Anna Drogosz
Instytut Neofilologii
UWM w Olsztynie

THE CONCEPTUAL DISTINCTION BETWEEN POLISH MARKERS[1] OF REFLEXIVITY: SIEBIE AND SIĘ

0. Introduction. The Polish language has two markers of reflexivity (*siebie* and *się*) which can both code the prototypical reflexive situation type in the sense of Kemmer (1993) but they differ in their meaning and syntactic behaviour. In this paper, an attempt will be made to account for these differences in terms of R.W. Langacker's model of grammar (Langacker 1987, 1991). It will be claimed that the Polish reflexive markers differ in the profile and the construal they impose on a situation, and that the semantic and syntactic properties stem from the profile and construal.

The paper is divided into three sections. In Section 1 we present the cognitive foundations of reflexive constructions (i.e. the canonical event model and the direct reflexive situation type). Section 2 presents semantic and syntactic differences between *siebie* and *się*. The explanation of these differences in terms of profiling and construal is developed in Section 3 of the article.

1. Cognitive foundations of reflexivization. One of the central assumptions of Cognitive Grammar (CG) is the claim that cognitive processing underlies linguistic structures and that grammatical patterns are motivated by semantic patterns. The use of reflexive constructions is not different in this respect. As Kemmer (1993) convincingly demonstrated, different uses of reflexive constructions correspond to a variety of reflexive situation types in the sense of Talmy (1972) which, in turn, constitute a modification of the canonical event model presented by Langacker (1991) drawing on Hopper and Thompson (1980), Givón (1984) and Talmy (1985).

---

[1] Throughout the paper I use the term 'markers', because of the uncertain status of się in the Polish literature. Się has been treated as a syllable (Bogusławski 1986), as a personal pronoun (Grzegorczykowa et al. 1984), as an independent lexeme (Saloni 1975), or as a derivational morpheme (Wilczewska 1966, Szymańska 2000).

The canonical event model is a two-participant event which is defined by Kemmer as 'a verbal event in which a human entity (an Agent or Experiencer) acts volitionally, exerting physical force on an inanimate definite entity (a Patient) which is directly and completely affected by that event. Thus, there are two participants, and the relation between them involves some kind of transmission of force from the animate participant to the second, affected participant' (1993:50). The canonical event model constitutes the basis for the prototypical transitive clause, with two participants distinct from the setting and from each other, which are in an energetic interaction with each other, which correspond to the trajector (TR) and landmark (LM) of the relation, and which are coded in a clause by the subject and direct object.

The direct reflexive situation departs from the prototypical two-participant event in the construal of the participants of the event. Firstly, the Agent (Experiencer) and the Patient are co-referential[2], that is the TR and LM of the relation are conflated in a single referential entity. Secondly, the direct reflexive situation differs from the canonical event in the nature of the Patient participant. Since the Patient in the reflexive situation is the same referential entity as the Agent, then it is human and definite, unlike the Patient of the prototypical two-participant event.

The direct reflexive situation is linguistically coded by the prototypical reflexive constructions such as in (1), in which the co-reference of TR and LM is realised in Polish by either of the two reflexive makers.

(1)   a)   Jan uderzył siebie/się.
                John hit himself
        b)   Ewa zobaczyła siebie/ się (w lustrze).
                Eva saw herself (in the mirror).

Apart from the direct reflexive situation type, Kemmer distinguishes indirect reflexive situation type (with more than two participants) and logophoric reflexive situation type (with more than two events). They underlie non-prototypical uses of reflexives, which fall outside the scope of the present study.

2. *Siebie and się*: restrictions on distribution. From (1) we can see that the Polish markers of reflexivity participate in prototypical reflexive constructions and, what is more, are often interchangeable. However, al-

---

[2] One of the first atempts to characterise reflexives in syntactico-semantic terms comes from Faltz (1977:3). He defines the archetypal reflexive context as follows: 'The archetypal reflexive context consists of a simple clause expressing a two-participant predication in which one participant is a human Agent or Experiencer and the other a Patient, and in which two participants refer to the same entity'.

though the sentences with *siebie* of the type illustrated in (1) have the potential to code the direct reflexive situation, they are surprisingly rarely used in this function. An informal count[3] showed that only 2.5% of *siebie* sentences were found to code the direct reflexive situation type. Instead, the sentences with *się* were used in this context. Further, the pronoun *siebie* is used in very specific situations: i) in emphatic contexts where the marker *siebie* bears the contrastive stress, ii) when the marker *siebie* functions as a prepositional complement, iii) when the marker *siebie* co-occurs with certain verbs of perception or mental verbs. The first observation is exemplified by the sentences in (2):

(2) a) Tomek kopnął sam siebie/*się.
         Tom kicked himself.
     b) Tomek ogolił sam siebie/*się.
         Tom shaved himself.
     c) Tomek zranił sam siebie/*się.
         Tom hurt himself.

The emphatic effect of *siebie* in these constructions is often reinforced by the emphatic marker *sam* added to the reflexive marker.
    Also, *siebie* is used contrastively, as in (3):

(3) a) Nie kłam! Tomek nie podrapał ciebie. On podrapał siebie/*się.
         Don't lie! Tom did not scratch you. He scratched himself.
     b) Co ty opowiadasz?! Tomek otruł siebie/*się a nie teściową!
         What are you talking about?! Tom poisoned himself and not his mother-in-law!

The second observation concerns the frequent use of *siebie* as a prepositional complement. In fact, this is where the pronominal reflexive is the only option. Consider:

(4) a) Często mówię głośno do siebie/*się.
         I often speak aloud to myself.
     b) Popatrzył przed siebie/*się.
         He looked ahead.
     c) Patrzę za siebie/*się (w przeszłość).
         I look back (into the past).
     d) Doszedł do siebie/*się.
         He came round.

---

[3] The count covered 123 sentences in which *siebie* and *się* appeared. The sentences were collected from the Internet, personal communication, television and press.

The third observation concerns mental verbs and verbs of perception, such as in (5):

(5)   a)   Tom zobaczył siebie/*się.
           Tom saw himself.
      b)   Ona nie lubi siebie/*się.
           She does not like herself.
      c)   Ona nienawidzi siebie/*się.
           She hates herself.
      d)   Oni kochają tylko siebie/*się.
           They love only themselves.

As we can see from the examples above, the two markers of reflexivity are subject to constraints on distribution even though they both code the direct reflexive situation type. In order to account for these constraints a more in-depth investigation is necessary.

3. *Siebie* and *się*: two kinds of construal. *Siebie* and *się* correspond to two types of reflexive markers distinguished by Langacker (1991), namely a nominal and relation reflexive marker respectively. They differ in profile and the trajector/landmark alignment. *Siebie* is a pronoun and as such it profiles a thing. In a prototypical reflexive construction it stands as the landmark of a relation, with the sentence subject (its antecedent) corresponding to the processual trajector. Consider:

(6)   Tomek uderzył siebie.
             TR   LM
             Tom hit himself.

Się, on the other hand, is a relational reflexive and, according to Langacker (1991:368), it can be analysed as a schematic processual predication deriving reflexive verbs from non-reflexive stems. The relational reflexive marker *się* specifies the identity of two participants that would otherwise be coded as the subject and object of a transitive verb[4]. Thus the roles of the trajector and landmark are conflated in the single participant, i.e. the referent of the subject, as in (7):

(7)   Tomek przewrócił się.
             TR/LM
             Tom fell over.

---

[4] The use of reflexive markers with intransitive verbs as in, for example, *Idę sobie i myślę, Siedzi się tutaj godzinami, Dalej droga się zwęża* is out of the scope of this study as such uses fall far from the reflexive prototype. These uses have been exhaustively discussed in Szymańska (2000) and Drogosz (2002).

The nominal and relational reflexive markers, due to their different profiles, allow the speaker to construe a reflexive situation in a slightly different way. Recall that Cognitive Grammar assumes that a construal is imposed on a scene by a speaker (conceptualizer) and is not an inherent property of a scene. The most significant facets of construal are the profiling and the choice of trajector and landmark. This is exactly where the two Polish reflexive constructions differ, the remaining differences being a logical consequence of a different profile and trajector/landmark alignment.

As the reflexive marker *siebie* profiles a thing, it is perceived as another nominal in a sentence. The sentence in (8) might be an answer to the question 'Who did John hurt?'

(8)   Jan zranił siebie
           John hurt himself.

On the other hand, *się* in the relational reflexive construction profiles a process and, consequently, the construction is focused on the event and not on the participant. This is why the sentence in (9) might be an answer to the question 'What did John do?'

(9)   Jan się zranił.
           John hurt himself.

Different profiling and the trajector/landmark alignment grant the construction with *siebie* a flavour of volitionality. Let us consider the following examples. Sentences with *siebie* (as in (10)) sound somewhat awkward when accompanied by expressions like *przypadkiem* 'by chance', niechcący 'by accident, without an intention', *nie zauważył*, że 'he did not notice that'.

(10) a)   ?Tomek niechcący/przypadkiem zranił siebie.
             Tom hurt himself by chance/by accident.
      b)   ?Tomek nie zauważył, że zranił siebie.
             Tom didn't notice that he had hurt himself.

When the same sentences are accompanied by *celowo* 'on purpose', *specjalnie* 'deliberately', *rozmyślnie* 'intentionally', as in (11), they sound perfectly acceptable:

(11)   Tomek zranił siebie celowo/specjalnie/rozmyślnie.
           Tom hurt himself on purpose/deliberately/intentionally.

Further, my informants tended to extend the context of a sentence such as in (11), into a sentence resembling that in (12):

(12)   Tomek celowo uderzył siebie w głowę młotkiem.
             Tom hit himself on the head with a hammer.

The situation with the *się*-construction is different, as it sounds equally acceptable with both types of expressions. Consider:

(13)   a)   Tomek uderzył się niechcący.
             Tom hurt himself by chance.
       b)   Tomek uderzył się specjalnie.
             Tom hurt himself deliberately.

The 'volitionality' of the construction with *siebie* stems from the profile of the reflexive pronoun. Because the pronoun *siebie* profiles a thing, its referent can function as Endpoint in the energy chain. However, it is only one of possible Endpoints of this energy chain which is illustrated by negative sentences in (14a, b). Consequently, the nominal reflexive construction designates a situation in which the subject participant intentionally selects himself as Endpoint of the event.

The relational reflexive *się*, on the other hand, profiles a process, and in the construction with *się* the roles of Initiator and Endpoint are conflated in the subject participant. Consequently, the action cannot be directed at other recipients and no conscious selection of Endpoint takes place. Again, negative sentences (14c, d) illustrate the point. In (14a, b) the referent of the reflexive pronoun is negated and another entity is affected by the action. In (14c, d) negation applies to the whole process and a different action is given as an alternative.

(14)   a)   Wyskakując z okna, Jan zabił nie siebie ale swoją teściową.
             Jumping out of the window, John didn't kill himself, but his
             mother-in-law.
       b)   Tomek uderzył młotkiem nie siebie lecz stół.
             Tom hit with the hammer not himself but the table.
       c)   Wyskakując z okna, Jan nie zabił się, lecz połamał obie nogi.
             Jumping out of the window, John didn't get killed, but he broke
             both his legs.
       d)   Tomek nie uderzył się lecz podrapał.
             Tom didn't get hit but scratched.

This interpretation allows to explain the emphatic and contrastive use of siebie in contexts, in which the contrast pertains to the referent of the sentence object.

Further, the difference of profile also explains why *siebie* and not *się* is selected as a prepositional complement, as in (15):

(15)   (Ja) mówię do siebie/*się .
          I'm speaking to myself.

The profile of a preposition, which is a relation, implies separate landmark and trajector. Since the pronoun *siebie* profiles a thing, it can perform the role of the landmark of a relation, while the marker *się*, due to its processual profile, cannot perform this function.

A consequence of the different profiling and trajector/landmark alignment in the nominal and relational reflexive constructions is a different degree of the relative elaboration of event in the sense of Kemmer (1993: 71). In the nominal reflexive the participant of the event is divided into two subparts which semantically correspond to the trajector and landmark of the relation, and syntactically to the sentence subject and direct object. As a result, the event is portrayed with greater precision because the Endpoint is delimited as if it were a separate entity. The relational reflexive, as we said before, construes the subject participant as performing the roles of Initiator and Endpoint. Consequently, this construction allows a lower level of the relative elaboration of event.

The issue of the relative elaboration of events is connected with the relation of identity between the conceived Initiator and an affected entity in the sense of Waltereit (2000: 263-264). In his analysis of French reflexive constructions, Waltereit distinguishes three types of co-reference: direct reflexive construction, partitive-reflexive construction and metonymic-reflexive construction. I believe that the same distinction can be made for Polish relational reflexives. In the direct-reflexive construction the Initiator and the affected entity are identical:

(16) a)   Ona zamknęła się w biurze.
            She locked herself in her office.
      b)   On powiedział do siebie, że...
            He said to himself that...

In the partitive-reflexive construction the co-reference relation is less evident:

(17) a)   On się musi golić codziennie.
            He has to shave every day.
      b)   Ewa skrzywiła się.
            Ewa made a wry face.

The conceptual relation in this case is a part-whole (meronymic) relation between two participants: if a body part is affected then the whole person is perceived as affected. The affected entity is nevertheless distinct from the Initiator, and they are co-referential only in a wider sense.

In the metonymic-reflexive construction the distinctness of participants increases even more.

(18) a)   Jan wyspowiadał się.
            Jan made a confession of his sins.
      b)   Ewa spakowała się.
            Ewa packed her things.

Waltereit demonstrates that the relation between the Initiator and the affected entity is usually thought of as a mere 'one having to do with each other', not even one being a part of the other.

The concept of 'distinctness of participants' analysed by Waltereit is separate from the concept of 'distinguishability of participants' as defined by Kemmer (1993: 66). Distinguishability of participants refers to the degree to which a single psycho-mental entity is conceptually distinguished into separate entities. This concept captures how the two-participant event model undergoes modifications in reflexive and middle situation types. As Kemmer demonstrated, participants are better distinguishable in reflexive situations than in middle situation types. Distinctness, on the other hand, refers to the actual relation of the participants of the event to each other. Therefore, if the event is conceptualised as affecting a person entirely, as in the case of the direct-reflexive situation, the participants are coincidental, even though the aspects of the event (Initiator and Endpoint) are well delimited. In the partitive-reflexive situation the participants are conceptualised as 'overlapping', because the event is conceptualised as affecting only a part of a person. In the metonymic-reflexive situation the initiating entity and affected entity are distinct, but the distinguishability of the participants is low. This suggests that the distinguishability of participants decreases as distinctness increases.

The observations made by Waltereit about French reflexives help to account for the difference in construal between nominal and relational reflexives in Polish. In constructions using *siebie*, Initiator and affected entity are presented as coincident, and the event affects the referential entity entirely. Constructions using *się* and coding the direct reflexive situation allow different degrees of distinctness between the initiating entity and affected entity.

The level of elaboration of event can also account for the relatively low frequency of the construction with *siebie* coding the direct reflexive situation type. It becomes evident that constructions with *siebie* enable the

speaker a more complex construal of a situation than constructions with się. The construction with *siebie* splits the single participant of an event into two subparts, performing the roles of Initiator and Endpoint, and interacting with each other. Such a construal of the situation demands more processing effort than the construal offered by the relational reflexive, in which the focus is on the process. Thus, unless the speaker has a specific intention to construe a situation as involving the participant subjectively divided into two separate entities, (as in emphatic context), the simpler relational reflexive is selected.

An interesting distinction between the two reflexive forms in Polish is found in Frajzyngier (2000). Frajzyngier in his cross-linguistic studies noticed that languages apply two different functions to reflexive forms, namely: affectedness of the subject and co-referentiality. How these functions are realised depends on how many reflexive forms a language has. Frajzyngier makes the following claim:

'In languages with two or more forms encoding "reflexive" functions, one form codes the event from the point of view of the subject. Representing the event from the point of view of the subject subsumes subject affectedness with those verbs that may involve affectedness. The other form encodes co-referentiality between arguments, such as the subject and another argument. The presence of another argument subsumes the control over the event on the part of the subject. What is more, it appears that within a language, the more-grammaticalized forms code point of view and the less-grammaticalized forms code co-referentiality of arguments.' (Frajzyngier 2000: 128).

With reference to Polish, Frajzyngier proposes (2000: 130) that the marker się codes subject affectedness, and does not code subject control, while the function of co-referentiality is performed by the reflexive pronoun siebie (and its inflectional forms). Consider (19):

(19) a)   Jacek skaleczył siebie.   (co-referentiality)
             Jack hurt himself.
      b)   Jacek skaleczył się.   (subject affectedness)
                Jack hurt himself. / Jack got hurt.

Się represents the situation from the point of view of what happens to the subject, or how the event affects the subject:

(20) a)   Ale serce mi się kraje na myśl o rozstaniu.
             But my heart hurts when I think about separation.
      b)   Urodziłam się w spalonym mieście.
             I was born in a burn-out town.
      c)   Zobacz, czy woda się nie podnosi.
             See whether the water is rising.

According to Frajzyngier, sentences similar to that in (21), in which
the agent is distinct from the patient, serve additional evidence that *się*
does not code co-referentiality.

(21)   Żona dała mu truciznę i on się otruł.
             His wife gave him poison and he was poisoned.

In (21) the event does not involve a suicide but a murder. It is presen-
ted, however, from the point of view of the victim rather than from the
point of view of the murderer.

Contrary to Frajzyngier, I believe that constructions with *siebie* and
się alike involve both co-referentiality and affectedness. The direct reflex-
ive situation itself is a situation involving a person who performs an action
directed at himself and, logically, affected as a result of this action. The
construction with *siebie* involves, obviously, co-referentiality between the
referent of the subject and the referent of the reflexive. At the same time
it codes affectedness: if the referent of the reflexive is affected, and it is
co-referential with the subject, then the subject is also affected. In the
construction with *się* affectedness is direct because the roles of Initiator
and Endpoint are conflated in one single participant. This construction
also codes co-referentiality, but it is not co-referentiality between partici-
pants or between verbal arguments (because there is only one). The co-
referentiality obtains at the conceptual level: the roles of Initiator and
Endpoint co-refer in the sense that they are the same entity. Additionally,
the sentences quoted by Frajzygier do not instantiate the direct reflexive
situation type, but the middle situation type.

Summing up, the direct reflexive situation in Polish is coded in two
ways: the nominal reflexive and the relational reflexive, which allow the
speaker to impose a different construal on a reflexive situation. The nomi-
nal reflexive marker *siebie* profiles a thing, a participant of the event.
Thus, constructions with *siebie* allow a higher level of relative elaboration
of the event. The participant of the event is divided into two subparts
corresponding to the trajector and landmark of the relation, which are
syntactically represented as the sentence subject and the reflexive pronoun
in the direct object position. Consequently, the participant of the event
coded by the construction with *siebie* is construed as intentionally initia-
ting an action directed at himself.

The relational reflexive *się* differs from the nominal reflexive both in
the profile and in relative elaboration of the event. First of all, the con-
struction with *się* imposes a processual profile on the situation it codes.
The trajector and landmark of the relation are conflated in the single
undifferentiated participant, which is construed as affected by the event.

The level of elaboration of the event is consequently lower. Secondly, the construction is neutral with respect to intentionality of the action it profiles. Consequently, the relational reflexive construction is conceptually simpler than the nominal reflexive construction and as such is more often selected to code the direct reflexive situation type.

References

Bogusławski A. (1977), „Polskie się – słowo nie do końca poznane", *International Review of Slavic Lingustics*, vol. 2 no. 1, 99–124.

Drogosz A. (2002), *Reflexivization Phenomena in English and Polish. A Cognitive Grammar Perspective*. Unpublished Ph. D dissertation. Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Lublin.

Faltz L. (1977/1985), *Reflexivization. A Study in Universal Syntax*, New York: Garland.

Givón T. (1984), *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction*, vol. I. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Grzegorczykowa R., R. Laskowski and H. Wrobel (eds.) (1984), *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia*, Warszawa: PWN.

Hopper P. and S. Thompson (1980), 'Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse', *Language* 56: 251–99.

Langacker R. (1987), *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, vol. 1: *Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Langacker R. (1991), *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, vol. 2: *Descriptive Application*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Kemmer S. (1997), *Middle Voice*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Saloni Z. (1975), „W sprawie języka", *Język Polski* LXV: 9–23.

Szymańska I. (2000), *A Construction Grammar Account of the Reflexive się in Polish*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Uniwersytet Warszawski.

Talmy L. (1972), *Semantic Structures in English and Atsugewi*. Ph.D. diss. Berkeley: University of California.

Talmy L. (1985), „Force dynamics in language and thoughts". *Papers from the Parasession on Causatives and Agentivity*. CSL 21/2.

Waltereit R. (2000), 'What it means to deceive yourself: The semantic relation of French reflexive verbs and their corresponding transitive verbs'. In Z. Frajzyngier and T. Curl. (eds.) *Reflexives. Forms and Functions*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wilczewska K. (1966), *Czasowniki zwrotne we współczesnej polszczyźnie*, Toruń: Towarzystwo Nauk w Toruniu.

Summary

The article discusses reflexivity as a departure from the canonical event model and examines the distinction between two Polish markers of reflexivity: *siebie* and *się*. Both these markers code the direct reflexive situation type but semantically and syntactically they are not always interchangeable. This distinction is explained within Langacker's Cognitive Grammar framework and attributed to the difference in profile, trajector/landmark alignment and construal that these markers impose on a given situation. The article suggests that *siebie* functions as a nominal reflexive marker, which profiles a thing, and in a reflexive construction stands as the landmark of a relation. Thus *siebie* imposes the construal of volitionality and contrastiveness, and syntactically, it is obligatory as a prepositional complement and after verbs of perception. *Się* is a relational reflexive, and as such it profiles a relation, and specifies the identity of trajector and landmark of a relation, which become conflated in the single participant, i.e. the referent of the sentence subject. Consequently, the *się*-constructions are neutral with respect to intentionality of the profiled action, and conceptually simpler than *siebie*-constructions, which accounts for their higher frequency of occurrence.