

UDC 81'36[811.113.6+811.161.1]=111

**Simone Mellquist**



**RUSSIAN CORRESPONDENCES  
TO SWEDISH BIPARTITE COMITATIVES**

*The present parallel corpus investigation shows that the Russian correspondences to Swedish bipartite comitatives — med- ‘with’-constructions with the structure [med + NP + PP] — can largely be predicted from the presence and positions of NPs referring to inalienable body parts in the constructions. When a Swedish bipartite med-construction contains an inalienable in the first (subject) part of the bipartite med-construction: [med + NP<sub>inalienable</sub> + P + NP], perfective converb constructions constitute the most frequent Russian correspondence. When there is an alienable NP in the first part and an inalienable NP in the PP part: [med + NP<sub>alienable</sub> + P + NP<sub>inalienable</sub>], by contrast, the Swedish bipartite med-constructions frequently correspond to Russian comitative (s+instrumental) constructions. The study shows two more important correspondence types: bare instrumental constructions expressing manner and finite constructions expressing condition or temporal condition. These four Russian correspondence types (converb constructions, s+instrumental constructions, bare instrumental constructions and finite constructions) represent four different ontological types, as they mark relations between the matrix and eventualities (states/temporary properties) entities, manners, and states of affairs, respectively.*

**Key words:** comitative constructions, absolute constructions, converbs, instrumental case, inalienability, Russian/Swedish.

**1. Introduction and theoretical background.** Swedish has a type of construction with the preposition *med* ‘with’ that does not have an unequivocal equivalent in Russian. Non-adnominal usages of *med* + NP + PP correlate with various Russian constructions, e.g., bipartite comitative (s+instrumental) constructions, as in (1); perfective converb (*deepričastie*) constructions, as in (2); bare instrumental case forms, as in (3); or finite clauses, as in (4). The present study seeks to investigate the factors underlying this variation using the Swedish-Russian Russian-Swedish parallel corpus within the Russian National Corpus, RNC.

- (1) a. Swedish (Wattin)  
 [...] min farfar brukade sova middag *med kalsonger på huvudet*.<sup>1</sup>  
 with shorts on head:DEF
- b. Russian  
 [...] мой дедушка Эрвин обычно спал после обеда *с трусами на голове*.  
 with shorts:INS on head:LOC  
 ‘[...] my grandfather used to take his lunchtime nap with (underwear) shorts on his head.’
- (2) a. Swedish (Hermanson)  
 Han vankade omkring *med händerna på ryggen* [...].  
 with hands:DEF on back:DEF
- b. Russian  
 [...] он разгуливал взад и вперед, *заложив руки за спину* [...].  
 back.put(PFV):CVB hands[ACC] behind back:ACC  
 ‘He wandered back and forth with his hands on his back [...].’
- (3) a. Swedish (Lagerlöf)  
 [...] och det var andra, som måste lägga sig ner *med ansiktet mot bänken*, [...].  
 with face:DEF against bench:DEF
- b. Russian  
 [...] а некоторым — лечь *лицом на скамейки* [sic!][...].  
 face:INSTR on benches[ACC]  
 ‘[...] and some of them had to lie down, facing the bench [...].’
- (4) a. Swedish (Enqvist)  
 Kvinnan Haubinger satt vid min ankomst i sängen *med sin man vid fotändan* [...].  
 with POSS man at foot.end:DEF
- b. Russian  
 Я застал пациентку в постели; *в изножье кровати сидел ее муж* [...].  
 in foot.end:LOC bed:GEN sat(IPFV) her husband  
 ‘At my arrival the Haubinger woman was sitting in her bed with her husband at the foot end [...].’

The Swedish construction has been called a «clause equivalent» «multipartite med-phrase» (satsekivalent flerledad med-fras, Teleman *et al.*, 1999) or «small clause» (Lundin 2003) or «absolute med-phrase» (Swedish: *absolut med-fras*, Swe Ccn, Swedish Constructicon, cf. Borin *et al.*, 2012).<sup>2</sup>

An important characteristic of Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions is a word order contrast that distinguishes temporary properties — *med armarna utsträckta* ‘with her arms spread’ or *med händerna på ryggen* ‘with his arms on his back’ — from permanent properties: *med sina långa armar* ‘with his long arms’, (cf.: <sup>?</sup>*med*

<sup>1</sup> The examples are presented as follows: a. examples are source text examples; b. examples are target text examples irrespectively of whether Russian or Swedish is the source language. The Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions are glossed in all examples. In the Russian examples, the relevant constructions are glossed. The important grammatical features (aspect, case, converb) are glossed while other features (tense, gender, participles etc.) are translated. The English idiomatic translations primarily reflect the Swedish examples. English translations, glosses and italics are mine. Unless otherwise indicated, the examples come from the parallel corpus used for the investigation. The glosses follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules.

<sup>2</sup> The construction consists of the comitative preposition *med* ‘with’ followed by a bipartite structure; the first part is an NP, and the second part can be a predicative adjective or participle (with gender and number agreement with the NP in the first part) or an adverbial such as a PP, as shown in (1) – (4). The present investigation is limited to [*med* + NP + PP] instances.

*armarna långa* ‘with his arms long’). When a participle/adjective is placed after the noun instead of before it, it is predicated to the noun instead of attributed to it.<sup>3</sup> The construction becomes bipartite rather than unipartite (cf. Jespersen (1951, p. 123ff «nexus»).

When the second part of the bipartite structure is a PP, the bipartite structure brings about a risk of syntactic ambiguity, as the PP can be interpreted as either a second part of a bipartite structure or a modifier specifying the location of all the participants in the clause. In the English example in (5), the ambiguity is symbolized by bracket notation; (5b) represents an interpretation of the italicized part of the example as a unipartite *with*-construction followed by a regular PP, whereas (5c) represents an interpretation of the example as a bipartite *with*-construction:

- (5) English (Prozorov, 1998: Ch. 10, cites an example from G.B. Shaw, first quoted in Jespersen, 1940, p. 41, italics and parentheses added)
- a. Do you expect me to sleep *with you in the room*?
  - b. (Do you expect me to sleep *with you*) *in the room*)?)
  - c. (Do you expect me to sleep (*with you in the room*))?)
  - d. Russian, suggested translation (Prozorov, 1998: ch. 10):  
 Неужели вы думаете что я могу спать, *когда вы находитесь в комнате*?  
 ‘Do you really expect me to sleep, *when you are in the room*?’

Russian students are specifically warned of this ambiguity in a textbook on translation (Prozorov 1998: Ch. 10). This suggests that bipartite structures are not conventionalized for all types of comitative constructions in Russian.

In Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions, the bipartite structure following *med* makes the constructions equivalent to clauses, (cf. Jespersen, 1951: 123ff «nexus»; Lundin, 2003 «small clause»). This occurs despite the lack of finite verbs or, in the case of [*med* + NP + PP], despite the lack of verb forms altogether. In studies of English, bipartite *with*-constructions are often referred to as «absolute» constructions, specifically «augmented absolutes» (cf. Stump, 1985, p. 8ff; Kortmann, 1991, p. 194ff).<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Studies of, e.g., English absolutes speak about a (secondary) *subject* and a *predicate* (part) of the bipartite constructions (cf. Kortmann, 1995, p. 9; Fabricius-Hansen and Haug, 2012, p. 2). Here, the terms *first* and *second part* will be used instead. The Swedish Academy Grammar, Teleman *et al.* (1999, p. 697) wrote «A- and B-parts», (A-led och B-led).

<sup>4</sup> A note on choice of terminology: «Augmented absolutes» are constructions in which the absolute is introduced by a special marker, e.g., *with* in English, e.g., *With the children asleep, Mary watched TV* (Stump 1985, p. 1). «Nominative» or «bare» absolutes in English or, e.g., «accusative absolutes» in German, lack a comitative preposition: *He was leaning forward from the pillows, his eyes alert, hands lifted from beneath the covers* (Stump, 1985, p. 95), *Kusna kommt blass und empört zurück, einem Brief in der Hand* ‘Kusna returns, pale and upset, with a letter in his hand.’ (Fabricius-Hansen and Haug, 2012, p. 1). The term «augmented absolute» is a contradiction in terms as the term «absolute» originally indicated that there was no linking word between the matrix clause and the absolute clause. Along with *with* and *without* also *and* and *what with* figure as «augmentors» of absolutes in English, cf. Kortmann (1991, p. 199ff), cf. also König and van der Auwera (1990, p. 343). Van de Pol and Hoffman (2016, p. 324) distinguished English with-augmented absolutes from «[...] mere prepositional phrases introduced by *with*», using the criteria of possibility of omitting *with* and convertability of the augmented absolute into a bare absolute. The non-absolute that exemplifies this selection in their paper is an adnominal (attributive) *with*-construction. Swedish only has very limited use of unaugmented (bare) absolutes (Teleman *et al.*, 1999, p. 697). The present investigation uses the term Swedish «bipartite *med*-constructions» rather than «absolutes», as the latter term is difficult to delineate, and furthermore, not used very much in Swedish. Weiss (1995, p. 263) even wrote about a «ban on absolute constructions» in Russian. Following König and van der Auwera (1990), he defined the term «absolute» as «converbs with overt subjects their own». As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, the term «absolute» does not normally cover «augmented absolutes» in the Russian grammatical tradition. This fact provides yet another

Bipartite *med*-constructions are mentioned in contrastive studies investigating Scandinavian correspondences to Russian converbs (cf. Bjørn, 1979, p. 173 for Danish; Krave, 2011, p. 88, 66 for Norwegian; Zorixina-Nil'sson, 2001, p. 145 for Swedish), but to the best of my knowledge, no previous studies have investigated Russian correspondences to Scandinavian bipartite *med*-constructions. On the other hand, a few contrastive studies have investigated the Russian correspondences to English absolute constructions (e.g., Prozorov, 1998; Recker, 2007[1974]; Isakova, 2003; Orekhova *et al.*, 2019). These do not, however, focus on *with*-augmented absolutes but investigate a broad range of English absolutes. The studies, moreover, largely focus on stylistics and translation and not exclusively on grammatical aspects of the constructions.

At the same time, studies investigating comitative constructions seldom take bipartite structures into account, neither broad typological studies (cf. Lehmann and Shin, 2005; Stolz *et al.*, 2006; Arxipov, 2009) nor studies of Russian prepositional phrases (e.g., Kalyuga, 2020, p. 243ff).<sup>5</sup>

In a broad study of «co-eventive adjuncts» in European languages, Fabricius-Hansen and Haug (2012, p. 21ff) used the term «closed adjuncts» as a cover term for all instances of absolutes, with or without comitative prepositions. The closed adjuncts are in turn distinguished from «open adjuncts», a term that encompasses converbs and secondary predicate participles, adjectives or nouns (depictives).<sup>6</sup>

Fabricius-Hansen *et al.* (2012, p. 55) stated that «A further characteristic is that closed adjuncts must, to varying degrees, obey a “pertinence constraint”; some constituent in the adjunct must be bound by some constituent in the host clause». This can be observed in the examples above, where three of the NPs in the adjuncts are bound by the matrix subject in terms of part-whole relationships, and one NP is preceded by a possessive pronoun that points to the matrix subject. In (1a), the matrix subject *farfar* ‘grandfather’ is sleeping with shorts on his *head* (*huvudet*); in (2), the matrix subject *han* ‘he’ is coreferential (via the part/whole relationship) with *händerna* ‘hands’ and *ryggen* ‘back’; *ansiktet* ‘the face’ in (3) is co-referential with *andra* ‘others’ (likewise via the part/whole relationship); the husband in (4) is preceded by the possessive pronoun *sin* ‘her’, which is co-referential with the matrix subject.

Swedish, unlike English, uses definite form rather than possessive pronouns in bipartite comitatives containing inalienable body parts. The definite form may indicate that the entity denoted by the noun has been mentioned earlier in context and is hence not a reliable pertinence marker. Therefore, the parameter of (in)alienability, reference to the body, is itself important when examining the pertinence characteristic of Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions.<sup>7</sup> It should be noted that Fabricius Hansen *et al.* (2012) found NPs adhering to the pertinence

---

reason for avoiding the term «absolute». An additional limitation of the present study is that the partly parallel phenomenon of *utan*- ‘without’ constructions is beyond the scope of the present investigation.

<sup>5</sup> Stolz *et al.* (2006, p. 17) stated that «The use of certain grammatical means does not always respect the boundaries between small and full clause». Small clauses, however, are, not thematized in their study, apart from a passage suggesting that all comitatives may be analysed as small clauses (see Section 4, below).

<sup>6</sup> Slightly simplifying, «closed adjuncts» have overt (secondary) subjects, whereas «open adjuncts» have covert (secondary) subjects. Depictives may share the covert argument with either the subject or the object. Cf. Fabricius-Hansen *et al.* (2012, p. 21ff) for a comprehensive account.

The notion of «depictives» was used by Schultze-Berndt and Himmelmann (2004, p. 60), who stated that it was the most widely used term for the type of secondary predicate formerly referred to as «predicative attribute», «copredicate» or «co-predicative».

<sup>7</sup> Inalienables are defined here as the body parts of the matrix subject, see Chappell and McGregor (eds.) (1996) for an overview of works on inalienability.

constraint in either of the two parts of the bipartite constructions. Previous studies of Russian correspondences to English absolutes (e.g., Recker 2007[1974], p. 113) and studies of English absolutes (e.g., Kortmann, 1991, p. 91ff) have mainly focused on characteristics of the first part, not of the second part.

The aim of the present paper is to investigate the factors underlying the variation in Russian correspondences to Swedish *med*-constructions with a view to better understanding the similarities and differences between Russian and Swedish. Specific attention is devoted to Russian bipartite comitative constructions. By investigating the factors underlying the varying correspondences, the study also uses the contrastive information provided by the Russian correspondences to gain insights into the Swedish bipartite *med*-construction and proposes a typology of different kinds of Swedish *med*-constructions. Moreover, the findings can be used as pieces of the larger typological puzzle of absolutes, converbs, comitatives and instrumentals.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 describes the material and methodology of the investigation. Section 3 presents the results. The central quantitative results are displayed in tables and tested for significance. The more detailed results will be displayed in separate tables and discussed in sections that are divided according to the (in)alienability properties of the nouns in both of the two parts of the Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions. The sections presenting the results are followed by a comparison of the largest correspondence categories and a brief discussion of similar instances in research on English *with*-constructions, Section 4. In the concluding section, Section 5, the main Russian correspondence types and the prototypical classes of Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions that are discerned based on these patterns are summarized.

**2. Methods.** The present study is usage based and draws on corpus data. A subpart of the Swedish parallel corpus in the Russian National Corpus (RNC) is used to investigate a large number of Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions in Swedish source texts as well as Swedish target texts and their Russian correspondences in Russian source and target texts. The investigation is unidirectional in the sense that the corpus query always starts from Swedish, independent of translation direction. The research questions are:

– What role does (in)alienability play in the correspondence patterns between Swedish non-adnominal bipartite *med*-constructions with the structure [*med* + NP + PP] and Russian converb constructions, bare instrumental constructions, comitative constructions or finite constructions?

– What other factors further determine the correlation between non-adnominal bipartite Swedish *med*-constructions with the structure [*med* + NP + PP] and Russian converb constructions, bare instrumental constructions, comitative constructions or finite constructions?

The subpart of the bidirectional Swedish-Russian parallel corpus of RNC that was used was located on a separate platform before the material was incorporated into RNC. This subpart was developed during the initial phase of preparing the Russian-Swedish Swedish-Russian part of the RNC, cf. Sitchinava and Perkova (2019). The material was retrieved 8 November 2019.<sup>8</sup> Before the incorporation, it contained 559 documents with 7,145,184 words. There were markedly more Swedish original texts than Russian original texts in the subpart, which was used in its entirety.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> I am very grateful for having early access to the corpus.

<sup>9</sup> The material that matches the query consists of 222 Swedish texts and 64 Russian texts, of which 64 Swedish texts and 22 Russian texts contain bipartite *med*-constructions with [*med* + NP + PP] structure.

In the present corpus investigation, Swedish non-adnominal bipartite *med*-constructions with prepositional phrases as second parts [*med* + NP + PP] and their correspondences in Russian constitute the study object. This structure is chosen to enable investigation of all of the correspondence types using the same dataset. Adnominal *med*-constructions (such as *en jacka med en örn på ryggen* ‘a jacket with an eagle on the back’) are excluded from the investigation, as these are less likely to correlate with adverbial constructions in Russian. Likewise, bipartite *med*-constructions with participles, e.g., *med armen höjd* ‘with his arm raised’, would bias the investigation too much towards converbs as correspondences and are therefore excluded. Importantly, all the Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions in the investigation are constructed in relation to verbs, verb phrases or clauses<sup>10</sup>.

The query used was [*med* + noun + preposition + noun] with one or zero possible words between *med* and the first noun. This query yielded a large number of irrelevant matches, which needed to be sorted out manually. Among them were nouns as complements of verbs *prata med* + NP ‘talk to’, or *börja med* + NP ‘start with’ etc.; adnominal *med*-constructions *en jacka med en örn på ryggen* ‘a jacket with an eagle on the back; fixed expressions like *med hjälp av* + NP ‘with the help of’ *med hänsyn till* + NP ‘with regard to’; *med* as verb particles: *följa med* + NP ‘follow along’; unipartite *med*-constructions with PP adverbials: ((*stod [tillsammans] med Anna*) på trappan) ‘((was standing [together] with Anna (on the stairs))’; and instrumental uses of *med* in Swedish ((*pekade med pipskaftet*) på dörrn) ‘pointed to the door using his pipe shank’.<sup>11</sup>

The nouns in the first and second parts of the Swedish *med*-constructions were labelled for (in)alienability. The (in)alienability variable was given three values: «inalienables», the matrix subject’s own body parts; «alienables», alienable entities of physical character that can be removed from the body, this included all sorts of artefacts or other objects, but also *tårar* ‘tears’ and *flätan* ‘the braid’; and «non-applicable» (n.a.), which includes cases that are difficult to define as either inalienable or alienable. These «n.a.» instances include non-permanent bodily or emotional phenomena such as *skräck* ‘fear’, *leende* ‘smile’ and *blick* ‘gaze’, many of which are deverbal and often correlate with verbal forms in the Russian texts. Abstract entities such as *kurs* ‘course’ (direction) or *kors* (in *i kors* ‘crossed’) also belong to the n.a. category.

The impact of (in)alienability of the first part is tested quantitatively, using the  $\chi^2$ -squared test of independence. The combinations of (in)alienability features of both parts of the bipartite *med*-constructions could not be tested because too many of the resulting categories were too small. The combinations are, however, examined and discussed in the paper.

---

Of these, 20 Swedish original texts are from non-fiction sources such as newspapers, and the rest are fiction texts. The larger number of Swedish original texts that match the query was largely due to the collection of short Swedish newspaper articles from the Russian inosmi.ru website, which translates foreign news into Russian. The samples include 455 examples from Swedish source texts and 173 examples from Russian source texts. Because the construction is quite infrequent and the corpus is developing, it was not possible to compose a balanced subcorpus or use a randomized sample, as this would result in a sample too small to base any generalizations on. The Swedish Russian part of the Russian National Corpus is in a stage of development and will probably provide a useful base for future investigations.

<sup>10</sup> Some of these may be implicit, e.g., the saying eventualities in (Chekhov) plays which are implied by the format of presenting lines.

<sup>11</sup> In the same manner as English or German, Swedish uses the same preposition, i.e., *med* ‘with’ for instrumentality and accompaniment, while Russian uses bare instrumental for instrumentality (cf. Lakoff, 1968; Stolz *et al.*, 2006). Another difference between Russian and Swedish use of comitative prepositions is that Russian sometimes uses *s* + instrumental in a coordinative way, e.g., *мы с мамой* ‘I and mom [literally: we with mom]’, cf. Stassen (2000).

**3. Results and analysis.** This section presents the results from the quantitative investigation. Table 1 and 2 show the frequencies of Russian correspondence categories in relation to the (in)alienability distributions of the first NP in the Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions matching the query in Swedish target and source texts, respectively. The Swedish target text sample (n=173) is smaller than Swedish source text sample (n=455).

The most important results are that *s*+instrumental and perfective converb constructions are most frequent. As evident in the first two rows of Table 1 and 2, these two categories, moreover, correlate with Swedish *med*-constructions with almost reversed patterns for the (in)alienability of the first part: *s*+instrumental constructions correlate with *med*-constructions with alienables in the first part, whereas perfective converb constructions correlate with *med*-constructions with inalienables in the first part:

Table 1. The (in)alienability distribution of the first part NPs of bipartite *med*-constructions in Swedish target texts, and their correspondences in Russian source texts

Correspondence categories	alienable	inalienable	n.a.	Total	%
<i>s</i> +instrumental constructions	36	2	8	46	27%
perfective converb constructions	2	37	1	40	23%
prepositional phrases (other than <i>s</i> )	21	2	4	27	16%
imperfective converb constructions	3	12	8	23	13%
other verbal constructions	5	7	3	15	9%
bare instrumental constructions		9	2	11	6%
adjectives participles adverbs		6	1	7	4%
omissions or rephrasings	4			4	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 2. The (in)alienability distribution of the first part NPs of bipartite *med*-constructions in Swedish source text, and their correspondences in Russian target texts

Correspondence categories	alienable	inalienable	n.a.	Total	%
<i>s</i> +instrumental constructions	123	5	15	143	31%
perfective converb constructions	20	92	14	126	28%
other verbal constructions	41	16	12	69	15%
imperfective converb constructions	24	23	2	49	11%
bare instrumental constructions	1	16	6	23	5%
prepositional phrases (other than <i>s</i> )	16	3	2	21	5%
omissions or rephrasings	4	5	4	13	3%
adjectives adverbs participles		6	5	11	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>100%</b>

Importantly, the correspondence categories that show a smaller degree of independence from the (in)alienability variable are *s*+instrumental constructions, perfective converb constructions, bare instrumental constructions and prepositional phrases.

The figures relating to the Russian source texts (Table 1) largely parallel the figures from the target texts (Table 2). Particularly the (in)alienability distribution between Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions correlating with perfective converb constructions and *s*+instrumental constructions is consistent between the two translation directions. This is shown in the first two rows of Table 1 and 2.

A notable difference between the translation directions, apart from sample size, concerns the proportion of prepositional phrases (other than *s*+instrumental).

This is largely an effect of standardized phrases in original (and translations of) stage directions in Chekhov plays and could presumably be considered noise. Therefore, the category will not be discussed in the paper, although it did not show independence from the (in)alienability parameter.<sup>12</sup> Other differences between the translation directions will be briefly touched upon in the relevant sections. The following are examples of instances in which the translation direction seems to influence the results: the proportion of alienables in the first parts of Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions correlating with perfective converb constructions (Section 3.2.1); the proportion of unipartite *s*+instrumental constructions correlating with Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions with alienables in the first part and inalienables in the second part (Section 3.2.1); the proportion of Russian other verbal (mostly finite) constructions correlating with Swedish *med*-constructions with alienables in both parts (Section 3.2.2).

The results were further validated using a  $\chi$ -squared test of independence, which showed highly significant results. The Russian source texts:  $\chi^2(10) = 104.7$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; The Russian target texts:  $\chi^2(12) = 217.42$ ,  $p < 0.001$ .<sup>13</sup>

In the following sections, 3.1 – 3.2.3, the analysis and discussion are divided into subsections based on the (in)alienability of the first parts of the Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions. These sections are further subdivided according to the (in)alienability of the second parts.<sup>14</sup> For reasons of space, the constructions with first parts for which the (in)alienability is non-applicable (n.a.) are left out of the discussion. Not all Russian correspondence categories are discussed, again for reasons of space. The focus is on the Russian correspondence categories mentioned in the introduction, i.e., perfective converb constructions, bare instrumental constructions, other verbal constructions (which mostly includes finite verbs but also some implicit verbs, null copulas and infinitives) and *s*+instrumental constructions. These are the correspondence categories that show least independence from the (in)alienability parameter when the first part of the Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions is concerned. Although the category «other verbal constructions» does show independence from the (in)alienability parameter when the (in)alienability of the first part is concerned, finite constructions stand out as the most frequent Russian correspondence type when both parts of the Swedish *med*-constructions contain alienables (see Section 3.2.2). In Section 4, the largest correspondence categories are compared to each other and discussed in relation to research on English *with*-constructions.

<sup>12</sup>There are no fewer than 15 occurrences of *сквозь слезы* ‘through tears’ and one with *в слезах* ‘in tears’ in the Russian source texts, all from Chekhov plays. These are mostly translated as *med tårar i ögonen* ‘with tears in her eyes’, but also *med gråten i halsen* ‘with a lump in her throat (literally: with the crying in the throat)’.

<sup>13</sup> Some of the smallest categories needed to be merged in order to carry out the test (there must not be any cells with an expected frequency below zero and no more than 20% of the cells should have an expected frequency below 5). This was carried out for the three smallest categories in Table 1, and the two smallest categories in Table 2. To avoid the error messages in the software, *r*, due to expected frequencies below 5 (in less than 20%) the Pearson's Chi-squared test was, furthermore, performed with a simulated p-value (based on 2000 replicates); the result was a p-value of 0.0004998 for both samples. The effect size was measured using Cramer's V, which was 0.55 for the Swedish target texts and 0.488 for the Swedish source texts. The effect sizes are strong considering the degrees of freedom, 10 and 12, respectively. Future corpora with more text may better enable significance tests to be carried out without such adjustment. It is possible that another way to treat the n.a. category should also be considered. To satisfy the assumption that the observations should be independent from each other, only one bipartite *med*-construction per text excerpt was tallied, as the *med*-constructions often appear in coordination with other *med*-constructions.

<sup>14</sup> Such (in)alienability-combinations need larger samples if they are to be tested for significance, as many of the frequencies were low, specifically for the n.a. category.

**3.1. Russian correspondences to Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions with inalienables in the first part.** The strong correlation between the occurrence of inalienables in the first (subject) part of the Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions and Russian (primarily perfective) converb constructions, as shown in Table 1 and 2, is in line with what has been shown in studies investigating Russian correspondences to English absolute constructions. Recker (2007 [1974], p. 113) found that English absolute constructions that have inalienables as subjects (i.e., first parts) regularly correspond to Russian converb constructions. Orekhova *et al.* (2019, p. 120) likewise found that English «logically one-subject absolute constructions» can be translated by means of Russian converbs.

The correlation has also been shown within the Russian language. Vaseva-Kadynkova (1961, p. 22) observed that inalienables as objects of converbs may alter the meaning of perfective converb constructions from relative tense (anteriority) to resultant state meaning, making the converb constructions equivalent to comitative constructions:

- (6) Russian (Vaseva-Kadynkova 1961, p. 22, English translation, italics and glosses added).
- a.            он        вышел,        опустив        *шторы.*  
                  he        exited        lower (PFV):CVB        curtains[ACC]  
                  (т.е. опустил шторы и пошел [sic!])  
                  ‘That is, pulled down the curtains and went.’
- b.            Он        вышел,        опустив        *руки.*  
                  he        exited:PFV        lower(PFV):CVB        arms/hands[ACC]  
                  (т. е. вышел с опущенными вниз руками.)  
                  ‘That is, went out with his arms down.’

For (6), it seems like the inalienability feature of *ruki* is the sole distinguishing trait that determines the interpretation of (6b) as a resultant state instead of an anterior action, which is a necessary interpretation of (6a).

**3.1.1 Inalienables + inalienables with her hands on her back**

Table 3. Russian correspondences to Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions with the structure [*med* + inalienable + P + inalienable]

Russian source texts			Russian target texts		
perfective converb constructions	17	61%	perfective converb constructions	45	74%
other verbal constructions	4	14%	imperfective converb constructions	8	13%
imperpective converb constructions	3	11%	other verbal constructions	2	3%
prepositional phrases (other than s)	2	7%	omissions or rephrasings	2	3%
bare instrumental constructions	2	7%	s+instrumental constructions	1	2%
			prepositional phrases (other than s)	1	2%
			bare instrumental constructions	1	2%
			adjectives adverbs participles	1	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>100%</b>

The figures in Table 3 show that the Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions with inalienables in both parts category largely correlate with perfective converb constructions.

- (7) a. Russian (Lermontov)  
 Он лежал в первой комнате на постели,  
*подложив            одну            руку            под            затылок [...].*  
 under.put(PFV):CVB    one:ACC        hand:ACC    under        neck:ACC

b. Swedish

Han låg i det främre rummet utsträckt på sin säng,

*med ena handen under nacken* [...].

with the one hand:DEF under neck:DEF

‘He was lying in the front room, outstretched on his bed, with one hand under his neck [...].’

The Russian perfective converb constructions corresponding to the Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions with the structure [*med* + inalienable + inalienable] mostly contain transitive converbs with nominal objects in accusative case (7), or less frequently, reflexive converb forms (8).

(8) a. Swedish (Axelsson)

[...] hon lutar sig över koppen *med handen över pannan* och bävar.

with hand:DEF over forehead:DEF

b. Russian

[...] она склоняется над чашкой, *упершись лбом в ладонь*, и дрожит.

lean (PFV):CVB:REFL forehead:INS on palm\_of\_hand:ACC

‘[...] She bends forward over her cup with her hand on her forehead, shaking.’

In some instances, the Swedish second part corresponds to the Russian accusative object, while the first part corresponds to a bare instrumental with an ordinary instrumental meaning:

(9) a. Russian (Gogol)

«Многие умирали с тех пор», — сказал приказчик и при этом икнул,

*заслонив рот слегка рукою*, наподобие щитка.

cover(PFV):CVB mouth[ACC] lightly hand:INS

b. Swedish

Det är många som har dött sen dess, sa förvaltaren och hickade härvid lätt,

*med handen för munnen*.

with hand:DEF for mouth:DEF

‘Many have died since then, said the salesman and while saying this he hiccupped with his hand before his mouth.’

In the material, there were almost no instances of Russian *s*+instrumental constructions corresponding to *med* + inalienable +inalienable. One occurrence of a bipartite *s*+instrumental construction with inalienables in both parts is found in a Russian target text:

(10) a. Swedish (Vallgren)

Ingen sover så elegant som Henriette, tänker han, som en tempeldansös,

*med en hand över pannan och munnen formad till en kyss*.

with one hand over forehead:DEF and mouth:DEF formed to a kiss.

b. Russian

Никто не спит так красиво, как Генриетта, думает он, она спит,

как танцовщица из храма, как жрица Астарты,

*с рукой на лбу* и сложенными для поцелуя губами.

with hand:INS on forehead:LOC

‘No one sleeps like Henriette he thinks, like a temple dancer, with her hand on her forehead and her mouth formed into a kiss.’

Because one example is attested, at least in Russian target texts, Russian bipartite *s*+instrumental constructions with inalienables in both parts cannot be considered impossible in Russian.

### 3.1.2 Inalienables + alienables with her back to the cupboard

Table 4. Russian correspondences to Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions with the structure [*med* + inalienable + P + alienable]

Russian source texts			Russian target texts		
perfective converb constructions	10	37%	perfective converb constructions	28	38%
bare instrumental constructions	7	26%	bare instrumental constructions	14	19%
imperfective converb constructions	7	26%	imperfective converb constructions	13	18%
other verbal constructions	2	7%	other verbal constructions	11	15%
<i>s</i> +instrumental constructions	1	4%	<i>s</i> +instrumental constructions	3	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	prepositional phrases (other than <i>s</i> )	2	3%
			omissions or rephrasings	2	3%
			adjectives adverbs participles	1	1%
			<b>Total</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>100%</b>

Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions denoting body parts that are directed at or placed on non-body parts correspond to several construction types in Russian. Here, the focus will be on perfective converb constructions and bare instrumental constructions. Some *s*+instrumental constructions will be discussed at the end of the section.

The perfective converb constructions are very similar to the constructions denoting inalienables directed at or placed on inalienables (cf. Section 3.1.1):

(11) a. Russian (Tolstoy)

Он стоял, положив руки на спинку сиденья, [...].  
 put(PFV):CVB hands[ACC] on back:DIM:ACC seat:GEN

b. Swedish

Han stod nu upp med händerna mot ryggstödet [...].  
 with hands:DEF against back\_support:DEF

‘He was now standing, with his hands on the back rest of the chair [...].’

Russian perfective converb constructions compete in an interesting way with bare instrumental constructions. The structure [*med* + NP<sub>inalienable</sub> + P + NP<sub>alienable</sub>] is the Swedish configuration that most frequently corresponds to Russian bare instrumental constructions in the investigated material:

(12) a. Russian (Lermontov)

[...] станет на самом углу, спиною к пропасти; [...].  
 back:INS towards abyss:DAT

b. Swedish

[...] skulle ställa sig där ute i hörnet, med ryggen mot avgrunden [...].  
 with back:DEF towards abyss:DEF

‘[...] should place himself in the corner, with his back toward the abyss [...].’

In the bare instrumental constructions, there is a close connection between the matrix verb and the body part positioning.<sup>15</sup> The bare instrumental construction expresses a manner relation; in (12a) the positioning of the back is an integral part of the standing (or rather, placing oneself). The inalienable *спиною* ‘back:INS’

<sup>15</sup> The «matrix verb» is most often a finite verb, but converbs or bare instrumental constructions may also relate to non-finite forms such as infinitives, participles or other converbs.

represents the whole matrix subject. This is not case in (11a), by contrast, where the hand does not represent the whole body. The leaning of the hand is not presented as a manner or way of standing, but rather an accompanying circumstance.<sup>16</sup>

Most of the NPs in the bare instrumental construction in the material denote inalienables that have a fixed (or stable) position relative the rest of the body, so that the position of the inalienable tells us something about the position of the whole matrix subject: *спиной* ‘back:INS’ *лицом* ‘face:INS’ *боком* ‘side:INS’ *брюхом* ‘stomach:INS’.<sup>17</sup> The verbs that precede the bare instrumentals are intransitive verbs that denote change of position, but also position verbs like *сидеть* ‘sit’, *стоять* ‘stand’ or motion verbs like *идти* ‘walk’.<sup>18</sup>

In certain instances, the perfective converb and the bare instrumental constructions occur together. The converb forms in such examples are derived from reflexive verbs denoting positioning, like *прислонившись* ‘leaning [having leaned herself]’ or *повернувшись* ‘turning [having turned]’, cf. (7b):

(13) a. Russian (Shishkin)

Лежит молча, *отвернувшись* *лицом* к *стене*, [...].  
away.turn(PFV):CVB:REFL face:INS towards wall:DAT

b. Swedish

Han ligger där knäpptyst, *med ansiktet* *mot* *väggen*, [...].  
with face:DEF towards wall:DEF

‘He is lying silently, facing the wall [...].’

Such instances (4 occurrences in the Russian source texts, 6 occurrences in the Russian target texts) are tallied as perfective converb constructions in the figures in Table (1) – (4), although both the reflexive converb form and the bare instrumental contribute to the correspondence to Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions. It should be noted that this usage of bare instrumental NPs differs from the instrumental use in, e.g., (9a).<sup>19</sup>

The investigation shows a very low frequency of Russian *s*+instrumental constructions with inalienables in the first part. Some of these are (syntactically) unipartite, whereas other are bipartite.<sup>20</sup> The following example shows that participles within comitatives may occur postposed (*окрашенными* ‘coloured’, *обожжёнными* ‘burnt’) as well as preposed (*повязанными* ‘tied’) in Russian:<sup>21</sup>

<sup>16</sup> It is not always possible to delineate the meanings of manner and accompanying circumstances, as the positioning of body parts may influence the manner of performing the eventuality denoted by the matrix verb to varying degrees, cf. Fabricius-Hansen (2007).

<sup>17</sup> Moreover, inalienables that can change their position relative the rest of the body function as representatives of the whole body when used in ways similar to the constructions mentioned in this section, cf. the locutions *вверх ногами* ‘upside down’ *вперёд ногами* ‘feet first’.

<sup>18</sup> Janda and Clancy (2002, p. 27) commented on a similar example [...] *Коля лежит безмолвный, носом в потолок* ‘Kolja is lying speechless, (with) his nose to the ceiling’: «[...] the nose indicates a direction for action in such a vivid way that no verb (hold, point, move?) is needed». In examples like (13a), by contrast, such a verb (a result of a turning move) is present in converb form.

<sup>19</sup> The division of labour between *s*+instrumental and bare instrumental forms deserves further research; (8), (9) and (12) represent differing usages of bare instrumental forms.

<sup>20</sup> Moreover, also Swedish has constructions with (preposed) participial attributes that are equivalent to bipartite *med*-constructions in that they convey temporary properties that are restricted by the duration of the finite verbs, e.g., *står med böjt huvud* ‘is standing with bowed head’ (cf. Fabricius-Hansen Haug and Sæbø, 2012, p. 74ff; Hasselgård, 2012, p. 248ff, on Norwegian). In such Swedish constructions, the participles/adjectives and nouns have bare indefinite form. The lack of determiners may signal that the properties are temporary.

<sup>21</sup> Michailov (2012, p. 178) mentioned this type of Russian comitative constructions (e.g., unipartite constructions with attributive participles that denote non-permanent properties), also noting their affinity with converb constructions. Arxipov (2009, p. 209) compared such Russian comitatives to French

(14) a. Russian (Gorky)

[...] он, дядья и работники приходили в кухню из мастерской, усталые, с руками, окрашенными сандалом, обожжёнными купоросом, с повязанными тесёмкой волосами, [...].  
 with hands:INS coloured:INS sandal:INS burnt:INS vitriol:INS  
 with tied:INS ribbon:INS hairs:INS

b. Swedish

[...] han, morbröderna och gesällerna kom in från verkstaden för att få sitt te — trötta, med händerna röda av sandel och brända av vitriol och med bindlar om håret, [...].  
 with hands:DEF red of sandal and burnt of vitriol  
 with ribbons around hair:DEF

‘He, the uncles and the novices arrived from the workshop to get their tea — tired, with their hands red from sandal and burnt by vitriol, and with ribbons in their hair [...].’

The material also contains examples with Russian bipartite *med*-constructions with PP second parts:

(15) a. Swedish (Boye)

[...] och där låg han nu med benet i sträck [...].  
 with leg:DEF in traction

b. Russian

[...] и вот теперь он лежал там со сломанной ногой на вытяжке [...].  
 with broken:INS leg:INS on traction:LOC

‘[...] and there he was lying with his leg in traction [...].’

The examples in the material thus show that even though there is a strong dispreference for Russian comitative constructions as correspondences to Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions with inalienables in the first part (as shown in Table 1 and 2), such examples are attested and by no means ruled out.

### 3.1.3 Inalienables + non-applicable with her arms crossed

Table 5. Russian correspondences to Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions with the structure [*med* + inalienable + P + n.a.]

Russian source texts			Russian target texts		
perfective converb constructions	10	50%	perfective converb constructions	19	61%
adjectives participles adverbs	6	30%	adjectives adverbs participles	4	13%
imperfective converb constructions	2	10%	other verbal constructions imperfective converb constructions	3	10%
s+instrumental constructions	1	5%	imperfective converb constructions	2	6%
other verbal constructions	1	5%	bare instrumental constructions	1	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100%</b>	s+instrumental constructions	1	3%
			omissions or rephrasings	1	3%
			<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>

absolute constructions. To the best of my knowledge, the word order variant (rather than contrast) with postnominal participles like *с руками, окрашенными сандалом* ‘with their hands burnt by sandal’ has not been discussed in the literature. Such examples are beyond the scope of the present study, which focuses on comitatives with prepositional phrases.

The query of the investigation [*med* + noun + preposition + noun] does not elicit bipartite *med*-constructions with second parts that refer to things other than locations. Some Swedish idiomatic expressions with PP form are, however, less location like, particularly when nouns that could not be defined as inalienables or alienables are examined. Many of the examples represented in Table 5 are highly idiomatic: *med armarna i kors* ‘arms crossed’ (literally ‘med arms:DEF in cross’), *med huvudet på sned* ‘head aslant’, *med ögonen på skaft* ‘attentive’ (Literally ‘with eyes:DEF on shafts’), *med pannan i veck* ‘frowned forehead’ (literally: ‘with the forehead in folds’), etc. The largest correspondence category of these examples is perfective converb constructions:

(16) a. Russian (Shishkin)

Папа лежал в гробу, сложив руки, как паинька.  
fold(PFV):CVB arms[ACC]

b. Swedish

Pappa låg i kistan med armarna i kors som en duktig pojke.  
with arms:DEF in cross

‘Dad was lying in the coffin with his arms crossed, like a good boy.’

(16a) violates the demand that the implicit controller of the converb form be co-referential with the matrix subject. (The deceased grandfather had probably not crossed his arms himself.) This may be analysed as a comic effect. Results from involuntary actions are better expressed with preposed passive participles in Russian:

(17) a. Swedish (Edelfeldt)

Jag kan ännu minnas hur hon satt där, insmord med sot och  
med håret på ända, [...].  
with hair:DEF on end

b. Russian

До сих пор помню, как она сидит там вся в саже,  
с растрепанными волосами [...].  
with dishevelled:INS hairs:INS

‘I can still remember how she was sitting there, smeared with soot and with her hair standing on end [...].’

**3.2. Russian correspondences to Swedish *med*-constructions with alienables in the first part.** The largest dividing line in the investigation is between inalienables or alienables in the first part. As shown in Section 3.1 – 3.1.3, inalienables in the first part are characteristic of the Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions that correlate with Russian perfective converb constructions or bare instrumental constructions. By contrast, *med*-constructions with alienables in the first parts largely correlate with Russian *s*+instrumental constructions.

In previous studies of Russian correspondences to English absolutes (e.g., Recker, 2007 [1974], p. 113) and studies of English absolutes (e.g., Kortmann, 1991, p. 91ff), the (in)alienability of the first part has been an important parameter, whereas the (in)alienability of the second part has not attracted much attention. Fabricius-Hansen *et al.* (2012, p. 21), however, state that the pertinence restriction of closed adjuncts can also be satisfied by, e.g., inalienables or anaphors in the second part.

The results of the present investigation show that the position of the in(alienable) in Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions is of considerable importance for the distribution of Russian correspondences in both translation directions.

3.2.1. Alienable + inalienable *with a glass in her hand*Table 6. Russian correspondences to Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions with the structure [*med* + alienable + P + inalienable]

Russian source texts			Russian target texts		
<i>s</i> +instrumental constructions	31	49%	<i>s</i> +instrumental constructions	109	56%
prepositional phrases (other than <i>s</i> )	19	30%	other verbal constructions	26	13%
other verbal constructions	5	8%	imperfective converb constructions	21	11%
imperfective converb constructions	3	5%	perfective converb constructions	20	10%
omissions or rephrasings	3	5%	prepositional phrases (other than <i>s</i> )	13	7%
perfective converb constructions	2	3%	omissions or rephrasings	4	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>100%</b>	bare instrumental constructions	1	1%
			<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>

As shown in Table 1 and 2, the bulk of the Russian comitative constructions has alienables in the first part, e.g., *с фонарем в руке* ‘with a/the lantern in his hand’. Table 6 further shows that these largely correspond to Swedish *med*-constructions with the structure [*med* + alienable + inalienable], such that the constructions refer to entities that are held, carried or worn on the bodies of the matrix subjects: *со стаканом в руке* ‘with a glass in his hand’; *с гармоникой под мышкой* ‘with an accordion under his arm’; *с колечком на пальце* ‘with the ring on her finger’. Inalienables in the second part preclude the risk of syntactic ambiguity, i.e., interpreting the second part as a normal adverbial location of both the matrix subject and the first part, cf. (5), as the matrix subject in, e.g., (18b) is unlikely to be (co-)located in her own hand.

Most of these *s*+instrumental constructions are bipartite and have PP second parts, mirroring the Swedish constructions. In the Russian source texts, however, the proportion of unipartite *s*+instrumental constructions is higher than in the Russian target texts.<sup>22</sup> The second parts of the *med*-constructions of [*med/s* + N<sub>alienable</sub> + P + N<sub>inalienable</sub>] could often be omitted. In example (18b), the second part *i handen* ‘in (her) hand’ is added to the Swedish translation. In constructions of this type, the PP part of the constructions is generally inferable from world knowledge, i.e., if someone enters with a candle, the candle can be assumed to be located in that person’s hand.

## (18) a. Russian (Chekhov)

Входит Марина *со свечой.*  
with a candle:INS

## b. Swedish

Marina kommer in *med ett ljus i handen.*  
with a candle in hand:DEF

‘Marina enters with a candle in her hand.’

While the second part is often omissible in Russian *s*+instrumental constructions, an omission of the second part of, e.g., (18b) in Swedish may entail an interpretation of delivering the candle. The second part may also serve to

<sup>22</sup> Of the examples in Table 6, 12 out of 109 of the Russian target text *s*+instrumental constructions are unipartite, of these 2 have attributes corresponding to the second part; among the Russian source text *s*+instrumental constructions, 9 out of 31 are unipartite, and one of these examples has an attribute that corresponds to the second part.

distinguish comitative *med* ‘with’ from instrumental *med* in Swedish, cf. Eriksson (2010, p. 58).<sup>23</sup>

*Med*-constructions with the structure [*med* + NP<sub>alienable</sub> + P + NP<sub>inalienable</sub>] typically have second part PPs that are omissible in the sense that the remaining comitative construction is well formed. In certain instances, however, the location denoted by the PP is not inferable:

(19) a. Russian (Chekhov)

Маша в черном платье, со шляпкой на коленях сидит и читает книжку, [...].  
with hat:DIM:INS on knees:LOC

книжку, [...].

b. Swedish

MASJA, i svart klänning, sitter med hatten i knät och läser en bok; [...].  
with hat:DEF in knee:DEF

‘Masha, in a black dress, is sitting with her hat on her lap, reading, [...].’

In this instance, the location is not in accordance with world knowledge (the unmarked position of the hat is on the head). Such examples do not seem to be anomalous instances of Russian comitative constructions. An interesting difference from (1) is that, while the first part NP in (19b) has definite form, the first part NP in (1a) has (bare) indefinite form. This results in the effect that the hat in (19b) is interpreted as the hat Masha wears the same day, whereas the shorts in (1a) are not the pair that the grandfather wears the same day — as a definite form may imply. The bare indefinite form also indicates a generic reading of *kalsonger* ‘shorts’.

A detour into the exceptions to the general pattern is motivated also for the Swedish *med*-constructions with alienables in the first part. There are very few instances of alienables in the first parts of Swedish *med*-constructions that correspond to perfective converb constructions in Russian source texts. There is one sole occurrence of an alienable entity as an (accusative) object of a perfective converb constructions in the Russian source texts.<sup>24</sup>

(20) a. Russian (Shishkin)

[...] устроюсь в постели с книжкой,  
Положив к ногам кошку, как грелку.  
put(PFV):CVB towards knees:DAT cat:ACC as hot\_water\_bottle:ACC

b. Swedish

[...] sätter mig till rätta i sängen med en bok och  
med katten på fötterna som envärmedyna.  
with cat:DEF on feet:DEF as a\_warmth.cushion

‘[...] (I) settle down in the bed with a book and with the cat on my feet, like a hot water bottle.’

A difference between Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions and Russian resultative converb construction is that the latter presupposes agentivity from

<sup>23</sup> The same holds for English: If, for example, one would like to express something like *I opened the door with a candle in my hand*, an omission of *in my hand* may result in the interpretation that the candle is an opening device.

<sup>24</sup> The second occurrence in Table 6 is a result of a translation manoeuvre in which an accusative object denoting an inalienable in the Russian source text example *заткнув ноздри ватой* ‘having stuffed his nostrils with cotton’ corresponds to the second (PP) part instead of the first part in the Swedish target text example: *med bomullstussar i näsborrarna* ‘with cotton balls in his nostrils’. (The same manoeuvre is found in (9), above). The Swedish source text sample contains a larger proportion of first part alienables than the Swedish target text sample, cf. Table 1 and 2. Translation transformations may partly explain this, along with the presence of non-fictional texts in the Swedish source text sample.

the matrix subject. The Russian cat in (20a) has been placed there by the matrix subject, whereas the Swedish cat in (20b) might have walked there itself.

There are more occurrences of alienables in perfective converb constructions in the Russian target texts than in the Russian source texts. In certain instances, the alienables denote entities that are being held or carried:

(21) a. Swedish (Delblanc)

[...] en parvel som tultade förbi      *med en leksaksbil i famnen.*  
with a toy\_car in fathom:DEF

b. Russian

[...] малыша, который, переваливаясь, проходил мимо,  
*прижав к себе игрушечный автомобиль.*  
press[CVB] towards self:DAT toy:ADJ[ACC] car[ACC]  
‘[...] a little boy that was toddling about with a toy car in his arms.’

In these instances, verbs with meanings of taking, grabbing or pressing concrete entities are used (e.g., *прижав к себе Юханну* ‘pressing [having pressed] Johanna close to himself’, *ухватив коробки обеими руками* ‘grabbing [having grabbed] the boxes with two hands’, *сжав тряпку* ‘[having grabbed] holding the cloth’, *прижав трубку к уху* etc. ‘pressing [having pressed] the telephone receiver to her ear’, etc.). These constructions compete with Russian comitative constructions. Similar constructions can be attested in Russian original text in the Russian national corpus and cannot be considered only a translation effect, although there are more such instances in the Russian target texts than in the Russian source texts of the present investigation, cf. the figures for perfective converb constructions in Table 6.

In other instances, the use of converb forms with alienable NPs as (accusative) objects are more similar to the uses of perfective converbs along with inalienables:

(22) a. Swedish (Delblanc)

Generaladjutanten sov orubbligt stående på ett ben och *med hatten på näsan.*  
with hat:DEF on nose:DEF

b. Russian

Генерал-адъютант спал, непоколебимо стоя на одной ноге,  
*надвинув шляпу на нос.*  
on.pull(CVB):PFV hat:ACC on nose[ACC]  
‘The general adjutant was sleeping, firmly standing on one leg and with his hat over his nose.’

In (22), the alienable *hatten* ‘the hat’ functions on par with inalienables (in Swedish the definite form may be used without prior mentioning of the entity in such instances), cf. (19). The resultant state converb construction has often been described as involving clothing pieces and other entities that can be used on par with inalienables (e.g., Akimova and Kozinceva 1987, p. 261).

The Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions with alienable first parts that correlate with Russian perfective converb constructions invariably have inalienables in the second parts (in his *hands*, on his *nose*, etc.); it therefore seems like the body is an important parameter for perfective converb constructions with resultant state meaning, regardless of where in the construction reference to inalienables is found. Reference to the body can be found in positional or directional prepositional phrases, e.g., *к уху* ‘to [my] ear’; verbs with the meaning of grabbing *сжав* ‘pressing [having pressed]’; in reflexive converb forms, and in the accusative or instrumental nouns denoting inalienables, which were described in Section 3.1. –

3.1.3. When the result of a (possibly anterior) eventuality follows along with the body, the resultative state meaning, rather than an anteriority meaning, is triggered. The resultative state converb construction therefore seems to be dependent on a similar kind of pertinence restriction as closed adjuncts, e.g., Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions (cf. Fabricius-Hansen and Haug, 2012, p. 22ff).

### 3.2.2 Alienable + alienables with a bucket beside the bed; with Putin at the helm in Moscow

Table 7. Russian correspondences to Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions with the structure [*med* + alienable + P + alienable]

Russian source texts			Russian target texts		
<i>s</i> +instrumental constructions	3	75%	other verbal constructions	11	52%
prepositional phrases (other than <i>s</i> )	1	25%	<i>s</i> +instrumental constructions	7	33%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	prepositional phrases (other than <i>s</i> )	2	10%
			imperfective converb constructions	1	5%
			<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100%</b>

In the present material, there are not many examples completely without inalienables (apart from the n.a. instances.): 4 Swedish target text examples and 21 Swedish source text examples. Only tentative conclusions can be drawn from this limited material. While «other verbal» constructions do not show any (in)alienability patterns when the first part alone is considered (see Table 1 and 2), there seems to be less independence from the (in)alienability variable when the (in)alienability of both parts is considered. In the Russian target texts, «other verbal constructions», (mostly constructions with finite verbs), constitute the most frequent Russian correspondence type when both parts contain alienables.

There are 3 instances in Russian source texts, and 7 instances in Russian target texts, of Russian bipartite *s*+instrumental constructions without inalienables. In all of these *s*+instrumental constructions, there is some kind of spatial co-presence: either direct attachment, where the alienable in one of the parts denotes a garment that is attached to the body of the matrix subject: *с топором за поясом* ‘with an/the axe in (behind) his belt’, or mediated attachment to the body: *с письмом под подушкой* ‘with the letter under her pillow’. In one Russian source text example, there is a detachment between the matrix subject and the alienable entity.

(23) a. Russian (Shishkin)

[...] лежу часами *с тазом около кровати.*  
with bucket:INS near bed:GEN

b. Swedish

[...] ligger timme efter timme *med en hink bredvid sängen.*  
with a bucket besides bed:DEF

‘[...] I’m lying for hours with a bucket close to the bed.’

In (23), the bed is the bed that the matrix subject is lying in, the bucket is located in the sphere of the matrix subject. The example does not seem to invite an interpretation of the matrix subject lying on the floor beside the bed with his bucket, although the risk of a syntactic ambiguity like that in (5) is present. Presumably, the Russian comitative construction, unlike the Swedish, demands that the co-present entity denoted by the NP in the first part be located in the immediate sphere of the matrix subject.

In the present material, the most frequent correspondence type of the Swedish source text *med*-constructions with alienables in both parts is Russian finite clauses. In (24a), two entirely separate states of affairs are related in a way that causes the situation in the *med*-construction to function as an adverbial time frame for the matrix situation. This is made explicit in the Russian translation (24b).

(24) a. Swedish (Israelsson)

[...] *med Putin vid rodret i Moskva* är det viktigt för Sverige att spionera i Ryssland.  
with Putin at helm:DEF in Moscow

b. Russian

[...] *когда в Москве у руля стоит Путин*,  
when in Moscow:LOC at helm:GEN stands(IPFV) Putin

Швеции важно тоже [sic!] вести шпионскую деятельность в России.

‘[...] with Putin at the helm in Moscow it is important for Sweden to carry on espionage in Russia.’

Eriksson (2010, p. 55), following Körner (1956, p. 153ff), distinguished between «predicative» and «adverbial» uses of *med*-constructions («nexuspredikativ» vs. «nexusadverbial»). Likewise, Fabricius-Hansen *et al.* (2012, p. 59) distinguished between «depictive» and «adverbial» uses of closed adjuncts.<sup>25</sup> The pertinence constraint is stronger for the depictive use than for the adverbial use (cf. Fabricius-Hansen *et al.*, 2012, p. 72). There is no part/whole or other coreference relation between the two states of affairs in, e.g., (24). The only relation is posed by the construction itself. Example (1) and (4) (and most of the examples in the present paper) exemplify the «depictive» (predicative) use, in which the time of the matrix verb/clause restricts the temporal duration for which the state/temporary property expressed in the *med*-construction holds true for the (matrix) subject. Thus, in an example like *he is walking with his arms on his back*, the arms are claimed to be on his back while he is walking. «Adverbial» use, in which the relation is the reverse, is exemplified in (5) or (24): The *when* (-clause) implied by the *med/with*-constructions, and explicated as *когда* ‘when’ in the Russian translation, restricts the time for which the claim in the following clause holds. In (24), the need for espionage is claimed to occur when Putin is at the helm in Moscow. «Adverbial» *med*- (or *with*-) constructions normally express condition or some kind of temporal condition. The clauses with finite verbs that are conditioned by the adverbial *med*-constructions typically contain modal verbs like *kan* ‘can’ or logical operators of various sorts (cf., e.g., Fabricius-Hansen *et al.*, 2012, p. 86ff).

Even though adverbial use is attested for Russian comitative constructions (cf. Nichols, 1978, p. 124 *с сахаром этот чай невкусный* ‘with sugar, this tea isn’t good’), this usage is probably less conventionalized in Russian than in English or Swedish.

Constructions with animate nouns in the first parts and alienable nouns in the second part may correspond to finite verbs rather than *s*+instrumental constructions, even when they are used predicatively (as depictives) rather than adverbially. In example (4), repeated here as (25), co-presence of the husband is expressed with the finite form *сидел* ‘was sitting’ in Russian.

<sup>25</sup> Fabricius-Hansen *et al.* (2012, p. 59) used the term «depictive», whereas Körner (1956) and Eriksson (2010) used the term «predicative» (Swedish «predikativ»). Arhipov (2009, p. 206) used the parallel Russian term «копредикативный» ‘co-predicative’.

(25) a. Swedish (Enqvist)

Kvinnan Haubinger satt vid min ankomst i sängen

*med sin man vid fotändan* [...].

with POSS man at foot.end:DEF

b. Russian

Я застал пациентку в постели;

*в изножье кровати сидел ее муж* [...].

in foot.end:LOC bed:GEN sat(IPFV) her husband

‘At my arrival the Haubinger woman was sitting in her bed with her husband at the foot end [...].’

There are not enough examples of Russian comitatives with two alienables in the investigations to draw any reliable conclusions. But judging from the correspondence patterns in the present material, it seems that adverbial usages of comitatives are less conventionalized in Russian and that predicative uses of comitatives should conform to the pattern of the bulk of the Russian comitatives (*s*+instrumental constructions with alienables in the first part and inalienables in the second part). If an alienable noun is not followed by an inalienable noun in the second part, the person denoted by this noun should not have too much independence (or animacy), like the husband in (4) has. Nor should the person be too remote from the matrix subject. Two parameters are thus important for Russian bipartite *s*+instrumental constructions: proximity and dependence; if an entity is too remote from the matrix subject or too independent (like animate beings), other constructions are preferred. The presence of inalienables in either part guarantees proximity, and the presence of inalienables in the first part guarantees dependence.

3.2.3 Alienables + non applicable with the courier for company

Table 8. Russian correspondences to Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions with the structure [*med* + alienable + P + n.a.]

Russian source texts			Russian target texts		
<i>s</i> +instrumental constructions	2	50%	<i>s</i> +instrumental constructions	7	50%
omissions or rephrasings	1	25%	other verbal constructions	4	29%
prepositional phrases (other than <i>s</i> )	1	25%	imperfective converb constructions	2	14%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	prepositional phrases (other than <i>s</i> )	1	7%
			<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100%</b>

Some alienables are followed by prepositional phrases that do not indicate locations but other kinds of relations, such as *i beredskap* ‘in readiness, *i släptåg* ‘in tow’. Various means are employed for translating such phrases in Russian, but *s*+instrumental constructions are more frequent than other types in the present material.

(26) a. Swedish (Tunström)

När hon efter tre kvart återkom från sovrummet, *med far i släptåg*, [...].

with father in tow

b. Russian

Когда минут через сорок пять Рагнхильд вернулась из спальни,

*с отцом в кильватере*, [...].

with father:INS in wake:LOC

‘When she returned after 45 minutes with [my] father in tow, [...].’

In (26), the second part PP indicates a certain degree of dependence on behalf of the father.

(27) a. Swedish (Axelsson)

Margareta tänder en cigaretten och böjer sig fram över köksbordet  
*med tändaren i beredskap.*  
with lighter:DEF in preparedness

b. Russian

Маргарета закуривает и перегибается через кухонный стол  
*с зажигалкой наготове.*  
with lighter:INS in.readyness

‘Margareta lights a cigarette and bends over the kitchen table with her lighter in readiness.’

The Russian target text examples in (26) and (27) may be influenced by the Swedish source texts.

**4. Discussion.** The broad tendency shown in Table 1 and 2 is the non-independence from the (in)alienability parameter for the distribution of Russian perfective converb constructions and comitatives as correspondences to Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions. This pattern is interesting because it sheds light on the discussion about the clause-like behaviour of bipartite comitatives.

Sakakibara (1982) discussed English *with*-constructions with the structure [*with* NP PP] and found that some of them are not bipartite. Sakakibara claimed that this group had omittable second parts:

(28) English (Sakakibara, 1982, p. 84, italics added.)

a. John stood firm on the deck *with a gaping wound across his chest.*

b. He stood *with a pipe in his mouth.*

c. Tanaka emerged from the car downtown *with a tense, frozen smile on his face.*

d. He came *with a hat on.*

These examples were contrasted to another series of examples in which the second part, according to Sakakibara, could be omitted:

(29) English (Sakakibara, 1982, p. 84, italics added.)

a. They stood *with their hats off.*

b. He stood *with his back to the fire.*

c. He sat down *with his back against a tree.*

Sakakibara concluded that the *with*-constructions in the second series (29) were equivalent to clauses, whereas the examples in the first series (28) were not. The examples in the first series were, by contrast, «possessive» and their second parts were not predicates but «secondary locations of possession». Sakakibara argued that the possessive group had a close relationship with the verb *have*, whereas the second group had a «direct and productive relationships to corresponding sentences with the copula» (Sakakibara, 1982, p. 84; cf. van Riemsdijk, 1978; McCawley, 1982, who mainly focused on adverbial *with*-constructions, which were treated separately by Sakakibara).

In light of the present study, the following observations of Sakakibara’s two types of *with*-constructions can be made: 1) all of the nouns in the first part of the «possessive» *with*-constructions (28) have indefinite articles and are alienables or non-applicable regarding (in)alienability; 2) all the nouns in the second part of the «possessive» group are inalienables, although in (28d) this inalienable

is implicit; 3) all of the first parts of the *with*-constructions in (29) have possessive pronouns, two of the nouns are inalienables and the alienable in (29a) can be seen as presupposed from world knowledge and consequently used on par with inalienables;<sup>26</sup> 4) two of the examples, (29b) and (29c), would be expressed with bare instrumental constructions in Russian, possibly in combination with reflexive perfective converb forms, cf. (12a), (13a). These observations contribute to the impression that there is a clear similarity between the «possessive» group, (28), and the Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions that correspond to Russian *s*+instrumental constructions, and likewise a clear similarity between the *with*-constructions in (29) and the Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions that correspond to Russian perfective converb constructions or bare instrumental constructions.

An additional observation is that even though *have* may result in better paraphrases than *be* for the *with*-constructions in 28, a *there*-insertion makes the copula acceptable in a paraphrase:

- (30) English (Sakakibara, 1982, p. 84, example (30d) and italics added)
- a. John stood firm on the deck *with gaping wound across his chest*.
  - b. \*A gaping wound *was* across his chest.
  - c. John *had* a gaping wound across his chest.
  - d. *There was* a gaping wound across his chest.<sup>27</sup>

These observations, along with the observations in the present study, suggest that the fundamental difference between Sakakibara's two groups is not about whether the comitatives are bipartite or not, rather the difference is ontological. The examples in (28) and the bipartite *med*-constructions that correspond to Russian *s*+instrumental constructions present *entities* as co-present with the matrix, whereas the examples in (29) or the Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions that correspond to Russian perfective converb constructions present *eventualities* (resultant states/temporary properties) or manners as co-occurring with the matrix.

Stolz *et al.* (2006, p. 20) described comitatives as having (an implicit) predicative function of asserting that something exists in the same place: «and (x) is there, in the same place too» (cf. Coseriu, 1970, p. 218-220; Seiler, 1974, p. 220). The bipartite *med*-constructions with inalienables do not conform to this pattern, as inalienables are inherently co-present. Rather, the location is in focus in such constructions. The difference between the two types can thus be analysed as a difference of focus. If the first part is in focus, the constructions serve to present an entity as co-present (Swedish: *med ETT GLAS i handen*; Russian *со стаканом в руке* 'with A GLASS in her hand'); if the second part is in focus, the constructions serve to present a co-occurring eventuality, a resultant state (Swedish: *med händerna PÅ RYGGEN*; Russian: *зложив руки за спину* 'with her hands ON HER BACK').

The Swedish or English bipartite comitatives of the first type, (28), which serve to present co-present entities, conform to the pattern of comitatives outlined by Stolz *et al.* (2006, p. 20). It can be argued that because they constitute a border phenomenon, they provide a missing link between the phenomena of comitatives and (augmented) absolutes. The location is explicated, whereas the co-presence remains implicit. As the focus is on the entity, the construction is, moreover,

<sup>26</sup> Cf. (17) and (19), which show that Swedish *hatten* 'hat:DEF' may correspond to *s*+instrumental constructions as well as perfective converb constructions in Russian.

<sup>27</sup> The idea of the relationship with the verb *have* also falls short when Russian and other languages that use periphrastic possessive constructions are considered: *у него на груди (была) открытая рана* (at him on chest (was) open wound) 'he had an open wound across his chest'.

perceived as more stative, and accordingly less predicative, than the constructions in which the focus is on the location.<sup>28</sup>

The two types of constructions mentioned here, the ones that present entities and the ones that present eventualities (resultant states or temporary properties), represent prototypical instances. In the present material, there are many intermediate instances, e.g., entities that have been mentioned before in context, but that are not used on par with inalienables.

(31) a Russian (Shishkin)

УВИДЕЛ ее и замер	с	валиком	в	руке.
	with	roller:INS	in	hand:LOC
Fick syn på henne och stelnade till	med	penseln	i	handen.
	with	paint_brush:DEF	in	hand:DEF

‘I saw her and froze, with the paint brush/roller in my hand.’

In (31), both the presence and the location of the entity may be in focus. Likewise, perfect converb constructions may be used to present co-present entities, cf. (21), although this is an exception to the main pattern.

Notwithstanding the non-prototypical instances, the presents study shows that bipartite Russian *s*+instrumental constructions largely conform to the characteristics of comitatives (co-presence, same place *with a glass in my hand*), whereas it is well known that Swedish or English bipartite comitatives may violate this pattern, using the predicative potential residing in the comitative structure to predicate resultant states (*with my arms on my back*), distant places (*with Putin at the helm in Moscow*) or even absence (*with both of us absent*, Jespersen, 1951, p. 124).

**5. Conclusions.** As a result of the contrastive investigation, four prototypical classes of Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions of the form [*med* + NP + PP] emerge. The four classes can be said to convey different ontological types: 1) co-presence of entities, 2) co-occurrence of eventualities, i.e., states/properties, 3) manner, and 4) co-occurrence of states of affairs.

The class of Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions that convey co-presence of (primarily concrete) entities broadly corresponds to Russian comitative (*s*+instrumental) constructions, which constitutes the largest Russian correspondence category in the present investigation. These are either unipartite or bipartite. The Swedish constructions have the structure [*med* + NP<sub>alienable</sub> + P + NP<sub>inalienable</sub>]. A typical example is Swedish: *Hon stod på trappan med ett glas i handen* Russian: *она стояла на лестнице, со стаканом в руке* ‘She was standing on the stairs with a glass in her hand’. In such examples, the position of the entity is less relevant than the presence of the entity. The factors, over and above inalienability, which determine which Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions correspond to Russian *s*+instrumental constructions are proximity and dependence, and (presumably) the fact that the comitatives are depictive rather than adverbial.

The class of Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions that convey co-occurrence of eventualities (states or temporary properties) broadly corresponds to Russian perfective converb constructions with the meaning of resultant states, which constitute the second largest correspondence category of the present investigation. The Swedish constructions have the structure [*med* + NP<sub>inalienable</sub> + P + NP].

<sup>28</sup> An additional observation that sets bipartite comitatives of this type apart from unipartite comitatives is that bipartite comitatives with animates are less compatible with accompaniment or reciprocal relations: <sup>?</sup>*Jag går tillsammans med Anna vid min sida* ‘I’m walking together with Anna by my side’; <sup>?</sup>*jag pratar med Anna vid min sida* ‘I’m chatting with Anna by my side’ (Anna cannot be interpreted as the conversation partner), rather they express accompanying circumstances.

A typical example is Swedish: *Hon gick med händerna på ryggen*; Russian: *Она ходила заложив руки за спину* 'She was walking with her hands behind her back'. In such examples, the state or property of the body parts is more important than the presence of them, which is presupposed. The factor, over and above inalienability, which determines which Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions correspond to Russian perfective converb constructions is that the result of an action should follow along with the body.

The class of Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions that conveys manner primarily corresponds to Russian bare instrumental constructions. The Swedish constructions have the structure [*med* + NP<sub>inalienable</sub> + P + NP]. A typical example is Swedish: *Han stod med ryggen mot publiken*; Russian: *Он стоял спиной к публике* 'He was standing with his back to the audience'. In such examples, the main message communicated does not concern the back or the audience per se, but the manner of standing or positioning of the body. The factor that differentiates such constructions from perfective converb constructions as correspondences to Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions is that the body parts generally have a fixed or stable position relative to the rest of the body and that the positioning of such body parts is an integral part of the description of the eventuality denoted by the matrix verb.

The class of Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions that convey co-occurring states of affairs primarily corresponds to Russian finite constructions in the present investigation. In the present material, these constructions have the structure [*med* + NP<sub>alienables</sub> + P + NP<sub>alienables</sub>]. A typical example is Swedish: [...] *med Putin vid rodret i Moskva är det viktigt för Sverige att spionera i Ryssland*. '[...] with Putin at the helm in Moscow it is important for Sweden to carry on espionage in Russia'; Russian: [...] *когда в Москве у руля стоит Путин, Швеции важно тоже вести шпионскую деятельность в России*. '[...] when Putin stands at the helm in Moscow, Sweden also needs to carry on espionage in Russia.' In such examples, it is not so much the structure of the *med*-construction itself, but its usage to condition another proposition that is the important trait. The factors, over and above inalienability, which determine which Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions correspond to Russian finite construction is either adverbial usage (in contrast to depictive usage) or that the entity denoted by the noun in the first part is independent or remote from the matrix subject.

The contrastive investigation shows that, while Swedish makes broad use of the predicative potential of comitative constructions, the use of bipartite comitatives in Russian seems to be limited to primarily conveying co-presence of entities, e.g., *со стаканом в руке* 'with a glass in [her] hand'. Several exceptions to the prototypical instances are discussed in the paper.

In future research, the impact of proximity and dependence in Russian bipartite comitative constructions should be further investigated. The behaviour of participles within Russian and Swedish comitative constructions is also a field that requires further research. An additional interesting topic concerns the functions of Russian bare instrumental forms.

#### **Бібліографія**

- Архипов, А.В. (2009). *Типология комитативных конструкций*. Москва: Знак.
- Акимова, Т.Г., Козинцева, Н.А. (1987). Зависимый таксис (на материале деепричастных конструкций). В Бондарко, А.В. (ред.), *Теория Функциональной Грамматики: Введение. Аспектуальность. Временная локализованность. Таксис* (с. 257–274). Ленинград: Наука.
- Васева-Кадынкова, И. (1961). Деепричастия совершенного вида с перфектным значением. *Русский язык в школе*. 6. 20–24.

- Исакова, Л.С. (2003). *Проблемы перевода абсолютных конструкций*. Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук, Московский государственный областной университет.
- Михайлов, Н. (2012). *Творительный падеж в русском языке XVIII века*. PhD Thesis. Uppsala: Uppsala University. Retrieved from <https://uu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:563667/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.
- Прозоров, В.Г. (1998). *Основы теории и практики перевода с английского языка на русский*. Петрозаводск: Карельская государственная педагогическая академия. Retrieved from <http://kspu-archive.petrsu.ru/ru/structure/faculties/languages/english/7214>.
- Рецкер, Я.И. (2007). *Теория перевода и переводческая практика. Очерки лингвистической теории перевода*. Москва: Р. Валент. Retrieved from [http://lib.yusu.am/open\\_books/311203.pdf](http://lib.yusu.am/open_books/311203.pdf).
- Зорихина Нильссон, Н.В. (2001). Русские деепричастные конструкции в зеркале шведского языка (выражение отношения одновременности между действиями). В: A. Barentsen (ed.) *Functional Grammar: Aspect and Aspectuality Tense and Temporality Essays in Honour of Alexander Bondarko* (pp. 143-155). München: Lincom Europa.
- Bjørn B. (1979). Det russiske gerundiums semantiske indhold og dets danske oversættelsesækvivalenter. *Svantevit, dansk tidsskrift for slavistik*. V (1-2). 167-175.
- Borin, L., Forsberg, M., Olsson, L.-J. and Uppström, J. (2012). The open lexical infrastructure of Språkbanken. *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'12)*, Istanbul: ELRA. 3598-3602.
- Chappell, H. and McGregor, W. (eds.) (2011). *The Grammar of Inalienability: A Typological Perspective on Body Part Terms and the Part-Whole Relation*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110822137>.
- Coseriu, E. (1969). *Semantik, innere Sprachform und Tiefenstruktur*. Tübingen: Romanisches Seminar. Retrieved from <http://www.romling.uni-tuebingen.de/coseriu/publi/coseriu55.pdf>. <https://doi.org/10.1515/flin.1970.4.1-2.53>.
- Eriksson, O. (2010). Den så kallade med-frasen i kontrastiv belysning. *Språk & stil*. 20 (1). 51-80.
- Fabricius Hansen, C. (2007). On Manners and Circumstances. In Nilsen, Appiah, Borthen (eds.), *Interpreting Utterances: Pragmatics and Its Interfaces. Essays in Honour of Thorstein Fretheim* (pp. 39-50). Oslo: NovusEditors. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260985630\\_On\\_Manners\\_and\\_Circumstances](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260985630_On_Manners_and_Circumstances).
- Fabricius-Hansen, C. and Haug, D. (2012). Co-eventive adjuncts: main issues and clarifications. In C. Fabricius-Hansen and D. Haug (eds.), *Big Events, Small Clauses: The Grammar of Elaboration* (pp. 21-54). Berlin: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110285864>.
- Fabricius-Hansen, C., Haug, D. and Sæbø, K. (2012). Closed adjuncts: Degrees of pertinence. In C. Fabricius-Hansen and D. Haug (eds.), *Big Events, Small Clauses: The Grammar of Elaboration* (pp. 55-91). Berlin: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110285864>.
- Hasselgård, H. (2012). Possessive absolutes in English and their Norwegian correspondences. In C. Fabricius-Hansen and D. Haug (eds.), *Big Events, Small Clauses: The Grammar of Elaboration* (pp. 229-258). Berlin: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110285864>.
- Janda, L.A. and Clancy, S.J. (2002). *The Case Book for Russian*. Bloomington: Slavica.
- Jespersen, O. 1951 (1924) *The philosophy of grammar*, London, Allen & Unwin.
- Jespersen, O. (1940). *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. Vol. 4. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Kalyuga, M. (2020). *Russian Prepositional Phrases: A Cognitive Linguistic Approach*. Singapore: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-5216-8>.
- Kortmann, B. (1991). *Free Adjuncts and Absolutes in English: Problems of Control and Interpretation*. London and New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315002880>.
- Krave Filiouchkina M. (2010). *Converbs in contrast: Russian converb constructions and their English and Norwegian Counterparts*. Oslo: Faculty of humanities, University of Oslo.

- König, E., van der Auwera, J. (1990). Adverbial participles, gerunds and absolute constructions in the languages of Europe. In J. Bechert, G. Bernini and C. Buridart (eds.), *Toward a Typology of European Languages* (pp. 337-355). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Körner, R. (1956). Strödda bidrag till komparativ lingvistik IX. *Moderna språk*. 50. 6. 449-463.
- Lakoff, G. (1968). Instrumental adverbs and the concept of deep structure. *Foundations of Language*. 4. 1. 4-29.
- Lundin, K. (2003). *Small Clauses in Swedish: Towards a Unified Account*. PhD Diss. Lund: Department of Scandinavian languages, Lund University. Retrieved from <https://portal.research.lu.se/portal/files/4625685/912647.pdf>.
- McCawley, J.D. (1983). What's with with? *Language*. 59. 2. 271-87.
- Nichols, J. (1978). Secondary predicates. *Proceedings of the 4th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. 114-127.
- Orekhova, E.Yu., Polatovskaya, O.S. and Badelina, M.V. (2019). Analysis of grammatical and stylistic features of translation of English absolute constructions into Russian. *XLinguae European Scientific Language Journal*. Issue 3, Volume 12, 2019. Retrieved from [http://www.xlinguae.eu/files/XLinguae3\\_2019\\_9.pdf](http://www.xlinguae.eu/files/XLinguae3_2019_9.pdf). <https://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2019.12.03.09>.
- Van de Pol, N., Hoffmann, T. (2016). With or Without with: The Constructionalization of the with-Augmented Absolute in English. *Journal of English Linguistics*. 44. 4. 318-345.
- Van Riemsdijk, H.C. (1978). A case study in syntactic markedness: The binding nature of prepositional phrases. *Studies in generative grammar*. 4. 1-313.
- Sakakibara, H. (1982). With-Constructions in English. *Studies in English Literature*. English Number 1982. Tokyo: English Literary Society of Japan. 79-95. Retrieved from [https://dl.ndl.go.jp/view/download/digidepo\\_11074052\\_po\\_ART0009666869.pdf?contentNo=1&alternativeNo=](https://dl.ndl.go.jp/view/download/digidepo_11074052_po_ART0009666869.pdf?contentNo=1&alternativeNo=).
- Seiler, H. (1974). The principle of concomitance. Instrumental, comitative, and collective. *Foundations of Language*. 12. 2. 215-247.
- Schultze-Berndt, E., Himmelmann N. (2004). Depictive secondary predicates in crosslinguistic perspective. *Linguistic Typology*. 8. 1. 59-131. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lity.2004.004>.
- Sitchinava, D. Perkova, N. (2019). Bilingual Parallel Corpora Featuring the Circum-Baltic Languages within the Russian National Corpus. *Proceedings of the Digital Humanities in the Nordic Countries 4th Conference*. Copenhagen, Denmark, March 5-8, 2019. 495-501. Retrieved from [https://www.academia.edu/39164269/Bilingual\\_Parallel\\_Corpora\\_Featuring\\_the\\_Circum\\_Baltic\\_Languages\\_within\\_the\\_Russian\\_National\\_Corpus](https://www.academia.edu/39164269/Bilingual_Parallel_Corpora_Featuring_the_Circum_Baltic_Languages_within_the_Russian_National_Corpus).
- Stolz, T. Stroh, C., Urdze, A. (2006). *On Comitatives and Related Categories: A Typological Study with Special Focus on the Languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Stump, G. (1985). *The Semantic Variability of Absolute Constructions*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Stassen, L. (2000). AND-languages and WITH-languages. *Linguistic Typology*. 4. 1. 1-54.
- Teleman, U., Hellberg, S., Andersson, E., Christensen, L. (1999). *Svenska Akademiens grammatik*. Vol. 3. Stockholm: Svenska Akademien. Retrieved from <https://svenska.se/grammatik/>.
- 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* (pp. 239-282). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110884463>.

### References

- Arxipov, A.V. (2009). *Tipologija komitativnyx konstrukcij*. Moscow: Znak.
- Akimova, T.G., Kozinceva, N.A. (1987). Zavisimyj taksis (na materiale deepričastnyx konstrukcij). In Bondarko, A.V. (ed.), *Teorija Funkcional'noj Grammatiki: Vvedenie. Aspektual'nost'. Vremennaja lokalizovannost'. Taksis* (pp. 257-274). Leningrad: Nauka.

- Bjørn B. (1979). Det russiske gerundiums semantiske indhold og dets danske oversættelsesækvivalenter. *Svantevit, dansk tidsskrift for slavistik*. V. 1-2. 167-175.
- Borin, L., Forsberg, M., Olsson, L.-J., Uppström, J. (2012). The open lexical infrastructure of Språkbanken. *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'12)*, Istanbul: ELRA. 3598-3602.
- Chappell, H. and McGregor, W. (eds.) (2011). *The Grammar of Inalienability: A Typological Perspective on Body Part Terms and the Part-Whole Relation*, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110822137>.
- Coseriu, E. (1969). *Semantik, innere Sprachform und Tiefenstruktur*. Tübingen: Romanisches Seminar. Retrieved from <http://www.romling.uni-tuebingen.de/coseriu/publi/coseriu55.pdf>. <https://doi.org/10.1515/flin.1970.4.1-2.53>.
- Eriksson, O. (2010). Den så kallade med-frasen i kontrastiv belysning. *Språk & stil*. 20. 1. 51-80.
- Fabricius Hansen, C. (2007). On Manners and Circumstances. In Nilsen, Appiah, Borthen (eds.), *Interpreting Utterances: Pragmatics and Its Interfaces. Essays in Honour of Thorstein Fretheim* (pp. 39-50). Oslo: NovusEditors. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260985630\\_On\\_Manners\\_and\\_Circumstances](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260985630_On_Manners_and_Circumstances).
- Fabricius-Hansen, C., Haug, D. (2012). Co-eventive adjuncts: main issues and clarifications. In C. Fabricius-Hansen and D. Haug (eds.), *Big Events, Small Clauses: The Grammar of Elaboration* (pp. 21-54). Berlin: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110285864>.
- Fabricius-Hansen, C., Haug, D., Sæbø, K. (2012). Closed adjuncts: Degrees of pertinence. In C. Fabricius-Hansen and D. Haug (eds.), *Big Events, Small Clauses: The Grammar of Elaboration* (pp. 55-91). Berlin: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110285864>.
- Hasselgård, H. (2012). Possessive absolutes in English and their Norwegian correspondences. In C. Fabricius-Hansen, D. Haug (eds.), *Big Events, Small Clauses: The Grammar of Elaboration* (pp. 229-258). Berlin: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110285864>.
- Isakova, L.S. (2003). *Problemy perevoda absoljutyx konstrukcij*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Moscow Region State University.
- Janda, L.A., Clancy, S.J. (2002). *The Case Book for Russian*. Bloomington: Slavica.
- Jespersen, O. (1951 / 1924) *The philosophy of grammar*, London: Allen & Unwin.
- Jespersen, O. (1940). *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. Vol. 4. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Kalyuga, M. (2020). *Russian Prepositional Phrases: A Cognitive Linguistic Approach*. Singapore: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-5216-8>
- Kortmann, B. (1991). *Free Adjuncts and Absolutes in English: Problems of Control and Interpretation*. London and New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315002880>.
- Krave Filiouchkina M. (2010). *Converbs in contrast: Russian converb constructions and their English and Norwegian Counterparts*. Oslo: Faculty of humanities, University of Oslo.
- König, E., van der Auwera, J. (1990). Aderbial participles, gerunds and absolute constructions in the languages of Europe. In J. Bechert, G. Bernini and C. Buridart (eds.), *Toward a Typology of European Languages* (pp. 337-355). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Körner, R. (1956). Strödda bidrag till komparativ lingvistik IX. *Moderna språk*. 50. 6. 449-463.
- Lakoff, G. (1968). Instrumental adverbs and the concept of deep structure. *Foundations of Language*. 4. 1. 4-29.
- Lundin, K. (2003). *Small Clauses in Swedish: Towards a Unified Account*. PhD Diss. Lund: Department of Scandinavian languages, Lund University. Retrieved from <https://portal.research.lu.se/portal/files/4625685/912647.pdf>.
- McCawley, J.D. (1983). What's with with? *Language*. 59. 2. 271-87.
- Mixailov, N. (2012). *Tvoritel'nyj padež v russkom jazyke XVIII veka*. PhD Thesis. Uppsala: Uppsala University. Retrieved from <https://uu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:563667/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.
- Nichols, J. (1978). Secondary predicates. *Proceedings of the 4th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. 114-127.
- Orekhova, E.Yu., Polatovskaya, O.S., Badelina, M.V. (2019). Analysis of grammatical and stylistic features of translation of English absolute constructions

- into Russian. *XLinguae European Scientific Language Journal*. 3. 12. Retrieved from [http://www.xlinguae.eu/files/XLinguae3\\_2019\\_9.pdf](http://www.xlinguae.eu/files/XLinguae3_2019_9.pdf).  
<https://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2019.12.03.09>
- Van de Pol, N. and Hoffmann, T. (2016). With or Without with: The Constructionalization of the with-Augmented Absolute in English. *Journal of English Linguistics*. 44. 4. 318-345.
- Prozorov, V.G. (1998). *Osnovy teorii i praktiki perevoda s anglijskogo na russkij*. Petrozavodsk: KSU. Retrieved from <http://kspu-archive.petsu.ru/structure/faculties/languages/english/7214>.
- Van Riemsdijk, H.C. (1978). A case study in syntactic markedness: The binding nature of prepositional phrases. *Studies in generative grammar*. 4. 1-313.
- Recker, Ja.I. (2007). *Teorija perevoda i perevodčeskaja praktika. Očerki lingvističeskoj teorii perevoda*. Moscow: R. Valent. Retrieved from [http://lib.ysu.am/open\\_books/311203.pdf](http://lib.ysu.am/open_books/311203.pdf).
- Sakakibara, H. (1982). With-Constructions in English. *Studies in English Literature*. English Number 1982. Tokyo: English Literary Society of Japan. 79-95. Retrieved from [https://dl.ndl.go.jp/view/download/digidepo\\_11074052\\_po\\_ART0009666869.pdf?contentNo=1&alternativeNo=](https://dl.ndl.go.jp/view/download/digidepo_11074052_po_ART0009666869.pdf?contentNo=1&alternativeNo=)
- Seiler, H. (1974). The principle of concomitance. Instrumental, comitative, and collective. *Foundations of Language*. 12. 2. 215-247.
- Schultze-Berndt, E., Himmelmann N. (2004). Depictive secondary predicates in crosslinguistic perspective. *Linguistic Typology*. 8. 1. 59-131. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lity.2004.004>
- Sitchinava, D. Perkova, N. (2019). Bilingual Parallel Corpora Featuring the Circum-Baltic Languages within the Russian National Corpus. *Proceedings of the Digital Humanities in the Nordic Countries 4th Conference*, Copenhagen, Denmark, March 5–8, 2019. 495-501. Retrieved from [https://www.academia.edu/39164269/Bilingual\\_Parallel\\_Corpora\\_Featuring\\_the\\_Circum\\_Baltic\\_Languages\\_within\\_the\\_Russian\\_National\\_Corpus](https://www.academia.edu/39164269/Bilingual_Parallel_Corpora_Featuring_the_Circum_Baltic_Languages_within_the_Russian_National_Corpus).
- Stolz, T. Stroh, C., Urdze, A. (2006). *On Comitatives and Related Categories: A Typological Study with Special Focus on the Languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Stump, G. (1985). *The Semantic Variability of Absolute Constructions*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Stassen, L. (2000). AND-languages and WITH-languages. *Linguistic Typology* 4. 1. 1-54.
- Teleman, U., Hellberg, S., Andersson, E., Christensen, L. (1999). *Svenska Akademiens grammatik. Vol. 3*. Stockholm: Svenska Akademien. Retrieved from <https://svenska.se/grammatik/>.
- Vaseva-Kadynkova, I. (1961). Deepričastija soveršennogo vida s perfektnym značeniem. *Russkij jazyk v škole*. 6. 20-24.
- 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* (pp. 239–282). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110884463>
- Zorixina Nil'sson, N.V. (2001). Russkie deepričastnye konstrukcii v zerkale švedskogo jazyka (vyraženie otnošenija raznovremennosti meždy dejstvijami). In A. Barentsen (ed.), *Functional Grammar: Aspect and Aspectuality Tense and Temporality Essays in Honour of Alexander Bondarko* (pp. 143–155). München: Lincom Europa.

## Резюме

Меллквіст Сімон

### РОСІЙСЬКІ ВІДПОВІДНИКИ ШВЕДСЬКИМ ДВОКОМПОНЕНТНИМ КОМІТАТИВАМ

**Постановка проблеми.** У шведській мові є тип конструкції із прийменником *med* 'з'. Ця конструкція не має однозначного еквівалента у російській мові. Вживання *med* + *NP* + *PP* співвідносяться з різними російськими конструкціями, наприклад: двоконпонентні комітативні (*с* + *інструментатив*) конструкції;

конвербні (дієприслівникові) конструкції; безприйменникові форми орудного відмінка; фінитні клаузи. Шведську конструкцію можна порівняти з англійськими так званими «доповненими абсолютними конструкціями».

**Мета** цього дослідження – виявити чинники, що є в основі цих відмінностей, використовуючи Шведсько-російський російсько-шведський паралельний корпус у складі російського національного корпусу. У ньому також використано результати контрастивного аналізу, щоб отримати уявлення про феномен двокомпонентних *med*-конструкцій.

**Методи.** Контрастивне дослідження паралельних корпусів. Дані перевірено за допомогою тесту незалежності  $\chi$ -квадрат.

**Результати.** Корпусні дослідження показують, що наявність та положення *NP*, що позначають частини тіла, у шведських двокомпонентних *med*-конструкціях істотно впливає на вибір моделі-відповідника. Можна виділити 4 типи: 1) Невіддільні частини тіла в першій частині двоскладової конструкції після *med* 'з' корелюють з дієприслівниковими перфективними російськими конструкціями. Шведська: *Hon gick med händerna på ryggen*; російська: *Она ходила заложив руки за спину* 'Вона ходила, заклавши руки на спину'. 2) Шведські двочленні *med*-конструкції з нетілесними компонентами в першій частині і невіддільними частинами тіла в другій частині корелюють з російськими комітативними конструкціями (*s + інструментатив*). Шведський: *Hon stod på trappan med ett glas i handen*; російська: *Она стояла на лестнице со стаканом в руке* 'Вона стояла на сходах зі склянкою в руці'. 3) Шведські двокомпонентні *med*-конструкції, що позначають спосіб дії, корелюють із російськими безприйменниковими інструментальними (орудними) конструкціями. Шведська: *Han stod med ryggen mot publiken*; російська: *Он стоял спиной к публике* 'Він стояв спиною до публіки'. 4) Шведські двоскладові *med*-конструкції з нетілесними компонентами в обох частинах корелюють з російськими фінитними клаузами. Шведський: *Men med valet av Donald Trump till USA: s president försvann det sista hoppet om utländskt stöd*. Російська: *Но после того как Дональд Трамп был выбран президентом США, последняя надежда на иностранную поддержку исчезла* 'Але після того, як Дональд Трамп став президентом США остання надія на іноземну підтримку зникла'.

**Дискусія.** Чотири типи відповідності: дієприслівникові конструкції, *s+інструментатив* конструкції, безприйменникові інструментальні конструкції та фінитні клаузи представляють різні онтологічні типи, оскільки вони виражають відносини між матрицею та подіями, сутностями, способом та станами справ відповідно. Темою, що заслуговує на подальше дослідження, є функціонування дієприкметників у шведських і російських комітативних конструкціях.

**Ключові слова:** російська, шведська, комітативи, абсолютиви, дієприслівники, семантика, синтаксис.

## **Abstract**

**Mellquist Simone**

### **RUSSIAN CORRESPONDENCES TO SWEDISH BIPARTITE COMITATIVES**

**Background.** Swedish has a type of construction with the preposition *med* 'with' that does not have an unequivocal equivalent in Russian. Non-adnominal usages of *med* + NP + PP correlate with various Russian constructions: e.g., bipartite

comitative (*s*+instrumental) constructions; converb (*deepričastie*) constructions; bare instrumental case forms; or finite clauses. The Swedish construction is comparable to English so called «augmented absolute constructions».

**Purpose.** The present study seeks to investigate the factors underlying this variation using the Swedish-Russian Russian-Swedish parallel corpus within the Russian National Corpus, RNC. It also uses the contrastive findings to gain insights into the phenomenon of bipartite *med*-constructions.

**Methods.** A contrastive parallel corpus investigation. The data is tested using a  $\chi$ -squared test of independence.

**Results.** The corpus investigations show that the presence and position of NPs referring to body parts in the Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions significantly influence the Russian correspondence patterns. 4 types can be discerned: 1) Inalienable body parts in the first part of the bipartite structure following *med* 'with' correlates with Russian perfective converb constructions. Swedish: *Hon gick med händerna på ryggen*; Russian: *Она ходила заложив руки за спину* 'She was walking with her hands on her back'. 2) Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions with non-body parts in the first part and inalienable body parts in the second parts correlate with Russian comitative constructions (*s*+instrumental). Swedish: *Hon stod på trappan med ett glas i handen* Russian: *она стояла на лестнице, со стаканом в руке* 'She was standing on the stairs with a glass in her hand'. 3) Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions indicating manner relations correlate with Russian bare instrumental constructions. Swedish: *Han stod med ryggen mot publiken*; Russian: *Он стоял спиной к публике* 'He was standing with his back to the audience'. 4) Swedish bipartite *med*-constructions with non-body parts in both parts correlate with Russian finite constructions. Swedish *Men med valet av Donald Trump till USA: s president försvann det sista hoppet om utländskt stöd.* Russian: *Но после того как Дональд Трамп был выбран президентом США, последняя надежда на иностранную поддержку исчезла* 'But with the choice of Donald Trump for president of the U.S.A, the last hope of foreign support disappeared.'

**Discussion.** The four correspondence types: converb constructions, *s*+instrumental constructions, bare instrumentals and finite constructions represent different ontological types as they express relations between the matrix and, eventualities, entities, manners and states of affairs, respectively. A topic that deserves further research is the behaviour of participles within Swedish and Russian comitative constructions.

**Key words:** Russian, Swedish, comitatives, absolutes, converbs, semantics, syntax.

#### **Відомості про автора**

Меллквіст Сімон, аспірантка факультету мовних досліджень, Університет Умео, Умео (Швеція), e-mail: [simone.mellquist@umu.se](mailto:simone.mellquist@umu.se)

Mellquist Simone, PhD Student, Department of Language Studies, Umeå University, Umeå (Sweden), e-mail: [simone.mellquist@umu.se](mailto:simone.mellquist@umu.se)

**ORCID** 0000-0001-5142-5656

Надійшла до редакції 24 травня 2022 року

Прийнято до друку 20 серпня 2022 року