REFLEXIVITY IN ENGLISH AND LITHUANIAN

E. GENIUŠIENĖ

1. This paper will concern itself with the units "verb + self-pronoun" in English, e. g., *wash oneself, cover oneself*[1], and their Lithuanian counterparts: a) reflexive verbs, i. e. verbs with the affix *-s/-si-*, e. g., *prausti-s, rengti-s*, and b) units "verb + save", e. g., *gerbti save, raminti save*. It follows that Lithuanian possesses two reflexive markers as compared to English.

Units with a reflexive marker of either kind, i. e. a reflexive pronoun or an affix, may be called formal reflexives. These are usually derived from and semantically related to formal non-reflexives, cf. *hurt→hurt oneself, prausti→prausti*s.

2. The term "reflexivity" is, at least, ambiguous. Usually, it covers two notions, formal reflexivity which is defined above as the presence of a reflexive marker in a unit and semantic reflexivity which may be defined as referential identity of the subject and object of a transitive action, as in (1) *John washed himself*, the latter being formally and semantically derived from (2) *John washed the child*. The reflexive markers are primarily a means of overt marking of semantic reflexivity, though they have developed quite a number of other functions in both languages. Such units as *wash oneself, rengtis, gerbti save* are reflexive both formally and semantically.

3. Semantic reflexives fall into two subclasses: 1) reflexives with complete referential identity of the subject and object, these being derived from non-reflexives denoting a transitive action whose subject and object refer to persons as in sentence (2), cf. also (3) *The mother covered the child with a blanket* → (4) *The mother covered herself with a blanket*, (5) *Jonas privertė mane dirbti* → (6) *Jonas prisivertė dirbti*; these reflexives may be called s e m a n t i c r e f l e x i v e s p r o p e r; 2) reflexives with partial co-reference of the subject and object: they denote an action of the subject upon itself, too, but the immediate object of the action is a part of the subject; this kind of semantic reflexives are derived from formal non-reflexives denoting a transitive action of the subject that refers to a person upon an object which is referentially either a part of the body (hand, head, heart, hair, bowels, etc.) or an inalienable property (mind, thoughts, strength, attention, etc.) of the subject. It follows that the corresponding formal non-reflexives are reflexive semantically, too, and they are denotationally synonymous with their derivatives, cf. (7) *John hurt his finger* ⇒ (8) *John hurt himself*, (9) *Jonas užmerkė akis* ⇒ (10) *Jonas užsimerkė*; both the formal non-reflexive and its reflexive derivative are surface representations of the same deep structure.

---

[1] The status of these units has been a matter of considerable controversy. They are considered either as verbal constructions with a reflexive pronoun or as reflexive verbs. Avoiding this controversial issue as irrelevant for the purposes of the present paper, we shall apply the term "reflexive units" to them.

In English, partial co-reference of the subject and object, in case the object refers to a part of the body of the subject, is commonly expressed by formal non-reflexives, reflexive derivatives being ungrammatical, cf. *shut one's eyes* ⇒ **shut oneself* (cf. Lith. *užmerkti akis* ⇒ *užsimerkti*), *powder one's face* ⇒ **powder oneself* (cf. Lith. *pudruoti veidą* ⇒ *pudruotis*). Very few of them can produce synonymous formal reflexives, e. g., *scratch one's back/leg* ⇒ *scratch oneself, relieve one's bladder/ /bowels* ⇒ *relieve oneself*. In case the object refers to an inalienable property of the subject, non-reflexives produce formally reflexive units with greater freedom, cf. *compose one's passions/thoughts* ⇒ *compose oneself, exhaust one's strength* ⇒ *exhaust oneself, hold in one's temper* ⇒ *hold in oneself, fuddle one's brain with gin* ⇒ *fuddle oneself with gin*, etc.

In Lithuanian, partial co-reference of the subject and object, whatever the type of the object (either a part of the body or some inalienable property of the subject), is expressed both by non-reflexives and formal reflexives, cf. *sučiaupti lūpas* ⇒ *susičiaupti, atlošti galvą* ⇒ *atsilošti, išžergti kojas* ⇒ *išsižergti, kasyti nugarą/koją* ⇒ *kasytis; tvardyti jausmus* ⇒ *tvardytis, sukaupti dėmesį* ⇒ *susikaupti*, etc. It is the morpheme *-s/-si-* alone, and not the pronoun *save*, that is employed to mark this kind of semantic reflexivity, though both of them are used to mark semantic reflexivity proper, cf. *prisiversti* and *versti save*.

4. As has been mentioned above, the reflexive markers in both languages are polyfunctional, and formal reflexives are far from being a semantically homogeneous class of verbs. Actually, semantic reflexives make up rather a small part of formal reflexives, about 15 per cent of reflexive units entered in the "Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English" by A. S. Hornby et al., and about 7 per cent of reflexive verbs in the „Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas" (1971).

For formal reflexives that do not denote semantic reflexivity the term "pseudo-reflexives" has been suggested[2]. The following oppositions provide examples of pseudo-reflexives: (11) *John suggested an idea to me* → (12) *An idea suggested itself to me*; (13) *John showed his annoyance* → (14) *John's annoyance showed itself in his looks*; (15) *Jonas uždegė šviesą* → (16) *Šviesa užsidegė*; (17) *Mes kuriame naują miestą* → (18) *Kuriasi naujas miestas*. In these instances both the syntactic and semantic structure changes in the reflexive derivatives; the non-reflexives are causative semantically while the derivatives may be roughly described as decausative in meaning and, consequently, they are not semantic reflexives.

There are many formal reflexives in both languages whose syntactic opposition with non-reflexives seems structurally identical to that of semantic reflexives and their non-reflexive counterparts, but a radical change of meaning accompanies the derivation of the reflexives, cf. (19) *I found John in the garden* → (20) *I found myself in the garden*. A similar change of meaning in a reflexive may be based on metaphor, cf. *pat smb. on the back* → *pat oneself on the back* 'be pleased with oneself, express approval of oneself'; *push smb.* → *push oneself* 'try to attract attention, impose oneself upon others'. In other instances yet the nature of the action changes referentially and a reflexive denotes an intransitive action with a subject alone, while the corresponding non-reflexive denotes a transitive action, cf. (21) *John threw his coat on the sofa* → (22) *John threw himself on the sofa* and (23) *Jo-*

² R. Channon. "Pseudo-Reflexive" Verbs in Russian. — In: Slavic Transformational Syntax. Michigan Slavic Materials No 10. Ann Arbor, 1974, p. 66—77.

nas paslėpė daiktus spintoje → (24) *Jonas pasislėpė spintoje.* Because of their semantic intransitivity, such formal reflexives as *throw oneself, fling oneself, pasislėpti, spraustis*, etc. are not reflexive semantically, either.

5. As has been made clear above, formal and semantic reflexivity may be related in three ways:

1) a unit is reflexive both formally and semantically — this is explicit reflexivity.

2) A unit is reflexive formally and non-reflexive semantically — this is pseudoreflexivity.

3) A unit is reflexive semantically and non-reflexive formally. Here belong two kinds of verbs: a) in both languages one can find semantic reflexives like *shut one's eyes, užmerkti akis, hurt one's finger*, etc.; b) in English there are a few cases of the so-called implicit reflexivity, e. g., the verb *dress* in the sentence (25) *John dressed quickly and left* has the meaning 'dress oneself'[3]. Implicit reflexives are doublets of explicit reflexives with high frequency and may be considered secondary to them in the sense that no implicit reflexives exist without explicit reflexives, cf. *dress oneself* ⇒ *dress, undress oneself* ⇒ *undress, wash oneself* ⇒ *wash, bathe oneself* ⇒ *bathe, shave oneself* ⇒ *shave*. Of the two doublets the explicit reflexive seems to be more frequently used than the corresponding implicit reflexive, with the exception of *shave*. The explicit and implicit reflexives may differ slightly in connotations: the former may be more descriptive or indicate a more intentional action[4]. Less difference is to be found between *wash oneself, bathe oneself* and *shave oneself*, on the one hand, and *wash, bathe* and *shave* in the same meaning, on the other; they are usually interchangeable and either of the two verbs may be preferred for euphony. Greater difference is to be found between *dress oneself* and implicitly reflexive *dress*, the latter being used in the senses 'wear clothes', 'change': (26) *Mary dresses plainly*, (27) *John never dresses for dinner*; the explicit reflexive alone is used to denote the ability to perform the action: (28) *The child is old enough to dress himself.* In unambiguous contexts other reflexives may lose the reflexive marker, e. g., (29) *I see him shaving before a cracked mirror, ... at all moments brushing, cleaning, washing, polishing, so that he may go smart, as a soldier should*[5].

6. In English, rather a limited number of semantic reflexives proper is entered in dictionaries — these might be called "fixed" reflexives. Lithuanian counterparts of English "fixed" reflexives are usually reflexive verbs, cf. *kill oneself — nusižudyti, dress oneself — rengtis, cover oneself — užsikloti*, etc. An extralinguistic phenomenon of typological significance underlies this fact: the range of actions that frequently happen to be reflexive in reality is roughly the same for both languages, and they have developed special means to denote such actions, i. e. "fixed" reflexives in English and reflexive verbs in Lithuanian.

On the other hand, the self-pronoun in English can be freely added to many verbs taking an object that refers to a person (on condition that the subject refers to a person, too) if necessity calls for it — such "occasional" reflexive units occur rather frequently in texts. Lithuanian counterparts of English "occasional" reflexives are

---

    [3] See, for instance, J. Lyons. Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics. Cambridge University Press, 1968, p. 362—363.
    [4] K. Schibsbye. A Modern English Grammar. London, Oxford University Press, 1965, p. 198.
    [5] The example is borrowed from K. Schibsbye, op. cit., p. 199.

usually units "verb + save", cf. *see oneself (in a mirror) — matyti save (veidrodyje), convince oneself — įtikinti save, call oneself — vadinti save, study oneself — apžiūrinėti save, soothe oneself — raminti save*; one should keep in mind that Lithuanian reflexive verbs parallel to some of these units, cf. *įsitikinti, matytis, vadintis*, possess a different meaning and are not semantic reflexives, therefore they are not to be taken into consideration.

Vilniaus V. Kapsuko universitetas
Anglų filologijos katedra

РЕФЛЕКСИВНОСТЬ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И ЛИТОВСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Е. ГЕНЮШЕНЕ

Резюме

Рассматриваются формальная и смысловая рефлексивность и три типа их соотношения в английском и литовском языках. Различаются два класса смысловых рефлексивов: рефлексивы, у которых объект действия полностью однореферентен с субъектом действия, и рефлексивы, у которых объектом действия на референтном уровне является часть субъекта. Английские рефлексивы делятся на „фиксированные" и „окказиональные"; в заключение рассматриваются их литовские эквиваленты.