

AXEL HOLVOET

Vilnius University
Institute for the Languages and Cultures of the Baltic

ORCID: 0000-0003-1744-5893

Demetonymised Reflexives in Polish

Abstract: The article deals with Polish reflexive constructions in which an object remaining implicit in the non-expanded reflexive construction as being metonymically coreferential with the subject (as in *tłumaczyć się* ‘explain oneself’ for *tłumaczyć swoje decyzje* ‘explain one’s decisions’ and the like) is reintroduced as an oblique argument, as in *tłumaczyć się ze swoich decyzji* ‘explain one’s decisions’. Such constructions have been characterised as antipassive. It is argued here that they can be explained as a minor, lexically restricted construction in the domain of the reflexive. The originally metonymic character of reflexivity being reinterpreted as affectedness of the subject-agent, the original object can be reintroduced as an oblique argument. The construction is thus unrelated to the antipassive.

Key words: Polish; reflexive; metonymy; antipassive

1. Introduction*

The object of this article is a certain type of reflexive constructions exemplified in (3) below. Examples (1) and (2) are given in order to provide a grammatical background against which to evaluate the construction in (3):

* I am obliged to two anonymous reviewers for their insightful and constructive comments. For any remaining shortcomings of the article I am solely responsible.

- (1) *Wszyscy deklarują chęć pomocy*
 all.NOM.VIR.PL declare.PRS.3PL willingness.ACC.SG help.GEN
i na słowach się kończy.
 and on word.LOC.PL REFL end.PRS.3SG

‘Everybody declares willingness to help and then it remains just words.’ (NKJP)

- (2) [Zgodnie „z sugestią” Zarządu Krajowego partii]

kandydaci na barona mieli się
 candidate.NOM.PL for baron.ACC.SG be.to.PST.VIR.PL REFL
zadeklarować na dwa tygodnie przed godziną „0”.
 declare.INF for two.ACC.M week.ACC.PL before hour.ACC.SG

‘[At the ‘suggestion’ of the party’s national board] candidates for the leadership were to declare themselves two weeks before hour zero.’ (NKJP)

- (3) *Mieszkańcy Długoszyna deklarują się*
 inhabitant.NOM.PL D.GEN declare.PRS.3PL REFL
z chęcią ponoszenia kosztów na szkołę [...]
 with willingness.INS bear.NMLZ expense.GEN.PL for school.ACC.SG

‘The inhabitants of Długoszyn declare their willingness to bear the expenses for a school...’ (NKJP)

The construction in (2), as compared to (1), is a metonymic reflexive: ‘declare oneself’ stands for ‘declare one’s intentions, one’s willingness to do something’ etc. A person’s intentions stand metonymically for the person itself. Sentence (3) retains the reflexive form appearing in (2), but the argument that is implicit in (2) (the subject’s intentions, willingness etc.) is reintroduced in the form of an oblique argument, so that the effect of metonymy

is cancelled. Such constructions, which I will discuss in more detail in this article, could be referred to as ‘demetonymised’: a construction with a reflexive marker standing, on the basis of metonymy, for an implicit argument belonging to the subject’s personal sphere in (2) is expanded in (3) through reintroduction of the argument metonymically represented by the reflexive marker in (2). By no means every language having reflexive pronouns and markers has reflexive constructions of the type illustrated in (3); in English, for instance, the translations of (1) and (3) will be exactly the same. Still, counterparts can be found in other languages, e.g., in Romance. This article is meant as a contribution to a better understanding of this demetonymised construction.

The structure of the article is as follows. In section 2 I attempt to characterize the demetonymised reflexive construction against the background of voice typology, arguing that the construction in (3) is properly reflexive rather than antipassive, as has been proposed in the literature. Section 3 is descriptive in character and deals with the subtypes of the construction and instances of variation. In section 4 I attempt to formulate the common constructional feature uniting the subtypes discussed in (3). Section 5 contains some brief conclusions.

2. Reflexive, not antipassive

Constructions as in (3) have been characterized as antipassive by Janic (2013), an analysis that seems to have gained broader recognition as a construction of this type is also given as an example of an antipassive in Zuñiga and Kittilä (2019: 105). Examples (4) and (5) are taken (in a slightly shortened form) from Janic (2013: 349), while (6) is added by me for the sake of completeness:

- (4) *Elle a refusé de confesser ses*
 she has refuse.PTCP.PASS.M.SG of confess.INF 3POSS.PL
péchés.
 sin.PL

‘She refused to confess her sins.’

- (5) *Elle a refusé de se confesser de*
 she has refuse.PTCP.PASS.M.SG of REFL confess.INF od
ses péchés.
 3POSS.PL sin.PL

‘She refused to confess her sins.’

- (6) *Elle a refusé de se confesser.*
 she has refuse.PTCP.PASS.M.SG of REFL confess.INF

‘She refused to confess [have her confession heard].’

The addition of (6) seems required because of the way antipassives are usually defined, cf. Polinsky (2017: 308):

Antipassives are constructions in which the logical object of a transitive (two-place) predicate is not realized as a direct object, but instead appears as a non-core argument or left unexpressed (but presupposed).

This definition suggests that both (5) and (6) must be antipassive. This, however, is not obvious as (6) can also be interpreted as a classical reflexive construction. In order to make this clear let us take the example of *explain oneself*:

- (7) *He had to explain his motives to the police.*
 (8) *He had to explain himself to the police.*

An analogous example could also be provided for French, though Janic does not have this particular verb among her examples:

- (9) *Il dut expliquer ses motifs devant*
 he have.to.PRET.3SG explain.INF 3POSS.PL motive.PL before
la police.
 DEF police

‘He had to explain his motives to the police.’

- (10) *Il dut s'expliquer devant la police.*
 he have.to.PRET.3SG REFL explain.INF before DEF police

'He had to explain himself to the police.'

As the relationship between (9) and (10) is analogous to that between (4) and (6) (where the 'presupposed object' is the subject's sins), we would have to regard (10) as antipassive. This interpretation is, however, not available for the English example in (8), as (8) contains an overt object. Let us recall that in an antipassive construction, according to the definitions, the logical object is either oblique or zero. In (8) it cannot be zero because English *himself* is not a grammatical marker but a pronoun occupying a syntactic argument position. The interpretation of (8) can therefore only be reflexive, not antipassive. How does this affect our interpretation of (10)? The case is more complicated as French *se* can be either a pronoun occupying an argument position, or a grammatical marker. The same holds for Polish *się*. In (11), *się* is a syntactic argument (and can be replaced with the orthotonic form *siebie*), whereas in (12) it is a grammatical (anticausative) marker:

- (11) *Zobaczyła się w lustrze.*
 see.PST.F.SG[3] REFL in mirror.LOC.SG

'She saw herself in the mirror.'

- (12) *Lustro się stukło.*
 mirror.NOM.SG REFL break.PST.N.SG

'The mirror broke.'

In principle, therefore, (10) is, unlike (8), susceptible both of a reflexive and an antipassive interpretation. But the situation concerning (8) is undoubtedly relevant to our interpretation of (10). If (8) is a reflexive construction, and the logical object is the subject's motives, behaviour, intentions etc, this means that with the verb *explain* the subject's motives, behaviour, intentions etc. stand metonymically for the subject itself. There is nothing surprising in this. More often than not, reflexives involve metonymy. Consider a more prototypical example of a reflexive construction in (13):

- | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| (13) <i>Zapiął</i> | <i>się</i> | <i>pod</i> | <i>szyję.</i> |
| button.up.PST.M.SG[3] | REFL | under | neck.ACC |

‘He buttoned himself up to the neck.’

What is buttoned up here is a shirt, coat etc., these pieces of clothing standing metonymically for the whole person. This metonymical shift is licensed by the fact that items of clothing are those attributes that may stand for the whole person with regard to the action of buttoning, just as hair may stand for the whole person with regard to the action of combing (Polish *uczesać się* alongside *uczesać włosy* ‘comb one’s hair’), etc. Other, immaterial manifestations of a person’s mental or social existence may also stand metonymically for the whole person, as in *explain oneself* = *explain one’s motives*, *declare oneself* = *declare one’s intentions*, etc.

The grammatical status of the reflexive being well established, and the ubiquity of metonymy in the reflexive domain being undeniable, the burden of proof should be on the side of those who would claim that (10) is antipassive rather than reflexive, all the more so as the English counterpart in (8) is, for syntactic reasons, not susceptible of an antipassive interpretation.

Of course, it is undeniable that Polish does have antipassive reflexives. A classic example would be the construction in (14), well known from kindergarten parlance:

- | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------|-----------|------------|---------------|
| (14) <i>Proszę</i> | <i>pani,</i> | <i>on</i> | <i>się</i> | <i>kopie!</i> |
| beg.PRS.1SG | Miss.GEN.SG | he.NOM | REFL | kick.PRS.3SG |

‘Miss, he’s kicking!’

Here it is clear that the implicit object refers to other children, and a reflexive reading, metonymic or not, does not apply. The subject and the implicit potential object are conceptually clearly distinct entities between which there is no metonymical relation.

A metonymic reflexive may develop into an antipassive when the condition to the effect that the implicit object must belong to the subject’s personal sphere is relaxed (Holvoet 2020: 64, Creissels, to appear). The following example is from Latvian, a language where reflexives with an antipassive function are highly productive:

(15) Latvian (Augusts Saulietis, cited from Holvoet 2020: 62))

<i>Mizas</i>	<i>māte</i>	<i>sēdēja</i>	<i>pie</i>	<i>maza</i>
M.GEN.SG	mother.NOM.SG	sit.PST.3	at	small.GEN.SG.M
<i>galdiņa...</i>	<i>un</i>	<i>lāpījā-s.</i>		
table.DIM.GEN.SG	and	mend.PST.3-RFL		

‘Mother Miza was sitting at a little table and doing her mending.’

As long as the use of the construction with *lāpītie-s* ‘do one’s mending’ is constrained by a condition to the effect that the implicit object (clothes) must be the agent’s own, the construction must be interpreted as a metonymic reflexive. When this condition is relaxed, the construction effectively becomes antipassive. It may still be the case that the clothes belong to the subject, but this is now irrelevant.

In view of the objections against regarding (10) as an antipassive construction (the evidence of English has unfortunately been overlooked here), questions arise as to the nature of the expanded construction with an oblique argument:

(16) <i>L'</i>	<i>armée</i>	<i>française</i>	<i>va</i>	<i>devoir</i>
DEF	army	French.F.SG	be.going.to.PRS.3SG	have.to.INF
<i>s'</i>	<i>expliquer</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>ses</i>	<i>actes [...]</i>
REFL	explain.INF	of	3POSS.PL	act.PL

‘The French army will have to provide an explanation for its actions [...].’

<https://www.fidh.org/fr/regions/europe-asie-centrale/france/15790-63-migrants-morts-en-mediterranee-l-armee-francaise-va-devoir-s-expliquer> (accessed 10 06 2024)

I assume that such constructions are not antipassive. One motive for this was already given: the antipassive interpretation would entail an antipassive interpretation of (10) as well, which seems unlikely. Secondly, the classification of constructions like (10) as antipassive rests exclusively on a formal criterion – formal marking on the verb and realisation of the original

object as an oblique argument. But research has also brought to light certain functional properties of antipassives that need to be incorporated into their definition if it is to be of any use. Though far from new, Cooreman's 1994 definition is perhaps still the best:

The antipassive which is used for semantic /pragmatic reasons is best described as indicating a certain degree of difficulty with which an effect stemming from an action by A on an identifiable O can be recognized. (Cooreman 1994: 67)

This definition subsumes two subtypes of antipassives—those marking affectedness and those marking lower individuation (described as distinct antipassive constructions by Vigus 2018). Neither of these features applies to constructions like (10). On the one hand, verbs like 'explain', 'declare' or 'confess' refer to mental acts and the notion of affectedness does not apply to their objects; on the other hand, it is hard to see how the oblique arguments in (3), (5) or (16) could reflect lower individuation when compared to the transitive constructions.

My assumption will therefore be that these constructions are reflexive, just as the corresponding constructions not expanded with oblique arguments. Indeed it seems that the existence of the non-expanded variety is a precondition for the rise of the expanded one. Before the implicit object can be reintroduced in the form of an oblique argument, it must first be ousted from its original status as a direct object, which is done by a syntactic operation of reflexivisation.

3. The micro-constructions

The construction under discussion here has three subtypes distinguished by the marking patterns for the oblique argument.

Let us start with the subtype illustrated in (3). The oblique argument is encoded by means of the proposition *z* and the instrumental case. The general meaning of the verbs occurring in this type could be formulated as 'divulgence' – they refer to an act of intentionally or unintentionally making something public. The verbs are *zdradzić* 'betray', *wydać* 'betray, blurt out', *zadeklarować* 'declare' and a few others.

- (17) *Jedna osoba zdradziła się z – niezbyt*
 one.NOM.F.SG person.NOM.SG betray.PST.F.SG[3] REFL with none.too

precyzyjną – wiedzę na temat biografii
 accurate.INS.SG.F knowledge.INS on topic.ACC.SG biography.GEN

Hłaski.

H.GEN

‘One person betrayed some – none too accurate – knowledge of Hłasko’s biography.’ (NKJP)

The second type has an oblique argument introduced by *z* ‘of, from’ with the genitive. It was already noted by Wilczewska (1966: 43), who formulates the general meaning as ‘externalization of a person’s inner states’. A canonical example would be *zверить się* ‘confide’:

- (18) Diderot [...] *zwierzył swój sekret.*
 D. confide.PST.M.SG[3] RPOSS.ACC.SG.M secret.ACC.SG

przyjacielowi

friend.DAT.SG

‘Diderot confided his secret to a friend.’

https://pl.wikisource.org/wiki/Strona:PL_Chamfort_-_Charaktery_i_anegdoty.djvu/068

- (19) [*Myślę, że tęsknił, ale mnie niczego nie mówił.*]

Może zwierzył się mamie.
 perhaps confide.PST.M.SG[3] REFL mum.DAT

‘[I think he was nostalgic, but he said nothing.] Perhaps he confided in his mother.’ (NKJP)

(20) [*Chciał iść do gimnazjum i*]

<i>w</i>	<i>końcu</i>	<i>zwierzył</i>	<i>się</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>tego</i>	<i>ojcu.</i>
in	end.LOC.SG	confide.PST.M.SG[3]	REFL	of	this.GEN	father.DAT

‘[He wanted to go to grammar school and] finally confided this to his father.’ (NKJP, *Gazeta Wyborcza* 1997)

While the construction with an oblique argument is strongly entrenched with *zверить*, Wilczewska (1966: 43) cites several examples where the expansion of the reflexive verbs with an oblique argument is apparently an occasionalism:

(21)	<i>Piję,</i>	<i>żeby</i>	<i>się</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>nerwów</i>	<i>wyładować.</i>
	drink.PRS.1SG	in.order.to	REFL	of	nerve.GEN.PL	unload.INF

‘I drink in order to unload myself of my nerves.’

(22) [*Człowiek ma myśli ukryte,*]

<i>rzadko</i>	<i>wypowiada</i>	<i>się</i>	<i>ze</i>	<i>złych.</i>
rarely	utter.PRS.3SG	REFL	of	evil.GEN.PL

‘[A man has hidden thoughts and] seldom delivers himself of them.’

These occasionalisms are interesting in that they show a certain productivity of the construction.

One and the same verb can sometimes oscillate between two subtypes as it is susceptible of more than one conceptualization. This is observed, e.g., with the verb *zверить się* ‘confide’, which can belong to the ‘externalisation’ or the ‘divulgateion’ type. An example of the genitive construction was cited above. Here is one with the instrumental:

- (23) [*Łukasinski wysłuchał uważnie Kosińskiego, a gdy ten skończył,*]

<i>zwierzył</i>	<i>się</i>	<i>ze</i>	<i>swoimi</i>	<i>zamyśłami.</i>
confide.PST.M.SG[3]	REFL	with	RPOSS.INS.PL	plan.INS.PL

‘[Łukasinski attentively heard out Kosiński and when the latter had finished,] he confided his plans to him.’ (NKJP, Wacław Gąsiorowski, 2001)

The third group is probably the smallest—I am actually aware only of one single verb representing the pattern: it is the verb *wykazać* ‘demonstrate, display’, but there might be more. The reflexive *wykazać się*, in absolute use, means something like ‘demonstrate one’s positive qualities’, hence ‘prove one’s worth, make one’s mark’. It may be expanded with a prepositionless instrumental:

- (24) *Zresztą oficer w istocie wykazał*
 besides officer.NOM.SG in essence.LOC.SG demonstrate.PST.M.SG[3]

roztropność, [...]
 prudence.ACC.SG

‘Besides, the officer essentially gave proof of prudence.’ (Arkady Fiedler, NKJP)

- (25) [...] *w sprawie motywu policjanci*
 in matter.LOC.SG motive.GEN.SG policeman.NOM.PL

<i>wykazali</i>	<i>się</i>	<i>roztropnością,</i>
demonstrate.PST.VIR.PL[3]	REFL	prudence.INS.SG

‘[...] at least in establishing the motive the police demonstrated prudence.’ (Monika Piątkowska, NKJP)

A special case that deserves to be discussed in more detail is that of *spowiadać (się)*, perfective *wy-spowiadać (się)* ‘confess’. It is the counterpart of French (*se*) *confesser* illustrated in (4)–(6) above. As in other cases, the demetonymised construction can be defined here on the basis of series of interrelated constructions as illustrated in (1)–(3), but the series now shows a gap. We find the reflexive construction and an expanded variety with an oblique argument analogous to (2) and (3) above:

- (26) [...] *ksiądz* *był* *zajęty* *i* *nie*
 priest.NOM.SG be.PST.M.SG busy.NOM.SG.M and NEG
- zdążyłam* *się* *wyspowiadać.*
 have.time.PST.F.SG REFL confess.INF

‘The priest was busy and I didn’t have time to have my confession heard.’ (Artur Baniewicz, NKJP)

- (27) *Czy gotów* *jesteś,* *synu,* *wyspowiadać się*
 Q willing.NOM.SG.M be.PRS.2SG son.VOC.SG confess.INF REFL
- ze wszystkich swych* *grzechów* *wobec Partii?*
 of all.GEN.PL RPOSS.GEN.PL sin.GEN.PL against Party.GEN.SG

‘Are you prepared, my son, to confess all your sins against the Party?’ (Adam Czerniawski, NKJP)

In order to understand the status of (26) as an originally metonymic reflexive we must take into account the Old Polish construction in (28):

- (28) *nygdy=m* *svych* *grzechow* *spravedlive* *ne* *spovedal*
 never=1SG RPO.GEN.PL sin.GEN.PL properly NEG confess.PST.M.SG

‘I have never properly confessed my sins.’

Skarga umierającego, Wrocław copy, 23. Cited from *Słownik staropolski* viii, 358

This valency pattern of the verb *(wy)spowiadać* has fallen into disuse in modern Polish,¹ and the verb can now, in its non-reflexive variety, only take an animate object encoding the penitent in an act of confession:

(29) [*Był u żony parafianina dwa dni temu z ostatnią posługą,*]

<i>wyspowiadał</i>	<i>ją,</i>	<i>namaścił,</i>	<i>dał</i>
confess.PST.M.SG[3]	her.ACC	anoint.PST.M.SG[3]	give.PST.M.SG[3]

wiatyk.

viaticum.ACC.SG

‘[He visited a parishioner’s wife two days ago to perform the last rites.] He confessed her, anointed her and gave her the viaticum.’
(Wojciech Żukrowski, NKJP)

The fact that the Old Polish construction in (28) went out of use almost completely while French retained both uses (cf. French *confesser ses péchés* ‘confess one’s sins’ and *confesser un pénitent* ‘confess a penitent’) is an accidental development, but the shift from the structure in (28) to that in (29) is significant and will be discussed further on.

4. Semantics

Is there a general constructional meaning associated with a macro-construction subsuming the three micro-constructions mentioned in Section 3? The semantic characterizations offered above for the individual subtypes are basically generalizations over the lexical meanings of the verbs occurring in the constructions involved; for the construction with *wykazać* it is the meaning of one single verb that is involved. There is apparently little point in attempting to formulate a more abstract meaning that would subsume the

¹ A reviewer kindly points out that the perfective *wyspowiadać* is still acceptable in colloquial Polish with the object *swoje grzechy* ‘one’s sins’. Doroszewski’s dictionary (1968–1969) marks this use as obsolete, while more recent dictionaries do not list it at all. Why this construction is not available with the imperfective *spowiadać* is not clear.

more specific meanings associated with the subtypes, which are just generalized lexical meanings. What we can say about the semantic features of all the subtypes involved is that they emphasise the way the subject's situation is affected by the event denoted by the verb. Indeed, when the metonymic reflexive construction is expanded and the implicit object is made explicit, the metonymic character of the reflexive marking obviously disappears: the object cannot at the same time be implicit (in the reflexive marker) and explicit. To be more precise, the metonymic character must disappear before the expansion becomes possible, and the effect of the reflexive marking must shift to that of marking a change in the situation of the subject as a mental or social entity as a result of the event involving their intentions, emotions etc. How can this claim be substantiated?

It seems that shifts in selectional properties with regard to the object might be an objectively verifiable manifestation of this. Polish *spowiadać* originally referred to verbal enumeration of sins, as clearly suggested by its origin as a *verbum dicendi* (IPFV *powiadać*, PFV *powiedzieć* 'say'); in the next stage the reflexive marking shifted to the person affected by this enumeration, which is primarily (due to the reflexive character of the verb) the subject themselves, but can, through a derivational process of dereflexivisation (a kind of back-formation), be another person, hence French *confesser un pénitent*, Polish *spowiadać penitenta* (now the only meaning in modern Polish). The shift from Old Polish *spowiadać grzechy* 'confess one's sins' to *spowiadać penitenta* 'confess a penitent' is most straightforwardly explained through a shift in the interpretation of reflexivity in the reflexive *spowiadać się*; it is hard to think of an alternative explanation. The rise and entrenchment of the dereflexivised *wyspowiadać* can, of course, be explained by the institutionalisation of the priest's role in conducting the process of confession. But a similar process of dereflexivisation, with retention of the oblique object, can occasionally be observed with a verb like *wytłumaczyć* 'explain':

(30) [*Myślicie, że w ten sposób gwiazdor Katalończyków*]

<i>postanowił</i>	<i>wytłumaczyć</i>	<i>siebie</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>swój</i>	<i>zespół</i>
decide.PST.M.SG	explain.INF	REFL	and	RPOSS.ACC.SG.M	team.
					ACC.SG

z tak nieoczekiwanego wyniku ostatniego spotkania?
 of so unexpected.GEN.SG.M result.GEN.SG last.GEN.SG.M match.GEN.SG

<https://przegladSPORTOWY.onet.pl/ofsajd/faceci/lionel-messi-postanowil-sie-usprawiedliwic/eemymrs>

‘[Do you think it’s in this way that Catalonia’s star player] had decided to explain his and his team’s unexpected recent match outcome?’

An interesting feature of this last example is the use of the orthotonic form *siebie*, induced by coordination (‘himself and his team’). Just like English *himself* in (8), *siebie* is a reflexive pronoun occupying a syntactic object position, and therefore provides damning evidence against an antipassive interpretation of (10).

The dereflexivised construction *wytłumaczyć kogo z czego* seems to be isolated, and there seem to be no analogous constructions of the type **zwierzyć kogo z czego*, **zadeklarować kogo z czym* etc. Yet a semantic shift analogous to that which underlies the dereflexivisation in *spowiadać kogoś* ‘confess somebody’ is betrayed by the constructions expanded with oblique noun phrases. To recapitulate, the stages are as follows:

- (i) transitive construction with an object belonging to the personal sphere of the subject – the subject’s intentions, thoughts, motives, decisions etc. (OP *wyspowiadał grzechy*);
- (ii) metonymic reflexivisation, in which the subject’s intentions, thoughts, motives, decisions etc. stand for the whole subject (*wyspowiadał się*);
- (iii) semantic shift in which the metonymic reflexive relationship is reinterpreted as a reflexive relationship involving the subject as a mental entity (at this stage the reflexive verb may become the basis for a new transitive *wyspowiadał penitenta*);
- (iv) reintroduction of the original object as an oblique argument (*wyspowiadał się z grzechów*).

5. In conclusion

The demetonymised reflexive construction is, as we have seen, quite small and quite restricted lexically. The constructional meanings we could associate with its subtypes are little more than generalizations over the lexical meanings involved. However, in view of the fact that we can discern a more abstract pattern behind the three individual subtypes we are, perhaps, justified in singling it out as a minor voice construction. In fact, the constructions involved already figure in the literature on voice, albeit under the not quite felicitous label of antipassive. As I hope to have demonstrated, it should rather be treated as a minor constructional pattern in the domain of the reflexive proper.

Sources

NKJP – *Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego* at <https://nkjp.pl>

Słownik staropolski IJP PAN at <https://pjs.ijp.pan.pl/sstp.html>

Abbreviations

ACC – accusative, DAT – dative, DEF – definite article, DIM – diminutive, FUT – future, GEN – genitive, INF – infinitive, INS – instrumental, IPFV – imperfective, LOC – locative, NEG – negation, NMLZ – nominalization, NOM – nominative, PASS – passive, PFV – perfective, PL – plural, POSS – possessive, PRS – present, PRET – preterite (perfective past tense), PST – past, PTC – particle, PTCP – participle, Q – question marker, REFL – reflexive, RPOSS – reflexive possessive, SG – singular, VIR – virile, VOC – vocative

References

- COOREMAN A., 1994, A functional typology of antipassives, in: Barbara A. Fox & Paul J. Hopper (eds.), *Voice. Form and Function*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 49–87. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.27.05coo>.
- CREISSELS D., To appear, *Transitivity, Valency and Voice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. <http://www.deniscreissels.fr/public/Creissels-ESSLT.pdf>.
- HOLVOET A., 2020, *The Middle Voice in Baltic*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/vargreb.5>.

- JANIC K., 2013, *L'antipassif dans les langues accusatives*, Thèse de doctorat en Sciences du Langage, Université Lumière Lyon2.
- POLINSKY M., 2017, Antipassive, in: Jessica Coon, Diane Massam & Lisa deMena Travis (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ergativity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 308–331. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198739371.013.13>.
- VIGUS M., 2018, Antipassive constructions: Correlations of form and function across languages, *Linguistic Typology* 22.3, 339–384. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lingty-2018-0013>.
- WILCZEWSKA K., 1966. *Czasowniki zwrotne we współczesnej polszczyźnie*, Toruń: Towarzystwo Naukowe w Toruniu.
- ZUÑIGA F. & KITILÄ S., 2019, *Grammatical Voice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316671399>.

Odmetonimizowane konstrukcje zwrotne w języku polskim (streszczenie)

Tematem artykułu są polskie konstrukcje zwrotne, w których obiekt domyślny w nierozszerzonej konstrukcji zwrotnej jako metonimicznie koreferencyjny z podmiotem (por. *tłumaczyć się = tłumaczyć swoje decyzje* itp.) zostaje na nowo wprowadzony w postaci frazy zależnej (*tłumaczyć się ze swoich decyzji*). Takie konstrukcje są charakteryzowane w literaturze jako antypasywne. W artykule argumentuje się, że są one leksykalnie ograniczonym podtypem konstrukcji zwrotnej w sensie właściwym. W wyniku utraty metonimicznego charakteru zwrotności wykładnik zwrotny jest reinterpretowany jako kodujący oddziaływanie akcji na podmiot-agensa, wskutek czego pierwotny obiekt może być na nowo wprowadzony jako argument zależny. Ten typ konstrukcji nie jest zatem pokrewny konstrukcjom antypasywnym.

S ł o w a k l u c z e : język polski; czasowniki zwrotne; metonomia; konstrukcje antypasywne