'

(16)   a. Russian (Гоголь, 1842)
   – Тут поцеловал он его в голову и обратился к Манилову и его супруге
   с небольшим смехом, с каким обыкновенно обращаются к родителям,
    давая им знать о невинности желаний их детей.
   b. Swedish (Skott, 2014)
   Så kysste han honom på huvudet och vände sig åter till Krusov och dennes
   hustru med ett sådant litet skratt som man vanligen använder inför föräldrar
   för att låta dem förstå hur oskyldiga deras barns önskningar är.
   'Then he kissed him on the head and turned to Manilov and his wife with a little

---

[25] Locutions like *davaja ponjat', davaja znat'* 'letting (somebody) know' are synthetic.

laugh, such as is usually addressed to parents, [letting/to let] them know the innocence of their children's desires.'

In the outcome category 'informations status of other', the messages are reported or described, that is to say, they are introduced by *čto* 'that', as in (15b) or *o* 'about', as in (16a). Such examples rarely include direct speech or quotations since the message is the outcome.

3.8 *Communication' > 'influence on other'*

In the category 'influence on other', where the message is the means, a large number of examples include direct speech. In this category, the direct speech functions as a means of obtaining other types of outcomes, typically illocutions or perlocutions.[26]

(17) a. Russian (А. Н. Стругацкий, Б. Н. Стругацкий, 1964)
— Выбора-то никакого нет, — сказал он, *словно оправдываясь*.
b. Swedish (Jonsson, 1998)
"Här är inget att välja på", sade han *liksom för att ursäkta sig*.
'"There's no choice," he said, [as if making excuses/to excuse himself].'

3.9 *Movement (contact other)' > 'influence on other'*

Another matrix category that correlates with the purpose of 'influence on other' category is 'movement', (specifically movements that include making contact with other people):

(18) a. Swedish (Tunström, 1978)
Han la sin hand på min *för att be om ursäkt*.
b. Russian (Т. В. Доброницкая, 2004)]
Он дотронулся до моей руки, *словно прося извинения*.
'He touched my arm [to apologise/as if apologising].'

The presence of the evidentiality marker, *slovno* 'like', in (18b) is interesting. It is not present in the Swedish source text but has been added to the Russian target text. If *slovno* were omitted, the converb would allow for a standard (additive) simultaneity interpretation (*He touched my hand while also apologising*). If this were the case, the communicative act would be interpreted as an independent, oral speech act.

3.10 *Communication' > 'meta-communication'*

The example in (19) demonstrates that communicative eventualities can also serve other purposes, for example, managing the course of the conversation, hence the category 'meta-communication':

(19) a. Russian (Славникова. 2017 (2006))
– Да, кто-то на этом хорошо заработает, – вздохнул страховщик с квадратными усиками, *заполняя нечаянную паузу*.

---

[26] To avoid further complexity and lengthy discussions, illocutions and perlocutions are not differentiated.

   b. Swedish (M. Grigoriev, M. Nydahl, 2013) «Ja, nån kommer att bli rik på det
   här», suckade försäkringstjänstemannen med den fyrkantiga mustaschen *för att*
   fylla ut den oavsiktliga pausen.
   '"Yes, someone will make good money on this," sighed the insurer with the
   square moustache, [filling/to fill] the inadvertent pause.'

As observed previously, the outcome category of 'information status of other' can correlate
with the matrix categories of 'gesture' or 'movement (body)'. In contrast, the outcome
category of 'information status of self' correlates with matrix clause categories of
'perception or cognition', as demonstrated in the following section

3.11 'Perception / cognition' > 'information status of self'

There are many examples that express acts of visual inspection or examination. The
converb *proverjaja* 'checking' are among the most frequent converbs in synthetic
constructions, with 19 tokens. See (20):

   (20)   a. Swedish (Östergren, 2005)
          Han såg på Jansen *för att se hur det tog*, om Jansen med en min kunde röja
          någon vetskap.
          b. Russian (Л. Стародубцева, М. Людковская,2010)
          Конни взглянул на Янсена, *проверяя, насколько подействовали его слова —*
          выражение лица могло дать подсказку.
          'He glanced at Jansen, [to see/checking] if his words had any effect—the look on
          his face might have given him a clue.'

3.12 Perception / cognition' > 'object towards self'

The matrix category of 'perception/cognition' also correlates with 'object towards self', as
demonstrated in the following example:

   (21)   a. Swedish (Axelsson, 2008)
          (…) slänger en blick över baren *för att lokalisera henne själv*, finner henne och
          låter sig nöja.
          b. Russian (Е. М. Чевкина, 2010)
          (…) озирается, *высматривая ее*, находит и успокаивается.
          '(…) glances across the bar [to locate/locating] her, finds her and settles down.'

In this category, different verbs lexicalise outcomes differently. A converb like *išča*
'searching', as in example (2), denotes a target-oriented process which is pseudo-
simultaneous with the eventuality denoted by the matrix verb. By means of the
eventuality denoted by the matrix clause, the Agent "deliberately provides conditions that
enables" (Andersson and Spenader, 2014: 4) this process. The process is clearly veridical
since it is entailed by the two clauses. However, nothing is asserted regarding the
attainment of the intended outcome (distant purpose). In some converbs, like *otyskivaja*
'trying to find/seeking out', the intension of attaining an outcome is morphologically
encoded in the form of a result-indicating prefix. Notwithstanding this, the attainment of
the result is not necessarily entailed. This verb has the translation 'try to find' in the
Oxford Russian Dictionary (Wheeler et al., 2020). Certain English verb + verb particle
combinations exhibit a meaning which is similar to certain Russian prefix + verb
combinations c.f. *find out*, *dig up*, etc. In (21b), the converb *vysmatrivaja* 'locating by eye,
spying out' denotes a successful target-oriented eventuality. The success of the eventuality

is stated by the juxtaposed finite verb form *naxodit* 'finds' without producing an awkward tautological nuance. This demonstrates that the converb has a purposive usage.

3.13 'Movement (body) > 'object away from self'

The majority of the matrix verbs included in this study denote some sort of movement, while most of the subcategories are distributed evenly over the outcome categories. As mentioned previously, the 'movement (contact other)' category shows a correlation with 'influence on other', see (18).

The 'movement (body)' category demonstrates a strong correlation with 'object away from self'

> (22) a. Swedish (Axelsson, 2008)
> Han skakade lätt på huvudet *för att driva undan dem*, men det hjälpte inte
> b. Russian (Е. М. Чевкина, 2010)
> Он чуть покачал головой, *отгоняя их*, но это не помогло.
> He shook his head slightly, [to chase/chasing] them away, but it didn't help.

In (22) the result is explicitly denied.

3.14 Movement (body) > 'self towards / from place'

There is also a correlation between the 'movement (body)' and the 'self towards/from place' category, (23).

> (23) a. Swedish (Enqvist, 1999)
> Då hade han bara bugat sig, och tagit ett steg tillbaka, *som för att gå*.
> b. Russian (А.В. Савицкая, 2004)
> Тогда он поклонился и отступил на шаг назад, *словно собираясь уйти*.
> 'Then he had bowed and taken a step back, as if [to/preparing to] leave.'

In (23), the *step back* is interpreted as a preparation for leaving. In this instance, there is no complete 'means:purpose' relation between the matrix clause and outcome clause. The Subject did not complete the act of leaving by taking a step back, but the step back is assumed to be evidence of preparation to do so.

3.15 'Effort' > 'time management'

There is a strong correlation between matrix clauses denoting 'effort' and outcome categories denoting 'time management'. The meaning of 'effort' is special in that it does not always specify manner. Still, abstract descriptions of strongly volitional eventualities fit the pattern of doing something with a purpose:

> (24) a. Swedish (Lindgren, 1945)
> Sommaren började lida mot sitt slut, och Kerstin och jag gjorde vad vi kunde
> *för att utnyttja varje ögonblick*.
> b. Russian (Л. Брауде, 1999
> Лето клонилось к концу, а Черстин и я делали все, что в наших силах,
> *желая использовать каждый миг*.
> 'The summer was coming to an end, and Kerstin and I did what we could
> [to make/wishing to make] the most of every moment.'

3.16 Exceptions to the larger patterns: less dynamic verbal situations and abstract matrix verbs

The purposive constructions reveal patterns of dynamicity and abstraction. As predicted by Schmidtke-Bode (2009: 108), purposive inferences (implicatures) arise when both the matrix verb and dependent verb have a dynamic aspectual construal. Some change must take place in order to bring about another change. The most important exception to this pattern, noted by Schmidtke-Bode, is suppressed motion, here referred to as the category of 'inhibited action'. In this context, suppressed motion involves some kind of dynamicity, even if it is denoted by expressions such as *standing still* or similar expressions.

The examples presented by Apresjan (1983) in refuting purposive usage of converbs go counter to this observation. Apresjan suggests that the lexical meaning of the converbs is the sole factor that determines the purposive interpretation of Russian converbs. Apresjan (1983) illustrates this phenomenon with the minimal pair in (25). (25a) includes the alleged target-oriented converb *ožidaja* 'waiting', which is replaced in (25b) with an allegedly non-target-oriented verb *vspominaja* 'remembering' causing the purposive nuance to disappear:

(25) Russian, Apresjan (1983: 334, 33viii, italics and translation added.)
 a. Она сидела на террасе, *ожидая возвращения сына*
 'She was sitting on the terrace, waiting for the return of her son.
 b. Она сидела на террасе, *вспоминая возвращение сына.*
 'She was sitting on the terrace, remembering the return of her son.'

Interestingly, neither of these converb usages correspond to Swedish purposive *för att* 'in order to' + infinitive constructions. However, if the stative matrix verb *satt* 'was sitting' were replaced by the more dynamic *satte sig* 'sat down', a purposive interpretation would be more feasible, as in *satte sig på terrassen för att minnas / vänta på sin son* 'sat down on the terrace to remember/wait for her son.[27] Given this, we expect the matrix verbs to be not only dynamic, but also indicate changes.

In this study, I have observed several examples of matrix contexts of location or existence that are paired with similarly less dynamic converb contexts of perceptual activity.

(26) a. Swedish (Tunström, 1996)
 Hela Skáldastígurs befolkning stod utanför sina hus,
 eller hängde i fönstren *för att betrakta Fretlas utbrott.*
 b. Russian (Н.Н. Федорова, 2001)
 Обитатели Скальдастигюр частью высыпали на улицу, частью торчали у окон, *наблюдая извержение Фредлы.*
 'All of the inhabitants of Skáldastígur stood outside their houses or hung in the windows, [to watch/watching] the eruption of Fretla.'

---

[27] Presumably, the observation that certain verbs that express 'distant purposes' can signal 'purpose' without the change-indicating dynamics residing in [*för att* '(in order) to' + infinitive] constructions points to an intermediate purposive category that has a clear additive nuance that permits paraphrases with coordination constructions with additive nuances (or "*while also*"). However, this phenomenon lies beyond of scope of the present investigation.

In (26), the purposive nuance may be achieved by the exceptionality of a volcanic eruption. The Russian matrix verbs are somewhat more dynamic or change-indicating than the Swedish matrix verbs, but the converb *nabljudaja* 'watching, observing' does not seem to indicate any change. Nevertheless, there are examples of less exceptional perceptual activities in the corpus data. Vendler (1957: 159) points out that certain perception verbs may have both activity and accomplishment senses.

Another anomaly identified in this study is that some matrix categories may denote less concrete, or manner specified eventualities. This is true of some occurrences of 'effort' (c.f., 24), and of the matrix category 'manipulation/interaction', which functions as a wastebasket category for a limited number of matrix clauses that were difficult to categorise:

> (27)   a. Swedish (Pleijel 1997)
>   Hon hade låtit sig utnyttjas. Det var *för att få kärlek*.
>   b. Russian (Т.М. Линденер, 2013)
>   Позволяла себя использовать, *пытаясь заслужить этим любовь*.
>   'She had allowed herself to be taken advantage of. (It was) to get love/trying to earn love.'

In (27), the Russian anaphoric demonstrative pronoun inflected in the instrumental case *ėtim* 'thereby' further emphasises the instrumentality. Not all matrix clauses denote concrete descriptions of movement. The matrix expression in (27) is abstract and manner-neutral and therefore deviates from the bulk of the matrix clauses in the investigation. This reveals that different kinds of eventualities can be used as a means of (or the steps in) obtaining certain outcomes. Likewise, some derived imperfectives denoting outcomes have manner indicating verbal roots, e.g. *ugovarivaja* 'talking somebody into something', *vysmatrivaja.* '(trying to) spying out something' Verbs like these are not wholly abstract or unspecified regarding manner. Such verbs can, however, always be further specified, direct quotations of the words of a speech act are more concrete than reference to the speech act itself, for example. The concreteness/abstractness of manner (means) and purpose specification is necessarily relative and scalar.

The broad pattern of this investigation establishes that increasing abstraction is one of the key features of the purposive interpretation of converbs.

4.   Conclusions

This study has shown that more than 600 Russian converb constructions that correspond to Swedish purposive *för att* '(in order) to' + infinitive construction can be attested in the RNC. The translation correspondences are not instances of calques. In contrast, they deviate from the expected pattern, which consists of infinitive phrases marked by *čtoby* 'in order to'. The majority of the correspondences are found in Russian target texts. This provides evidence of *implicature* of purpose in Russian converb constructions and not merely inference.

This study has identified several regularities and important features in Russian converb constructions corresponding to Swedish purposive *för att* 'in order to' + infinitive constructions.

Above all, there is a strong correlation between the translation correspondence and the Russian imperfective aspect. This correlation can be explained by the ability of Russian imperfective verbs to denote eventualities (actions) performed with specific purposes in mind, c.f., Russian *dejstvovat′ s celju* 'to act with a purpose' (Padučeva and Rozina, 1993: 6; Padučeva, 1994; Padučeva, 2004). The correlation can also be explained by *conation*, in which case the imperfective verb denotes a target-directed eventuality with a possibly incomplete outcome (i.e., merely an attempt). However, in most instances, the correlation should be explained by *pseudo-simultaneity*; the imperfective can signal that an outcome verb denotes an eventuality that consists of (rather than results from) an instrumental eventuality denoted by a matrix verb.

There are marked semantic differences between the matrix clauses and the converb clauses. Both clauses generally have a dynamic and change-indicating aspectual construal, but the matrix verbs generally denote more concrete and manner-specified eventualities (56% denote concrete movements) whereas the converb clauses generally denote more abstract and manner-neutral eventualities.

Two structural types among the Russian converb constructions regularly correspond to Swedish purposive *för att* '[in order] to'+ infinitive constructions. The analytic construction type consists of Russian converb constructions with converbs like *želaja* 'wishing', *namerevajas′* 'intending', and *sobirajas′* 'preparing' followed by infinitives. An important finding is that verbs of trying *starajas′* 'trying' and *pytajas′* 'trying' are used in almost 40% of these constructions. The converbs make explicit the mental states or actions that the Subject has or does while performing the eventualities denoted by the matrix verbs in order to accomplish the intended outcomes denoted by the infinitives. These mental states or actions are (pseudo-)simultaneous with the eventualities denoted by the matrix verbs.

(28)	*подергивают мышцами,*	*пытаясь*	*согнать с себя мух*
	'They twitch their muscles	trying	to chase away the flies'
	matrix eventuality	(mental state/action	(intended outcome))
	VPconcrete,+manner	VPcvb:ipfv:mental	VPinf:abstract,-manner

The matrix verb serves as a means or method of obtaining (or a step in enabling) the (intended) outcome. In (28) the mental state of wishing does not take place independently of the matrix verb but constitutes the motivation to perform it. Therefore, the mental state or action denoted by the converb + the infinitive is pseudo-simultaneous rather than simultaneous with the matrix clause and it is not possible to insert markers with an additive nuance such as while also (e.g., *v to vremja kak…takže*) without altering the meaning of the relation.

The converbs in the analytic constructions differ in the degree of integration between the matrix verb, converb and infinitive. Converbs like *želaja* 'wishing' and *namerevajas′* 'intending' are neutral as to whether the process of obtaining an outcome has begun or not since they are used in either situation. In contrast, the converb *sobirajas′* 'preparing' is mostly used in instances where there is no temporal overlap or (means-purpose complementarity) between the eventualities. Converbs like *starajas′* or *pytajas*' 'trying', on the other hand, signal that the progression towards the outcome has begun.

In the synthetic Russian converb construction type, the mental states or actions are implicit. An imperfective converb denoting a target-oriented process is pseudo-simultaneous with the matrix verb.

(29) *Он чуть покачал головой,*   *отгоняя их,*
   'He shook his head slightly,   to chase/chasing them away'
   matrix eventuality   intended outcome
   VPconcrete, +manner   VPcvb:ipfv:abstract,-manner

In (22) repeated here as (29), the Subject did not shake his head *while also* chasing away something. Instead, the chasing *consisted* of the shaking, and the movement was performed in order to chase them away.

The present study's exploration of the semantics of the matrix contexts and the converb constructions included in the corpus data has revealed an overall pattern of abstraction. The matrix verbs generally denote more concrete descriptions of movement, perception, or communication, whereas the lexemes in the converbs of the synthetic constructions generally denote more abstract and manner-neutral (intended) outcomes. In many instances, a concrete matrix verb and manner neutral converb complement each other like the two sides of a coin.

In future research, avertive, 'lest' meanings of converbs like *bojas'* 'fearing', *opasajas'* 'fearing', and *ne želaja* 'not wanting' should be investigated.

Related pseudo-simultaneous meaning relations expressed by Russian converbs, such as 'instrumentality' ('means/method') and the role of interpretation, also need further exploration by corpus linguistics, specifically contrastive studies.

References

Akimova T.G., and Kozynceva N.A. (1987). Aspektual'no-taksisnye situacii. Zavisimyj taksis (na materiale deepričastnyx konstrukcij). In V.A. Bondarko, (ed.). *Teorija funkcional'noj grammatiki Vvedenie Aspektual'nost' Vremennaja lokalizovannost' Taksis*. 256–74. Leningrad: Nauka.

Andersson, M., and Spenader, J. (2014). Result and Purpose relations with and without 'so'. *Lingua* 148. 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2014.05.001

Anscombe, G.E.M. (2000 [1957]). *Intention*. Second edition. Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, England: Harvard University Press.

Apresjan, Ju.D. (1980). *Tipy informacii dlja poverxnostno-semantičeskogo komponenta modeli smysl – tekst*. (*Wiener slawistischer Almanach, Sonderband I*). Vienna: University of Vienna. https://doi.org/10.3726/b12934 .

Apresjan, Ju.D. (1983). O strukture značenij jazykovyx edinic. In: T. Dobryńska and E. Janus, (eds.). *Tekst i zdanie*. 313–339. Wroclaw: Ossolineum.

Babenko, L.G. (ed.). (1999). *Tol'kovyj slovar' russkix glagolov: Ideografičeskoe opisanie. Anglijskie ėkvivalenti. Sinonimy. Antonimy*. Moscow: AST-PRESS.

Birzer, S. (2010). *Russkoe deepričastie: processy grammatikalizacii i leksikalizacii*. (Slavolinguistica 11). München Berlin: Verlag Otto Sagner.

Botting, D. (2010). Three theses on acts. *Philosophical Explorations*, 13(1), 65–79. https://doi.org/10.1080/13869790903324803

Cristofaro, S. (2005). *Subordination*. Oxford University Press.
https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199282005.001.0001

Croft, W. (2010). The origins of grammaticalization in the verbalization of experience.
Linguistics, 48, 1–48. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2010.001

Diessel, H. (2013). Adverbial subordination. In S. Lurighi and C. Parodi (eds.)
Bloomsbury companion to syntax. London, New York: Bloomsbury.
http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781472542090

Dowty, D.R. (1991) *Word meaning and Montague grammar: The semantics of verbs and
times in generative semantics and in Montague's PTQ*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-9473-7

Gisborne, N. (2010). *The event structure of perception verbs*. Oxford: Oxford University
Press https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199577798.001.0001

Glovinskaja, M.Ja. (1982). *Semantičeskie tipy vidovyx protivopostavlenij russkogo
glagola*. Moscow: Nauka.

Goldman, A.I. (1970). *A theory of human action*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-
Hall.

Grano, T. (2011). Mental action and event structure in the semantics of *try*. In Ashton,
N., A. Chereches and D. Lutz (eds.) *Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT)* 21:426-
443.https://journals.linguisticsociety.org/proceedings/index.php/SALT/article/view/260
7/2354

Hamburger, H. (1983). Conation and aspect in Russian. *Dutch contributions to the ninth
international congress of slavists. Linguistics*, 109–134.

Haug, D., Fabricius-Hansen, C., Behrens, B., and Helland, H.P. (2012). Open adjuncts:
Degrees of event integration. In C. Fabricius-Hansen and D. Haug (eds.). (2012). *Big
events, small clauses: The grammar of elaboration*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter. 131–
178. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110285864

Kearns K. (2003). Durative achievements and individual-level predicates on events.
Linguistics and Philosophy, 26(5), 595–635. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025803912153

Kortmann, B. (1991). *Free adjuncts and absolutes in English: Problems of control and
interpretation*. London, New York: Routledge.

Kuznecov, S.A. (ed.). (2000). *Bol'šoj tolkovyj slovar' russkogo jazyka*. Saint Petersburg:
Norint

König E. (1995). The meaning of converb constructions. In E. König, M. Haspelmath,
(eds.). *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective: Structure and meaning of adverbial
verb forms - adverbial participles, gerunds*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110884463

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago
Press.

Lane, A. (2014). "You Tryna Grammaticalize?": An analysis of 'tryna' as a
grammaticalized semi-auxiliary. *The Eagle Feather* Volume 11, issue 2014.
https://doi.org/10.12794/tef.2014.305

Lavrov, B.V. (1941). *Uslovnye i ustupitel'nye predloženija v drevnerusskom jazyke*.
Moscow: Izdatel'stvo akademii nauk SSSR.

Levin, B. (1993). *English verb classes and alternations*. London, Chicago: University of

Chicago Press.

Levin, B., and Rappaport Hovav, M. (2013). Lexicalized meaning and manner/result complementarity. In B. Arsenijević, B. Gehrke, and R. Marín (eds.). *Studies in the composition and decomposition of event predicates. Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy* Volume 93. 49–70. Dordrecht, Heidelberg, New York, London: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5983-1_3

Maslov, Ju.S. (2004) *Izbrannye trudy. Aspektologija. Obščee jazykoznanija*. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kulʹtury.

Mixeev, A.F. (1974). Deepričastnyj oborot kak osobaja forma vyraženija sledstvennyx otnošenij v sovremennom russkom literaturnom jazyke. In E.Ja. Bolgova (ed.) *Teoretičeskie i metodičeskie problemy grammatiki i stilistiki russkogo jazyka: Doklady i soobšenija mežvuzovskaja seminara kafedr russkogo jazyka vysšix učebnyx zavedenij Zapadnoj Sibiri*. Barnaul. 108–128.

Mustajoki, A, (2005). "Pobeditelʹnaja a tema", ili novyj vzgljad na konativnye predikaty v sisteme aspektualʹnyx značenij. In V. N. Toporov (ed.) *Jazyk, ličnostʹ tekst, Sbornik statej k 70-letiju T. M. Nikolaevoj*. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskix kultur, Studia Philologia. 224–236.

Padučeva, E.V (1992) Glagoly dejstvija: tolkovanie i sočetaemostʹ. *Logičeskij analiz jazyka. Modeli dejstvija*. Institut jazykoznanija RAN. Moscow: Nauka.

Padučeva, E.V. (1994) Tipy kauzalʹnyx otnosenij v semantičeskoj strukture leksemy. *Russian Linguistics*, 18(1), 1–16.

Padučeva, E.V. (2001). Aspektualʹnaja specifika glagolov s aktantom Rezultʹat: paradoks imperfektiva. *Glossos* 1, 1–19. https://slaviccenters.duke.edu/sites/slaviccenters.duke.edu/files/media_items_files/paducheva.original.pdf

Padučeva, E.V. (2004). *Dinamičeskie modeli v semantike leksiki*. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kulʹtury.

Padučeva, E.V. (2008). Imperfektiv otricanija v russkom jazyke. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 3. 1–20.

Padučeva, E.V., and Rozina, R.I. (1993). Semantičeskij klass glagolov polnogo oxvata: tolkovanie i leksiko-sintaksičeskie svojstva. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*. No 6, 5–16.

Plungian, V.A. (2001). Antirezulʹtativ: do i posle rezulʹtata, In V. A. Plungian (ed.). *Issledovanija po teorii grammatiki, 1 ed. Glagolʹnye kategorii*. Moscow: Russkie slovary. 50–88.

Poljanskij, S.M. (1987). Odnovremennostʹ, raznovremennostʹ i drugie tipy taksisnyx otnošenij. In V.A. Bondarko, (ed.). *Teorija funkcionalʹnoj grammatiki Vvedenie Aspektualʹnostʹ Vremennaja lokalizovannostʹ Taksis*, pp. 243–250. Leningrad: Nauka.

Pusch, L. (1980). *Kontrastive Untersuchungen zum italienischen, gerundio': Instrumental- und Modalsätze und das Problem der Individuierung von Ereignissen*. (Linguistische Arbeiten 69). Berlin, New York: Niemeyer. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111355245

Rachilina, E.V., Kustova, G.I., Ljaševskaja, O.N., Reznikova, T.I., and Šemanajeva, O.Ju. (2009). Zadači i principy semantičeskoj razmetki leksiki. In V.A. Plungian (ed.)

NKRJa Nacional'nyj korpus russkogo jazyka: 2006–2008. Novye rezul'taty i perspektivy. 215–239. Saint Petersburg: Nestor Istorija.

Rappaport G.C. (1984). *Grammatical function and syntactic structure: The adverbial participle of Russian*. Columbus: Slavica Publishers.

Rjabova, A.I. (1992). Russkoe deepričastie v funkcional′nom aspekte. In M.V. Vsevolodova (ed.) *Strukturnye i semantičeskie tipy osložnenija russkogo predloženija*. 6–78. Moscow: Izdatel′stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta.

Růžička, R. (1980). *Studien zum Verhältnis von Syntax und Semantik im modernen Russischen*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783112533925

Ryle, G. (2009). *The concept of mind*. Oxford, New York. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203875858

Šatunovskij, I.B. (2015). Glagoly popytki v russkom jazyke: Pytat′sja, starat′sja i probovat′. *Russian Language, Literature and Culture Studies*, No 4 2015, Serial No 50, 1–4.

Savčuk, S.O., Arxangelskij, T.A., Bonč-Osmolovskaja, A.A., Dolina, O.V., Kuznecova, Ju.N., Ljaševskaja, O.N., Orexov, B.V., Podrjadčikova, M.V. (2024). Nacional′nyj korpus russkogo jazyka 2.0: Novye vozmožnosti i perspektivy razvitija. *Voprosy jazykoznaija*, 2024, 2, 7–34.

Sbisà, Marina. (2009). Uptake and Conventionality in Illocution. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2009, 33–52. https://doi.org/10.2478/v10016-009-0003-0

Schmidtke-Bode, K. 2009. *A typology of purpose clauses*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.88

Sharvit, Y. (2003) Trying to be progressive: the extensionality of *try*. *Journal of Semantics* 20(4), November 2003, 403–445, https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/20.4.403

Sonnenhauser, B. (2017). Aspects of conativity in Russian: Towards a linguistics of attempt and success. In O. Mueller-Reichau, and M. Guhl (eds.), *Aspects of Slavic linguistics: formal grammar, lexicon and communication*. 310–332. Berlin: de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110517873

Sæbø K. (2008). The structure of criterion predicates. In J. Dölling, M. Schäfer, and T. Heyde-Zybatow, (eds.). *Event structures in linguistic form and interpretation*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2008. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110925449

Sæbø, K. (2016). "How" questions and the manner–method distinction. *Synthese*, 193(10), 3169–3194. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-015-0924-9

Sæbø, K. (2018). 'By': A vindication of the Anscombe thesis. Unpublished manuscript. Available: https://kjelljs.github.io/pdf/by.pdf

Talmy, L. (1988). Force dynamics in language and cognition. *Cognitive Science*, 12(1), 49–100. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1201_2

Thompson, S. (1985). Grammar and written discourse. Initial vs. final purpose clauses in English. *Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 5(1–2), 55–84. https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1985.5.1-2.55

Townsend, C.E. (1989). Conative verbs in Russian. *Russian Language Journal*, 43(145/146), 13–20.

Van der Auwera, J., Plungian, V.A. (1998) Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology*, vol. 2, no. 1, 1998, 79-124. https://doi.org/10.1515/lity.1998.2.1.79

Vendler, Z. (1957). Verbs and times. *The Philosophical Review*, 66(2), 143–160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2182371

Verstraete, J.-C. (2008). The status of purpose, reason, and intended endpoint in the typology of complex sentences: Implications for layered models of clause structure. *Linguistics*, 46(4), 757–788. https://doi.org/10.1515/LING.2008.025

Vincent, N. (2013). Conative. *Linguistic Typology*, 17(2), 269–289. https://doi.org/10.1515/lingty-2013-0012

Weiss, D. (1995). Russian converbs: A typological outline. In M. Haspelmath and E. König (eds.), *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective: Structure and meaning of adverbial verb forms, Adverbial participles, Gerunds*, 239–282. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110884463.

Wheeler, M., Unbegaun, B., Falla, P.S., and Thompson, D. (2020). *Oxford Russian Dictionary* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Zaliznjak A.A., and Mikaėljan, I.L. (2016). K voprosu ob aspektualʹnom statuse konativnyx par v russkom jazyke: počemu iskatʹ ne možet označatʹ 'najti'? In *Komp'juternaja lingvistika i intellektual'nye texnologii: Po materialam meždunarodnoj konferencii "Dialog' 2016"*. Moscow. 776–785.

Zaliznjak, A.A., and Šmelëv, A.D. (2012). *Lekcii po russkoj aspektologii*. München, Berlin,Washington D.C: Verlag Otto Sagner.

Simone Mellquist
Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden
simone.mellquist@umu.se