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Language for its own sake. Essays on Language and Literature offered to Harry Perridon.

Adrie Barentsen

Exploring the borders.
A contrastive view on the Swedish connectives 
*tills (till dess (att)), innan and förrän*¹

Over the years Harry Perridon, to whom the present volume is dedicated, has been an active participant of the linguistic meetings organised by members of the Slavic department of our University. Several of these meetings were devoted to the discussion of a contrastive approach to grammatical phenomena in Slavic and non-Slavic languages. The general feeling was that such an approach is useful to gain a better understanding of the relevant structures in each of the languages studied. In most cases it appears that structures seeming to have at first sight a practically identical meaning nevertheless differ in use in particular instances. Establishing such differences is important both for practical reasons (developing more sophisticated dictionaries and material for second language teaching) and for more theoretical reasons. It raises, for instance, questions of typology, i.e. to which extent general patterns can be discerned in such cases, but also the important question of how the

¹ I am indebted to my colleagues René Genis, Henk Proeme and Nadezhda Zorikhina-Nilsson for their comments on preliminary versions of this paper. Henk Proeme also kindly provided a number of additions to my corpus, specifically for the purposes of the present investigation.
semantics of linguistic elements or structures can be described in such a way that differences in actual use can be satisfactorily accounted for.  

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper I would like to present some material that could be taken into consideration in defining the Gestalten of the Swedish temporal connectives tills (till des (att)), innan and förrän and their correspondences in other languages. In this way I continue the tradition of the above-mentioned meetings where constructions with temporal connectives are discussed regularly. This has some connection with the fact that in Russian linguistic literature of the last decades considerable attention was given to the study of such elements. They are considered to be an important component, at least in many languages, of the functional-semantic category ‘Taxis’, which covers the various means of expressing temporal relations between situations.

The connectives mentioned above may be viewed as the principal means of explicitly expressing posteriority of the situation indicated by a dependent part of the sentence with respect to the situation indicated by the matrix predicate. I will compare their use with connectives in some other Germanic languages – English, Dutch and German, and two Slavic languages, Russian and Polish. This comparison is based on the examples found in a selection of texts in my parallel corpus ASPAC. Original texts in Swedish, English and Dutch were compared with their translations into the other languages. The Dutch versions of these texts contain more than 650,000 word forms, which corresponds to about 1.700 pages in average

---


3 For this use of the term Gestalt see Perridon (1989: 8).

4 The term ‘Taxis’ was introduced by Roman Jakobson (1957). In Russian linguistics it was adopted and extended by a.o. Ju.S. Maslov, A.V. Bondarko and the typologist V.S. Xrakovskij [Kharkovskij]. The latter is the editor of the impressive recently published ‘collective monograph’ in which extensive surveys of taxis-means in 20 languages from various different language groups are presented (Xrakovskij (ed.) 2009). In Xrakovskij’s introductory chapter the relevant notions are defined. He also gives a short history of the term ‘Taxis’.

5 A description of this corpus can be found on the following Internet page: http://home.medewerker.uva.nl/a.a.barentsen/page3.html
printing. Although for a more exact picture of the relative frequency of the various connectives in the languages under scrutiny a larger sample is necessary, I suppose it suffices for our purposes, because our main interest here is the establishment of noticeable shifts in use of the various types in translational equivalents.

2. TWO GROUPS OF POSTERIORITY CONNECTIVES

In the languages discussed here the semantic field of posteriority is divided into two parts, corresponding to two different (groups of) connectives (cf. SAG 1999, 4: 260). For the sake of convenience I will refer to them by the terms ‘T-connectives’ (after English till, Swedish tills and Dutch tot(dat)) and ‘B-connectives’ (after English before and German bevor) respectively.

Table 1 presents the connectives that represent these two groups. (The numbers between brackets indicate the number of occurrences found in the parallel texts.) The table demonstrates the interesting fact that in all languages there is some variation in at least one of these groups. An important question is, of course, whether we have here some kind of semantic specialization or merely stylistic variation. In my opinion both occur. In the table this is symbolized by placing the variants in one line, separated by a slash (stylistic variation), or by using separate lines (semantic specialization). I cannot exclude the possibility that a more thorough investigation will reveal semantic distinctions where I did not spot them.

As an example I point to the different ways the table treats the distinction between Dutch voor(dat) and eer and its cognates in English and German, before - ere and bevor - ehe respectively. My reason for placing Dutch eer in a separate line (along with alvorens) is that these connectives cannot be

---

6 For authors, titles and abbreviations referring to these texts, see the table at the end of this paper.

7 There is some confusion in the terminology, due to the fact that one can take either the main clause event or the dependent clause event as point of departure. In ANS (1984: 649), as in the Russian tradition, e.g. in the stimulating article of Xalizeva (1969), these connectives are regarded as expressing anteriority and I followed this in my earlier publications (Barentsen 1999; Barentsen & Pupynin 1999). Nowadays it seems more appropriate to use the terminology of Xrakovskij (2009).
combined with a specification of temporal distance between the events:  
*Dat gebeurde een week voor(eer/)alvorens hij vertrok* 'This happened a week before he left.' It is quite possible that the same applies to the pairs in English and German, but I have not been able to verify this. English *ere* seems to be far more clearly stylistically marked (archaic) than German *ehe*. This accounts for the considerable differences in the proportions between the members of these pairs in English and German.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T-connectives</th>
<th>B-connectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Swedish</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tills</em> (185) / <em>till dess</em> (att) (40)*</td>
<td><em>innan</em> (515) / <em>före det att</em> (***)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>until</em> (259) / <em>till</em> (80)</td>
<td>before (512) / <em>ere</em> (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dutch</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tot</em> (162) / <em>totdat</em> (78)</td>
<td><em>voordat</em> (350) / <em>voor</em> (147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>German</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bis</em> (410)</td>
<td><em>bevor</em> (246) / <em>ehe</em> (137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Polish</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dopóki nie</em> (66) / <em>pokí nie</em> (65)</td>
<td><em>zanim</em> (295) / <em>nim</em> (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Russian</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>poka ne</em> (203) / <em>pokuda ne</em> (11)</td>
<td><em>prežde čem</em> (94) / <em>ranže čem</em> (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>perv tej kak</em> (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>do tugo kak</em> (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>poka</em> (+ p̣) (52)****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1**

| **Notes** | |
|-----------| |
| *         | Only in Larsson (36) and Tolkien (4) |
| **        | Not represented in the texts examined in the present study |
| ***       | In the more than 500 pages of Larsson only 1 occurrence of *förrän* as connective was found |
| ****      | 34 of which after a verb of waiting (see section 8) |

8 As will be argued below (section 7), I view this as connected with the semantics of these connectives and not as a purely syntactic distinction. An example of a syntactic distinction would be the fact that *alvorens* can be combined not only with a finite verbal form but also with an infinitive (in cases of coreference between the subjects of main clause and dependent clause) whereas with *eer* the latter combination is excluded. In the present study this kind of features will not be taken into account.

9 Some stylistically very strongly marked and rare variants, such as English *afore* (colloquial), Dutch *voorader* (regional), Russian *dokole* and some others, are omitted in the table.
As to the semantics, I refer to Herweg, who states, referring to other investigators: “Die Konjunktionen bevor und ehe sind synoniem [...]. Die Wahl zwischen beiden erfolgt aus stilistischen Gründen.” (1989: 234). On the other hand we find a suggestion of a difference of the same kind as in Dutch in an example given in a textbook by Zielinski (1981: 147): “Glücklicherweise war sie ausgestiegen, kurz bevor (nicht: ehe) der Bus verunglückte”.

On the attempts to define a semantic distinction between English *till* and *until* see footnote 10 in Barentsen 2006.

In her elaborate description of the Swedish temporal connectives, Zorixina notes with respect to Swedish *tills* and *till dess att*, that the latter “is rarely encountered in fiction. It is more characteristic for publicistic and official styles” (Zorixina-Nilsson 2009: 413 – my translation, AB). The fact that *till dess att* is frequently used in the popular novel by Stieg Larsson might be connected with Larsson’s previous work as a journalist. But, as noted in the table, there is another feature which sets his book apart from the other texts: the almost complete absence of the connective *förön*. I am not able to evaluate the significance of these peculiarities.

As far as B-connectives are concerned, it appears that Russian displays the most elaborate system of distinctions. This is rather surprising in view of the fact that, on the whole, Russian uses its posteriority connectives far less frequently than the other languages under scrutiny (cf. section 3).

Some special comment is needed on the Polish and Russian T-connectives *(do)póki nie* and *pok*(ud)a *ne*. In the way they are presented in table 1 they look like regular strings/units like Swedish *till dess att*, but their nature is far more specific. The second element (*nie* or *ne*), which is in fact the regular negative particle in these languages, is commonly separated from the first part by one or more words (cf. example (1) below). Using the term “the connective *poka ne*” we essentially mean a specific construction, consisting of the element *poka* and a negative form of the predicate which semantically is not regarded as having a normal negative meaning.\(^{10}\) We

\(^{10}\) The same applies to Polish *(do)póki nie*. The absence of regular negative meaning makes these connectives examples of “expletive negation”. As will be shown below, expletive negation is also found with German *bevor/ehe* and Polish *(za)nim* after a main clause containing negation. But while in the latter cases the negative particle can be omitted without changing the meaning of the
must regard this as a specific construction, because its meaning cannot be
derived in a normal way from the meaning of its components. Note that
\textit{poka} with a non-negated predicate means ‘as long as’ or ‘while’ in case of
an imperfective predicate and usually ‘before’ with a perfective predicate.
The meaning ‘until’ arises specifically from combining \textit{poka} (or \textit{(do)póki nie})
with a negated predicate referring to a complete event. For this reason this
predicate prototypically must have perfective aspect.\footnote{Imperfective aspect is allowed only when referring to complete events. This
occurs in the narrative present or in those instances of unbounded repetition
where each of the events is complete.} Unfortunately, a clear
formulation of the distinctions between the connectives \textit{poka ne} and \textit{poka}
is complicated by the fact that the latter can also be combined with a negated
predicate. However, in such cases the negation retains its regular meaning
and thus, such clauses express the meaning ‘as long as/while not ...’. Usually
they contain an \textit{imperfective} predicate of an atelic verb. An example would be:
\textit{Poka on ne rabotal, on vel sebja očen’ stranno} ‘As long as he did not work,
he behaved very strangely’.\footnote{An extensive survey of the different uses of \textit{poka} and \textit{poka (ne)} can be found in
(Barentsen 1979). An interesting study in English is (Iordanskaja & Mel'čuk
2009). For \textit{poka} corresponding to \textit{until} after a verb of waiting see below,
section 8. For reasons of space a rather specific use of \textit{poka} plus a negated
perfective preterite, often corresponding to a B-connective in other languages,
cannot be discussed in the present paper. See on this subject (Barentsen 1999:
268) and (Barentsen & Pupynin 1999: 119). (These (infrequent) cases have
been excluded from the count in table 1.)}

3. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE LANGUAGES IN THE DISTRIBUTION OF T- AND B-CONNECTIVES

If one compares the use of the connectives in parallel texts it becomes
apparent that there are considerable differences in their distribution in the
various languages. The following figure visualizes the results of the count

---

sentence, with \textit{poka ne} or \textit{(do)póki nie} this is usually not possible. (In the remain-
der of this section I shall mention only the Russian connectives \textit{poka} and \textit{poka}
ne, but most of what will be said also applies to Polish \textit{(do)póki} and \textit{(do)póki nie}.
For some important differences between the connectives of these languages
see (Barentsen 2011).)
presented in table 1 of the previous section. In the figure the groups are taken as a whole and opposed to each other. The vertical line designates the border between the groups and the length of the cells to the left and right from it symbolizes the total amount of the connectives found in each of them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T-connectives</th>
<th>B-connectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English13</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figure displays two important facts:

a) there is a striking difference between the languages in the overall frequency of the posteriority connectives. Swedish has the largest amount (923), whereas Russian has the smallest (420, i.e. less than half of the Swedish score).

b) The proportions between the two groups differ from language to language. Most conspicuous are the strong dominance of the B-connectives in Swedish and the notable dominance of T-connectives in Polish and German.

As will be shown below, the situation in Swedish and Polish is connected with the specific type of semantic variation found in these languages. The relevant groups contain a “supplementary” connective (Swedish förrän, Polish aż) which semantically displays a certain “overflow” – i.e. these connectives can be found in cases where the other languages would not use a posteriority connective. In the figure this is symbolized by the arrows.

The other differences, for instance the relatively high proportion of T-

---

13 Unfortunately the English translation of one of our bigger texts – Lagerlöf – is far from complete. If all lacking passages would have been translated there might be about 20 extra examples of a T-connective and at least 30 of the B-type.
connectives in English and German and its relative low proportion in Swedish, suggest that the borders between the T- and B-domains are determined by different features. Below I will present a number of cases in which these distinctions are most noticeable.

In this paper our primary interest concerns the cases that illustrate differences between the languages in the demarcation between the two groups of posteriority connectives or within them. (This is reflected in the title.) Before examining those differences though, we will also have a quick look at what I regard as the central types of use of these connectives: the cases where all scrutinized languages agree in employing a connective from the same group.  

4. MAIN FEATURES AND CENTRAL TYPES OF USE OF T-CONNECTIVES

In the remainder of the text I will use some abbreviations to avoid overloaded formulations: M stands for ‘the situation or situational change indicated by the main/matrix clause’ and in the same way D designates ‘the situation or situational change indicated by the dependent clause’. The clauses themselves will be designated with Mc and Dc respectively.

A T-connective signals not merely the temporal relationship of posteriority of D to M but suggests a more specific connection between them. It forces us to see M as a situation with a certain duration, existing or developing (at least) until the situational change D. This may be symbolized as follows:

\[
\text{---/}
\]

More details on these connectives are provided in the detailed studies on temporal connectives in English (Heinämäki 1978), Swedish (Zorixina-Nilsson 2009) and Dutch (Barentsen 2009).

In examples from Polish and Russian the perfective and imperfective aspect will be indicated at the end of the verb with the subscripts p and i respectively. Starting from example (2), the languages will not be indicated anymore, but the order in which they are presented will in principle be the same, with the exception of the first two variants. The original text will always be given as the first variant, followed, if applicable, by the English translation.

The horizontal line symbolizes the durative situation M and the slash the
In the clearest examples M has a meaning containing an element like 'keeping', 'continuing' and D is an event that takes away the possibility or necessity to hold this situation:

(1) Sw: [Lillebror klättrade tyst upp i knät på henne och kröp ihop i hennes famn, och hon höll honom stilla där, tills han hade vaknat ordentligt] (Lind_Karly);
   E: [Smidge silently climbed onto her lap and snuggled into her arms] and she held him quietly until he had woken up properly;
   D: [...] en ze liet hem daar rustig zitten tot hij helemaal wakker was;
   G: [...] und sie hielt ihn dort fest, bis er ganz wach geworden war;
   P: [...] ona ćaś trzymała go spokojnie, dopóki na dobn się nie obudził;
   R: Tak oni i sideli, poka Malýš okončatel’no ne promušil’;

In this case the T-connective is used to suggest that mother changes her position once Lillebror is fully awake.

Note that in contrast with the other variants the Dutch translation has a stative expression 'was awake'. In such cases the meaning of the T-connective forces us to associate this with the most easily imaginable situational change, which leads to the interpretation that the coming into being of this situation is meant. This is more explicitly expressed by the pluperfect form in the corresponding examples of the other Germanic languages.

As indicated in the Polish and Russian examples, Dc has perfective aspect, which very explicitly indicates a situational change. This is the prototypical choice for a Dc with a T-connective in all Slavic languages.

In the next example the predicate of Dc points more directly to the situational change. In the Swedish original the fact that M continues up to D is emphasized by ända. For this purpose also fram can be used. Such additional elements mainly emphasize a feature already present in the meaning of the T-connective, but their use probably also makes it more clear that M is not continued beyond D. In the translations only Russian used a similar device – do teč por, literally 'to those times'.

(2) Älgtjuren stod där, ända tills jägarna kom fram i skogsbynet. [Då kastade ban
om och flydde åt ett annat håll än det, som han hade kommit från (Lag);18

There [the elk bull] stood until the poachers emerged from the woods. [Then be turned and fled in the opposite direction];

De elandstier bleef daar staan tot de jagers aan de bosrand verschenen. [...];

Und dort blieb der Elch stehen, bis die Jäger am Waldrand auftauchten. [...];

Łoś stał, dopóki myśliwi nie ukazali się na skraju lasu. [...];

Łos' stojal tam do tex por, poka na lesnoj opuške ne pokazali'i, ocotniki. [...].

5. POLISH (DO)PÓKI NIE VS. AZ

Since the result or effect of an action quite often follows the action directly, it is not surprising that we regularly find this relationship (although not expressed explicitly) in sentences with a T-connective. In the following example there is a clear causal 'overtone' in the relation between M and D:

(3) Then she set to work nibbling at the mushroom [...] till she was about a foot high (Car);

Sedan satte hon i gång att knapra lite på svampen [...] tills hon var ungefär trettio centimeter lång;

Vervolgens begon ze aan de paddestoel te knabbelen [...] tot ze ongeveer dertig centimeter was;

Sie machte sich daran, an dem Pilz zu knabbern [...], bis sie ungefähr einen Fuß hoch war;

Później zabrała się do dzijała, nadgrzyzając grzyb po odrobince [...], póki nie skurczyła, się do wysokości mniej więcej jednej stopy (Słomczyński);

Potem zabrała się do nadgrzyzienia grzyba [...], aż zmalała do wysokości może jednej stopy;

A potom vynula pokoški griba [...] i ela, poka ne stala, s fut roston.

Note that we have two Polish translations here that differ in choice of the connective. This difference reflects a distinction in regarding the relations between M and D. As argued in (Barentsen 2006), dopóki nie emphasizes the incompatibility between M and the resultative state of D while aż rather emphasizes the coming into being of D. Simplifying things one could give the following paraphrases (Barentsen 2006: 78-79):

---

18 The second sentence clearly shows in which way M came to an end.
M dopóki nie D = M exists and/but ends because of D  
M aż D = M exists and/but then (at last/suddenly) emerges D

In (3) the first Polish translation focuses on the fact that by reaching the desired height Alice ends nibbling at the mushroom, while the second focuses on the effect that was obtained. It will be clear that this distinction is very subtle. The T-connectives in the Germanic and most of the Slavic languages do not express this variation in perspective on the relations between M and D and for this reason one quite often finds different solutions in alternative translations from these languages into Polish.\(^{19}\)

Nevertheless there are many cases where the choice for aż appears to be clearly motivated. Because of the hyperbolic expression in the De of the following example, the attention is very much drawn to the effect that it describes and for that reason the choice for aż is natural:

\[(4)\] Blom och Dunder-Karlsson och Pippi [...] åt tills de var närapå fyrkantiga (Lind);
Bloom and Thunder Karlsson and Pippi [...] ate until they were just about square;
Donder-Karl, Blom en Pippi aten tot ze bijna vierkant waren;
Blom, Donner-Karlsson und Pippi [...] essen, bis sie beinahe vierreckig waren;
Blom, Dunder-Karlsson i Pippi [...] jedli, aż im brzydco zaczęły pękać;
Blom, Gromila Karl i Peppi [...] jadli, upletat’ za obe zęki, poka ne naels’o do otvala.

In many descriptions of T-connectives it is more or less explicitly assumed that M cannot extend beyond D. See, for instance, the part between parentheses in the definition of tills / till dess att in the Swedish Academy Grammar (SAG 1999, 4: 260). In this definition it is stated that M “löper ända fram till början på den aktion som anges av bisatsens finita verb (men inte länge)”.

With respect to English until, Heinämäki (1978: 111) states that this

\[^{19}\] A similar distinction clearly exists in Czech and (to a somewhat lesser extent) in Slovak. Both languages have the cognate connective až. It is interesting to note that the words až/aż also functions as a particle emphasizing a high grade, e.g. až do dnia katastrofy ‘to the very day of the disaster’. It is possible that in Bulgarian and Ukrainian the omission of the negative particle in the connectives doseka ne and poky ne can have a rather similar effect as choosing aż in Polish. See (Barentsen 2011) for some examples.
assumption is merely an implicature and not an entailment of its meaning, because it can be cancelled. I suppose this is true for most of the T-connectives in other languages as well. Cf. example (5), the further context of which points clearly to the fact that M continues beyond D.\footnote{That Owl’s storytelling continues is clear from the indication that Piglet woke up a little later because of “a sudden loud squawk from Owl, which was really part of the story” (my italics, AB).}

(5) and the story went on and on, [rather like this sentence], until Piglet [who was listening out of his window without much hope,] went to sleep quietly and naturally (Milne);

In Polish the connective \( \text{\ldots} \) is chosen in both available translations (only one of them is reproduced in the example). I suppose that Polish \((\text{do})\text{póki } \text{nie}\) is not admissible here because it quite explicitly denotes the discontinuation of M. In this respect it appears to be more restrictive than the T-connectives in the other languages. Polish \( \text{\ldots} \) in principle allows both readings.

Besides cases where \( \text{\ldots} \) is practically interchangeable with \((\text{do})\text{póki } \text{nie}\) or at least very close in meaning, there are rather many cases where it passes the border of a normal T-connective. For this reason, in Polish grammatical literature it is usually regarded as a connective expressing “manner or measure”. This is reflected in the fact that it quite often corresponds to Swedish \( \text{så att} \) ‘so that’ or its equivalents in the other languages. In such cases it can even lose its temporal meaning of posteriority, as in the following example, where the imperf ective aspect in Dc clearly indicates simultaneity in Polish and Russian. Note that none of the other languages has a T-connective here:
However, in several cases the distinctions between the temporal and the causal meanings are less clear. Examples as the following, where English uses till and Polish uses aż but all other translations choose a connective of the type ‘so that’, suggest that the borders of the T-domain in the various languages differ slightly.21 This begs for further research.

6. Prototypical uses of B-connectives

In contrast to the T-connectives, the main B-connectives do not presuppose distinct (and different) aspeccual characteristics with respect to M and D. (Cf. the overview given by Heinämäki (1978: 47).) However, cases where both Mc and Dc refer to complete events and where the order in which they occur has some special relevance should, in my view, be regarded as prototypical. In the following example this relevance is connected with the fact that Pippi had, just before, put her cup on her head while it was not yet empty (giving a clearly undesired effect):

21 From now on not all language variants will be given in all examples (for economy of space).
The relevance of the order is emphasized also in the next example with an Mc containing the adverbial ‘first’:

(9) Innan en gren fattade eld, sveptes den först in i en tunn slöja av rök, sedan blev alla barr röda på en gång, och så började det att knastra och brinna (Lag);

Before a branch caught fire it was first enveloped in a thin veil of smoke, then all the needles grew red at one time, and it began to crackle and blaze.

Note that in this example the order of Mc and Dc is not ‘iconic’ – it does not reflect the temporal order of the events that are described in the sentence. This appears to be a rather common feature of sentences with B-connectives, far more so than with T-connectives or in other temporal constructions.

One regularly finds examples which express that M is a kind of pre-requisite for the realization of D:

(10) Henrik Vanger tittade ned på sina händer en kort stund och smuttade därefter på kaffet som om han behövde en liten paus innan han äntligen kunde börja närma sig sitt ärende (Lars);

Vanger looked down at his hands, then sipped his coffee, as if he needed a pause before he could at last begin to broach what he wanted.

This relation of cause - effect can also be reversed. It is interesting to note that in all languages these B-connectives are regularly used with a counterfactual reading of D. This interpretation arises when M expresses an action that prevents the coming into being of D. In such cases Dc often precedes Mc and frequently contains a modal auxiliary:

(11) Innan de hade hunnit resa sig upp, hade Pippi fått fram ett rep, och kvickt som tanken surrade hon fast armar och ben på de bägge tvåerna] (Lind);

Before they were able to get up, Pippi had got out a rope, [and as quick as thought she bound fast the arms and legs of both the thieves];

Voor ze overeind hadden kunnen komen pakte Pippi een touw [...];

Bevor sie dazu kamen anzustoßen, hatte Pippi einen Strick geholt [...];
Zanim zdążyli się podnieść, Pippi błyskawicznie dwukroć pochwyciła powrót [...];
Preżde ćem oni uspeli podniatać, Pippi sscvatila dlinuju vermku [...].

7. SEMANTIC SPECIALIZATION OF B-CONNECTIVES IN RUSSIAN

In section 2 I mentioned the existence of semantic specialization with the B-connectives in Russian. This is first of all connected with the distinction between ‘designating the order of the events’ vs. ‘localization in time’. Only in the latter case the distance between M and D can be explicitly expressed. In such cases prežde ćem cannot be used. The connectives do togo kak or pered tem kak are used instead. The latter of these has the additional feature of suggesting that the distance is very small. The following examples should be sufficient for the purposes of this paper:

(12) Jag och Erika ... har en historia som startade långt innan vi började jobba ihop (Lars);
Erika and I ... have a history that started long before we started working together;
U nas s Èrikoj... istorija nalalas’ zadolgo do togo, kak my stali vmeste rabotat’.

(13) Jag kom dit när han frågade ut dig om vad som hade hänt med Harriet, just innan han hängde upp dig i snaran (Lars);
I got there when he was asking you about what happened to Harriet, just before he hung you up by the noose;
Ja prišla tuda, kogda on vysprašival o tom, što proizošlo s Xarriet, pered tem kak podvet’, tebya na udavke.

As mentioned in section 2, the feature of ‘localization in time’ also plays a role in Dutch, as eer and alvorens cannot be used in such cases. But the main B-connectives of the other languages seem to be indifferent to this feature. Another example of semantic specialization in Russian is the use of pokó (without negation) corresponding to a regular B-connective in the other languages:

(14) Innan de hinner tillbaka, är borgen redan tagen (Lag);
Before they can get back, the castle will be taken;
Voor ze hier terug zijn, is het kasteel al ingenomen.
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Ehe sie zurück sein können, ist die Burg genommen; 
Zanim wrócą, zamek zostanie zdobyty; 
Poka oni vernutsja, zamok budet vzjat serymi krysami.

This construction signals a peculiar combination of the meanings ‘posteriority’ and ‘simultaneity’: the final point of M is reached not later than the change of situations associated with D, but M itself is viewed as simultaneous with the process which ultimately leads to D. In (14) this means that according to the Russian variant the process of returning must somehow already be going on at the point the castle is taken. In the other languages this nuance is lost. For more examples of this specific use of *poka* see (Barentsen 1979: 77-79; 1999: 271). A comparable use of *poka* is found in sentences where the Mc expresses duration, cf. section 10 below.

In this section, as in section 5 above, it was shown that in some languages there are certain borders in the T- or B-domain itself. In the case of Polish *aż* this concerned also an extension beyond the border of the domain of posteriority proper.

In the remainder of the paper we will look at some cases which above all concern the border between the T- and B-domains.

8. Russian *poka* after a verb of waiting

Another peculiarity of *poka* is its use after a verb of waiting, where the other languages use a T-connective:

(15) Karlen väntade *nu*, tills vargarna var alldeles inpå släden (Lag);  
The man waited until the wolves were almost upon the sledge;  
*Nu* wachtte de man, tot de wolven heel dicht bij de slee waren;  
*Der Bauer wartete *nun*, bis die Wölfe wieder ganz dicht herangekommen waren;  
Teraz wieśniak poczekał, *aż* się wilki przybliżyły;  
*Krest'janin podoznala*, pok, volki podogat, *sovsem bližko.*

Example (18) below shows that in similar positions the T-connective *poka* *nu* can also be used. The distinction is sometimes very subtle. With *poka* *ne* D is exclusively seen as an event that puts an end to the waiting, but *poka* treats D more as a kind of object of waiting: the *expected* event. In Swedish and English this latter meaning is explicitly expressed by specific constructions, with *på att* and *for... to* respectively:
Sedan satt de båda två stilla och väntade på att Karlssons feber skulle sjunka (Lind_Karl);
Then they both sat still, waiting for Karlssons temperature to come down.

Note that in Swedish De contains a ‘future in the past’. This corresponds with the relative use of the perfective present/future in the Russian version of (15) and is opposed to the past tense in the Swedish version of (15) and the Russian version of (18). The Russian translation of (16) actually uses another connective – the interrogative kogda ‘when’, also with a relatively used perfective present/future:

Potom oni seli i mošč priglashj čždat’, kogda u Karlsona upadet, temperatura.

Replacing kogda by poka in such cases appears to have the effect of raising the certainty that D will soon be realized. I tend to explain this by the emphasis poka lays on the existence of the process that will lead to the realization of D. (See the discussion of (14).)

In Russian the details of choosing the most adequate connective and tense form after ‘waiting’ is quite complicated and they cannot be discussed here. For more information see (Barentsen 1980; 1981; 1998).

9. Expression of Quantity in MC

As indicated above, a T-connective typically indicates that M ends at the moment of the full realization of D. In many occasions it is perfectly feasible to give a quantitative evaluation of M from the perspective of this moment. Most naturally this concerns the time taken by M:

and stayed there for two days until the danger was over (Milne);
[...] och stannade där två dagar, tills all fara var över;
[...] en daar twee dagen bleef zitten, tot het gevaar voorbij was;
[...] und zwei Tage dort blieb, bis die Gefahr vorüber war;
[...] i siedział tam przez dwa dni, aż niebezpieczeństwo minęło; (Tuwim);
[...] i prosidel v nej dva dnia, poka opasnost’ ne minula; (Veber).

In rather similar circumstances one finds also B-connectives, but preferences for one of the two types differ between the languages. In the following example a B-connective is used only in the Swedish original and its English translation. All other languages have chosen the T-connective in-
The competition between the two connectives we find here is clearly based on the fact that the purely temporal relations between M and D are the same in both cases. As was shown above, with a T-connective M must extend at least until D whereas a B-connective generally allows the possibility of some distance between the actions. But in the cases with quantification in Mc this latter possibility is virtually excluded, because the moment we need for the measurement of M is normally provided by D. In this way one of the main distinctions between a T- or B-connective loses its strength.

Nevertheless, the choice for a B-connective in such cases seems to be motivated by some supplementary features in the perception of the relation between the two actions. With respect to the Dutch translation in (18), I suppose changing totdat into voordat would have the effect that the action of the main clause is more clearly viewed as a certain task that has to be fulfilled in order to 'receive' the situational change indicated in the Dc. A similar motivation of choosing the B-connective might be present in the Swedish original and the English translation. (In (18) this view of the relation between the actions is, of course, stimulated also by the modal 'had to'.) The importance of such features may also explain why in my Polish examples of this type the connective aż is chosen while (do) póki nie is not represented.22

22 In the various languages there might be different other factors involved. It seems to me that in Dutch the degree of specificity of D might also play a role.
On the whole, in sentences with quantification in the Mc, B-connectives appear to occur far more frequently than T-connectives. An interesting exception is German, which displays a rather strong preference for bis. Nevertheless bevor or the do occur in a number of cases. Sometimes both types can be found in alternative translations, as in example (19). This example also shows that the quantification is not necessarily confined to expressions of time. The choice for a B-connective in the original and all but one of the translations (the first German translation) is probably also connected with the strong sense of effort that has to be spend to reach the result indicated in Dc.

(19) They [tried shooting at the squirrels, and they] wasted many arrows before they managed to bring one down on the path (Tolkien); De [...] slösade bort många pilar innan de fick en att falla på stigen; Ze [...] verspilden vele pijlen voordat ze erin slaagden er een op het pad te doen vallen; Sie [...] vergaasteten viele Pfeile, bis sie eines auf dem Pfad zur Strecke brachten (Krege); Sie [...] vergaasteten viele Pfeile, bevor sie eines zur Strecke brachten (Scherf); [...] zmarnowali wiele strzałów, zanim zdolali zabić jednego (Braiter); Oni [...] potratili wiele strel, zanim zdolali zabić jednego (Andreev).

10. MC MERELY DESIGNATES THE QUANTITY OF TIME

A specific subtype of the former are sentences in which Mc merely measures the quantity of time that passes between a point implied in the context and the realization of D. Five of our six languages typically use the B-connective. The exception, again, is German, where usually the T-connective is found:

(20) det dröjer många år, innan den här skogen blir vad den var (Lag); it will take many years before the forest will be what it once was; het duurt jaren voordat dit bos weer is zoals het ooit was; es wird viele Jahre dauern, bis der Wald wieder das ist, was er früher war;

In an example like (18) I find it easier to replace totdat into voordat if Dc has a less specific subject: voordat er iemand verscheen 'before somebody appeared'. Such questions beg for further research.
Nevertheless, a B-connective is certainly not impossible in German, as demonstrated by the following two alternative translations:

(21) Actually it was some days before Bilbo really set out (Tolk);
    Men det kom att dröja några dagar innan Bilbo gav sig i väg;
    Aber es dauerte noch einige Tage, bis Bilbo wirklich aufbrechen konnte (Scherf);
    Tatsächlich vergingen aber noch ein paar Tage, bevor Bilbo aufbrach (Krege).

One might assume that the choice for bevor/ehe instead of bis could be motivated by the subjective evaluation of the given quantity as big. This finds some support in the examples I found, but a Google search on the strings ‘es dauerte eine ganze Zeit bis/bevor/ehe’ showed that bis was nevertheless used about 30 times more than the B-connectives. Moreover, the strings ‘es dauerte nicht lange bevor/ehe’ also resulted in about 60,000 hits (but bis gave more than a million here).

Similar searches showed that on Internet pages the Swedish, English and Dutch T-connectives are not entirely excluded in the given position either (although the use of Swedish tills appears to be most limited here). We must conclude that the contrast between German and the other languages is not a strictly principal one but rather a matter of degree of preference.

In Russian one finds in these cases an interesting contrast between the connectives prežde čem and pok. For reasons of space I will not illustrate this in the present paper. On this distinction, see Barentsen (1999: 270-271).

11. NEGATIVE EXPRESSION OF DURATION AND QUANTIFICATION; QUICK SUCESSION

Whereas in English an Mc with a negative expression of duration, like it wasn’t long, takes the same connective (before) as in the previous cases, in most of the other languages we typically find a shift of patterns:

(22) [De rasade hem, och] det dröjde inte länge förrän de var tillbaka (Lind);
They rushed home, and it wasn’t long before they were back; 

... het duurde niet lang of ze waren weer terug; 

... es dauerte nicht lange, da waren sie wieder zurück; 

... zalewio po paru chwilach znów był "powsiemiem; 

... i wskore vernulis".

In the Swedish original we find förrän instead of innan. In our texts this is by far the most common choice in such cases. 

In the Polish and Russian translations of (22) we find a simple sentence with an adverbial meaning ‘only after some moments’ and ‘soon’, respectively. Choosing an adverbial expression appears to be the most common type of correspondence in these languages of det dröjde/dröjer inte (länge) förrän and suggests that this expression is close to becoming a kind of adverbial itself.

Dutch has a rather specific use of the connective of (which usually means ‘or’). Sentences of this special of-type, which may express also non-temporal relations, are marked by the fact that both clauses have main clause word order and that the order of the two clauses themselves cannot be reversed. They are discussed in a number of publications on Dutch grammar. An interesting survey and discussion is given by Ebeling (2006: 319-327), who points out that in this type of use the connective of signals a confrontation of two situations in which a strong limit of the first one is implied. Two examples given by Ebeling (2006: 325) show that this leads to the expression of quick succession of two situational changes, (which, in fact, is implied also in (22)):

\[(23) \begin{align*}
  &\text{a) We waren nog niet thuis of het begon te regenen;} \\
  &\text{(Lit. ‘We hadn’t yet arrived at home or it started to rain’)} \\
  &\text{b) We waren nog maar net thuis of het begon te regenen;} \\
  &\text{(Lit. ‘We only just arrived at home ....’)}
\end{align*} \]

‘As soon as we arrived at home it started to rain’

The German construction with da (with main clause word order in De) is also found in sentences of both types ((22) and in (23)). It is probably the closest correspondence of the temporally used Dutch of.

It is important to note that Swedish förrän is also regularly used in both types. The following example shows a very common type with the adverbial knapppe ‘hardly’ in Mc, which (alongside with knapppast) is practically an equivalent of the Dutch nog maar net, used in (23b). Example (24) shows al-
so the most typical correspondences of this type in the other languages:

(24) Men knappt hade gråråtorna sväljt de första vetekornen, förrän nerifrån gården ljudet av en liten pollare (Lag);
    But the gray rats had hardly swallowed the first wheat-grains, before the sound of a little shrill pipe was heard from the yard;
    Maar nauwelijks hadden de grijze ratten de eerste tarwekorrels doorgeslikt of op het burchtplein was het scherpe geluid van een schel fluitje te horen;
    Aber kaum hatten sie die ersten Weizenkörner verzehrt, als da unten im Hof vor der Burg der weiche Ton einer kleinen scharfen Pfeife ertönte;
    Ale zaledwie zakosztowały, pierwszych ziaren picienicy, gdy na podwórzu zamkowym rozległ się piesiuny, w fulfilling the necessary amount of time’. In such cases only the connective kak (lit. ‘how’) can be chosen.\(^{23}\)

The Polish and German translations in (24) also use a connective with the meaning ‘when’. In German this construction (with dependent clause word order) competes with the da-construction in (22) and is probably stylistically more neutral.\(^{24}\)

I take the fact that most languages regularly do not use a B-connective in cases like (22) and (24) as an indication that these cases, with their sense of quick succession, exceed the border of the prototypical B-domain.\(^{25}\)

An interesting feature of this kind of sentences is the fact that the

---

\(^{23}\) In other temporal sentences kak functions as a stylistically expressive variant of the most neutral connective kogda ‘when’.

\(^{24}\) Instead of da in one example so was found.

\(^{25}\) The most explicit way of expressing this sense is using a connective like English as soon as. Being a kind of mirror image of the meaning expressed in (22)–(24) a construction with this connective requires that the status of Mc and Dc changes parts, if one wants to retain the same predicates (cf. (23)). (This is not to say that these structures can always be felicitously transformed into each other.)
proximity of M and D can be worded both by positive and negative means, cf. ‘only just’ in (23b) and ‘not yet’ in (23a). In these cases the negation is commonly used in a kind of hyperbolic way. In principle, the construction used in (23a) and the Russian version of (24) may be interpreted literally. In such case M is not yet totally realized at the moment of realization of D. But it seems far more common to view D as coinciding with M or coming slightly after it.

The negative variant is regularly used with an expression of quantification:

(25) Han hade visst inte sovit i fem minuter, förrän han gled fram under vingen (Lag);

He certainly had not slept five minutes before he slipped out from under the wing.
Ne prošlo p i pjati minut, kak on vyskoľ'znil, iz-pod guinogo kryla.

The connective used in the various translations of (25) are the same as in (24). The Mc in the Russian variant literally means ‘not even five minutes passed’. This variant is given here to show, that with indications of quantity the word i ‘and/even’ has to be added and the auxiliary uspet’ can be omitted.

In Swedish, Dutch and German the connectives, regularly found in positive sentences with an expression of quantity of time in the Mc (see example (20), can also be found in cases of negative expression of duration, but the number of such instances in my material is rather limited.26 Some examples:

Swedish innan and German bis:

(26) Det dröjde inte heller länge, innan han fann reda på en väg (Lag);

It wasn’t long, either, before he discovered a road.
Es dauerte auch nicht lange, bis er einen Weg fand.

Swedish innan and Dutch voor:

(27) It will not be long now,” thought Bilbo, “before the goblins win the Gate [...]” (Tolk);

26 Even one example with Dutch tot was found here: ’t Duurde niet lang, tot Hij klaar was ‘It wasn’t long before he was through with it’. I find it difficult to define a difference with choosing voor(dat) here.
In example (22) the specific *of*-construction in the Dutch example can easily be replaced with a regular temporal clause, cf.

(22') *Het duurde niet lang voor ze weer terug waren.*

To my knowledge this has primarily a stylistic effect: the *of*-sentence gives a more vivid presentation of the course of the events, which is obviously connected with the sense of quick succession, expressed in the temporal use of the *of*-construction. This sense of vividness possibly also explains why with reference to future events one usually finds *voor* instead of *of* (cf. example (27)). Another factor of this kind seems to be the use of a (plu)perfect in *Mc*, as in the following example, where I find it rather difficult to use the *of*-construction:

(28) *Det hade inte dröjt länge, förrän han hade fått se ladunyckeln* (Läg);
*He had not been there long [lit. It hadn’t been long] before he caught a glimpse of the shed key;*
*Het had niet lang geduurd voor hij de schuursleutel had gezien.*

I do not know whether choosing *innen* instead of *förrän* in these cases has any clear effect. A Google-search (June 17, 2011) showed the following number of hits of *innen* and *förrän* after *det dröjde inte länge*: 244.000 vs. 275.000. This suggests that in actual use both constructions must be considered rather common.

12. OTHER CASES WITH NEGATION IN *MC*

In the previous sections we have seen that competition between T- and B- connectives arises in cases of quantification of the predicate in the *Mc*. A second, very important field of possible competition are sentences in which the *Mc*-predicate contains a negation.

As in the quantificational type, the reason for this competition must be that a negative M is readily perceived as continuing up to D. It seems to me that this is indeed the case and that this is connected with the fact that negating the presence of something in a given domain is taken to be relevant for the whole domain. This explains why in the *Mc* of temporal
sentences even punctual predicates under negation acquire a sense of durativity (cf. Heinämäki (1978: 84)). For this reason both not M until D and not M before D imply in fact the continuing relevance of the absence of M up to D. In languages where both are available, the differences between these two structures must probably be sought in the extent to which M is supposed to be realized at a later moment, i.e. at D or after D. (Many, but not all, of the examples can be more or less easily transformed in M only when after D).

There appear to be noticeable differences between the possibilities and effects of choosing between a T- or B-connective in the various languages. In some languages the differences appear to be, again, very subtle. Not all details are at present fully understood. For this reason, and in order to limit this paper’s length, I will not go into detail here. Below I will indicate only the most typical or remarkable types of correspondences found in my material.

Example (29) shows one of the most frequent patterns:

(29) Jag ska inte vila, förrän den där älgen ligger död på marken (Lag)
I shall not rest until that elk lies [...] dead on the ground;
Ik zal niet rusten voordat die eland dood op de grond ligt;
Ich will nicht ruhen, bis der grausame Elch [...] tot auf der Erde liegt;
Nie spocznę, póki okrutny łóś nie legnie, martwy na ziemi;
[N]euspokojus’ do tez por, poka čtot loš’ ne padet, mertvym na zemlju.

In this example the Swedish original contains förrän, which in my material is the most frequently encountered connective after a negated Mc. I would like to point out that I did not find any examples with tills in such cases, and only very few with innan (cf. (32) and (33)). If we assume that Swedish really does not admit a T-connective in this position, this would be a feature that clearly distinguishes this language from the others.

In cases like (29) one finds a rather strong sense of condition between the events: the realization of D is readily perceived as a necessary and sufficient condition for the coming into being of M. The naturalness of förrän

---

27 Cf. the use of perfective predicates in the Mc of the Polish and Russian translations of (29), in spite of the fact that a T-connective is used.

28 A possible factor might be the aspectual character of M, see Barentsen (1999: 269; 2009: 354–355).
in such sentences might be connected with the fact that this connective (in contrast to *innen* and most B-connectives in other languages) very strongly presupposes that the negated M is realized after the realization of D.\(^{29}\)

A very regular correspondence in Russian is the T-connective *poka ne*. Its Polish correspondence (*dopóki nie*) is also quite common, but it can be replaced more easily by a B-connective than in Russian. In the following example only the Polish translator made a different choice, compared to (29):

\[(30)\]  
\[\text{Jag ska inte lämna dig, förrän jag ska sätta ner dig på dörrtröskeln […] (Lag);}\]

*I shall not leave you until I put you down on your […] doorstep;*

\[\text{Nie opuszczę cię, zanim cię nie postawię przed progiem domu.}\]

Interestingly, in this Polish translation Dc is negated as well. This is a clear case of expletive negation. It looks like a kind of contamination of (*dopóki nie*) and *zanim*. Examples with *zanim nie* are rather common, although the negation is not obligatory here. I have not yet found any indication of a possible difference in meaning between the negated and non-negated variants, and the difference between *zanim* (*nie*) an (*dopóki* *nie*) in this position is also not very clear.\(^{30}\)

It is interesting to note that the phenomenon of expletive negation with a B-connective is rather common in German as well. For a discussion I refer to Krifka (2010) who states that this is quite normal use in German and offers an explanation in terms of temporal logic. Example (31) demonstrates the variant *bevor nicht*, but *ehe nicht* occurs as well:

\[(31)\]  
\[\text{[Till sist blev Hai Shang så arg, så han sa att ingen ny mat skulle lagas åt Petter, förrän han hade ätit ett svalbo för pappa (Lind);}\]

*[In the end Hai Shang got so angry that he said no new food should be made for Peter before he’d eaten that bird’s nest just for daddy;]*

*[…] dat Peter niets anders te eten zou krijgen, totdat hij het vogelnestje voor papa zou hebben opgegeten;*

*[…] Petter sollte kein anderes Essen kriegen, bevor er nicht ein Schwalbenest*
In (31) the Dutch translation is provided to demonstrate the interesting fact that the choice between T- and B-connectives in English and Dutch is just the opposite to that, which we encountered in (29). Polish and Russian have *zanim nie* and *poka że*, respectively.

In view of the patterns presented above, one might suppose that Swedish *förrän* has the specific function of being used in cases where the opposition between T- and B-connectives is virtually neutralized. However, the situation appears to be more complicated, as after a negative Mc not only *förrän* is used, but also *innan*. Some examples can be found even in the text of Lagerlöf, although she far more frequently uses *förrän* in this position. Here, I prefer to give an example from Larsson, because it better illustrates a feature that is found in almost all of the few examples of this type of use of *innan* in my material: De is to be interpreted as future-oriented (from the point of view of the subject of Mc):

(32) En sak till. Inga fler joggingturer *innan* vi löst det här (Lars);

One more thing. No more jogging until we crack this.

Our only example of a De with clear reference to the past has another interesting feature: the function of De is clearly more localizing (of states) than in the other examples in this section, in which the sense of succession (of events) dominates. (Cf. the discussion of this distinction in section 7.)

(33) Voor ik elf of twaalf jaar oud was, wist ik *[dat]* nooit (Frank);

Until I was eleven or twelve, I didn’t realize *[that]*.

*Innan* jag var elva eller tolv hade jag ingen aning om *[det]*;

Further research is needed to examine in which way and to which extent some of the features mentioned above determine the choice for the most suitable posteriority connective after a negative De.

13. CONCLUSION

The material presented above points to a number of noticeable differences in the use of T- and B-connectives in the languages under scrutiny. I will limit myself here to some brief comments on the specific proportions between the occurrences of the Swedish T- and B-connectives, provided in the figure in section 3. In my view, the relative low proportion of the T-
domain is easily explained by the fact that the use of *tills* appears to be pro-
hibited (or certainly restricted) in the cases studied in sections 10 and,
especially, 11 and 12. The latter two cases are the almost exclusive domain
of using the ‘supplementary’ B-connective *förrän*. As demonstrated in
section 11, in many cases this connective is strongly associated with the
sense ‘quick succession’. (In my material about two thirds of the examples
of *förrän* belong to this type.) As was pointed out, this type exceeds the
border of the prototypical B-domain and this certainly accounts well for
the strikingly large amount of B-connectives in Swedish, as compared to
the other languages.31

On the whole, the differences between the languages, signalled in this
paper, are not only connected with various degrees of extension of the
relevant semantic domains and their potential internal structure, but also
manifest themselves on the border of the two domains, i.e. in cases where
connectives of the two main types sometimes seem practically inter-
changeable. In my view there is no real synonymity here and we must ex-
pect that even in such cases the choice of connective influences the way in
which the relations between M and D are perceived. But it is no easy task
to construct a semantic description that accounts for such differences in
the *Gestalt* of the relevant connectives. To my knowledge, all existing for-
mulations of the semantics of temporal connectives lack the necessary ela-
boration. For the time being, though, too many details still remain insuf-
chiefly clear to begin the task of drawing up more adequate formulations.
More research is obviously needed. I sincerely hope that this paper has at
least pointed to some of the problems and that the attention of specialists
in the various languages may be attracted to this kind of research.

31 Some of the differences in relative frequency of these connectives might be
connected with a factor that cannot be discussed in this paper – a kind of se-
matic bleaching. Especially in Swedish, but also in English and Dutch, one
finds examples with B-connectives where there seems to be no very specific
need to emphasize the meaning of posteriority. In such cases Russian and
Polish translations regularly use a coordinative construction (*‘and’*). Cf. Barend-
sen & Pupynin (1999: 116) and Zorixina-Nill’sson (2009: 425-426), where a
Swedish example is given.
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<td>E: Velma Swanston Howard; D: Elina van der Heijden en Viveca Jongeneel; G: Pauline Klaiber; P: Teresa Chlapowska; R: L.Ju. Braude.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindgren, Astrid</td>
<td><em>Pippi Langstrump</em> (1945)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lind)</td>
<td>E: Edna Hurup; D: Lisbeth Borgesius-Wildschot en Saskia Ferwerda; G: Cäcilie Heinig; P: Irena Szuch-Wyszomirsk; R: L. Lungina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lind_Karl)</td>
<td><em>Lillebror och Karlsson på taket</em> (1955)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E: Sarah Death; D: Rita Törnqvist-Verschuur; G: Thyra Dohrenburg; P: Irena Szuch-Wyszomirsk; R: L. Lungina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsson, Stieg</td>
<td><em>Millennium 1</em> (<em>Män som hatar kvinnor</em>) (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lars)</td>
<td>E: Reg Keeland; D: Tineke Jorissen-Wedzinga; G: Wibke Kuhn; P: Beata Walczak-Larsson; R: Anna Savickaja.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The translators mentioned in this table indicate the texts used to obtain the quantitative data presented in table 1. In a number of cases I have studied various alternative translations as well. (*Tolkiens Hobbit*, for instance, was available in 6 different Russian translations and 2 Polish and German versions.) When in the body of the article a translator is indicated, it means that the example is taken from an alternative translation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language for Its Own Sake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank, Anne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Het achterhuis. Dagboekbrieven 12 juni 1942 - 1 augustus 1944.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sw: Per Holmer; E: Susan Massotty; G: Mirjam Pressler; P: Alicja Dehue-Oczko; R: S. Belokrinickaja i M. Novikova.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll, Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alice in Wonderland</em> (1865)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Car)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sw: Harry Lundin; D: Eelke de Jong; G: Antonie Zimmermann; P: Robert Stiller; R: N. Demurova.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milne, Alan Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Winnie-The-Pooh</em> (1926)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Milne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sw: Brita af Geijerstam; D: Mies Bouhuys; G: Harry Rowohlt; P: Monika Adamczyk-Garbowska; R: S.Ja. Maksimišin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolkien, J.R.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Hobbit or There and Back Again</em> (1937)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tolk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sw: Britt G. Hallqvist; D: Max Schuchart; G: Wolfgang Krege; P: Paulina Braiter; R: N. Raxmanova.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>