

Functioning of the Reflexive Pronouns in the Contemporary Russian Language

Tatyana Troshkina¹ & Aida Gainutdinova¹

¹ Department of Russian Language, Preparatory School for International Students, Kazan Federal University, Russia

Correspondence: Tatyana Troshkina, Department of Russian Language, Preparatory School for International Students, Kazan Federal University, Russia. E-mail: t_troshkina@mail.ru

Received: August 27, 2014 Accepted: October 9, 2014 Online Published: December 2, 2014

doi:10.5539/ass.v11n1p22

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v11n1p22>

Abstract

Analyzed the functioning of reflexive pronouns in the modern Russian language based on a broad textual base. In particular, analysis was performed on the basis of works of Russian writers of XIX-XX centuries, newspaper and magazine articles, passages from spoken language. Identified problems of grammatical rules, their variability, which is particularly interesting in modern linguistics. Also give a more precise definition of the "norm" in linguistics, the "culture change", "culture of speech."

Keywords: reflexive pronouns, grammatical norm, Russian language, language culture, genre variety

1. Introduction

The problems of the grammatical norm, its variability and usage are of interest for studying and are included into the circle of the actual problems of the contemporary linguistics.

The term "norm" has double interpretation. Understanding the norm as a result of purposeful codification of language (narrow understanding of the norm) is connected with the literary language. Moreover, the norm is interpreted as "traditionally and spontaneously formed way of speech that differs given language idioms from other language idioms" (wide understanding of the norm). In such understanding "the norm is close to the notion of usage, i.e. generally accepted, established ways of usage of the given language" (Krysin, 2007, p. 5). The scientists specify that the norm is implementations, understood as the right and desired, while the usage is all generally accepted implementations. Thus, it is validly to consider that the usage is the language category while the norm includes psychological and social moment, connected with the perceptions of the code carriers about the right and prestige speech (Erofeeva, 2003).

The usage reflects the speech traditions of the certain language community in different situations of communication, at that the usage of the usual variants of speech promotes to the communication success that doesn't mean the indispensable observance of the prescriptions of the dictionaries and grammars. The norm is based on the usage, and tradition of the usage; it can officially legalize usage or in certain conditions reject it (Zemskaya, 2010).

The difference of the language system, norm and usage allows determination of the correlation in this triad. "The system of language is understood as an aggregate of the possible means and ways of expression, which are owned by each national language" (Krysin, 2007, p. 7). The peculiarities of the language system are considerably wider than the norm accepted in the language that limits and prohibits, while the system promotes to satisfaction of the big demands of communication. Thus, the norm opposes to the language possibilities and doesn't realize everything that the system owns. The usage (speech practice) can realize a) that is allowed by the norm; b) that is not allowed by the norm, but is allowed by the language system; c) that is not allowed by the norm and is not allowed by the language system.

It is generally known that the changes of a norm and in future a system arise from the usage. As V. V. Kolesov states "the norm is a choice of the invariant from many variants, worked out by the system in its development (Kolesov, 1989, p. 3). In the opinion of V. A. Itskovich "the norm is the language units existing in the particular time in the certain language community and obligatory for all members of the community, and peculiarities of

their usage at that these obligatory units can be the only possible, or be in the form of existing variants within the literary language” (Itskovych, 2012, p. 8).

“The norm as an aggregate of traditionally used language means and rules of their combination is opposed to the system of language (as a complex of possibilities, from which the norm realizes only some ones), and the norm as a result of purposeful codification can enter into the opposition with speech practice, in which the conformity to coded prescription, and their violation is observed (Krysin, 2003, p. 156).

The availability of the variant units is accompanied, as a rule, by the semantic, stylistic and functional differentiation.

The problems of norm and usage are directly connected with the problem of the language culture, at that it is necessary to follow the differentiation of the notions “culture of language” and “culture of speech”. We speak about the culture of language when we mean “the properties of the exemplary texts fixed in the literary texts, as well as the expressive and notional possibilities of the language system”; we understand under the culture of speech “the concrete realization of the language properties and possibilities in the conditions of daily and mass – verbal and written – communication” (Yartseva, 1990, p. 247). The language culture means the whole spectre of the phenomena relating both to the language system and to its functioning in the speech (usage).

The wide material for the research of the norm and usage is represented by the linguistic frames. The peculiarity of the national frames is that they are represented by the aggregate of the language material in all its stylistic and genre variety.

The national frames include, except for the codified form of language, the territorial and social variants of language, the language for special purposes and etc. This specificity of the national frames allows considering them as a certain cut of the state of the public language during the certain period of time. There can be also created the frames, which fix not only the norm, however they are constructed artificially for certain purposes. The national frames certainly reflect the usage, and language practice that is connected with the representativeness of the frame.

The national frame of the Russian language (NFRL) includes the works of the fiction literature, newspapers and magazine articles on different themes, special texts, advertisements, memoirs, and notes of the spoken language etc.

“... the term “literary” language (actually denoting rather not literary language in the direct sense, but simply the nationwide normative, i.e. standard language) partly supposes that the most prestigious and “the most regular” part of the texts created in this language, – are the texts of the fictional prose (Plungyan, 2005). The writers’ language and the nationwide language, undoubtedly, are not equivalent particularly in the second half of the XX century, that’s why in NFRL the fiction texts do not dominate.

In the main subframe of the National frame of the Russian language (NFRL) the usual practices are reflected, and the educational subframe reflects only a codified form of the language. The metalinguistic marking gives possibility to use the language material in the dynamics and execute the procedure of comparison for fixing the usual manifestations, in particular, for correcting the norm.

As the creators of NFRL state one of the most interesting tasks that can be solved by the Frame is the observations over the dynamics of the language development. The dated texts allow following for occurrence or gradual disappearing of the words, constructions or grammatical forms”. The changes, first of all, are dealt with the lexical and phonetic systems. Although “the grammar still survives”, “sooner or later it should have impact on the weak zones of the Russian grammar system” (Plungayn, 2005).

2. Functioning of the Reflexive Pronoun *себя* (from Norm to Usage)

At the modern stage in the range of the Slavonic languages there is a tendency to the change of the historically formed norm of usage of the reflexive pronouns.

In accordance with the language norms reflected in the grammars of the contemporary Russian language, the reflexive pronoun *себя* is used for denoting the identity of the subject and object of the action: “*себя* points out the subject (the person or non-person), that is the object of the own action” (Shvedova, 1982). At that as it follows from the definitions of the explanatory dictionaries of the contemporary Russian language, the reflexive pronoun becomes the alternative to the personal pronoun: *себя* “indicates on the turn of the action towards the very producer of the action, changing the personal pronouns by implication” (Ozhegov, 1992). Compare recommendations, given in the work “Variant forms in the Russian language”: “The reflexive pronoun *себя* is

used when the subject of action simultaneously is its object, addressee or localizer. If such coincidence of the semantic actants is absent in the sentence, than instead of *себя* the personal pronouns is used respectively (Koprov, 2006, p. 42).

It should be noted that the characteristics of the reflexive pronoun as a replacement of the personal pronouns causes the fair criticism of the scientists, as there is a lack of all cases of the usage of the pronoun *себя* (about imperfection of the transformational approach in studying the reflexive pronouns see works of E. V. Paducheva (Paducheva, 1985, p. 181)). Nevertheless the above-mentioned formulation is of interest for us, as it evidences about limitations, imposed by the grammar norm on the opportunities of the language system: potentially the meaning of the identity of the subject and object can transfer the personal pronoun of the same person that the subject of action is. At that if the similar non-use of the pronouns of the third person leads to ambiguity of the context, then the usage of the pronouns of the first and second person does not cause such problems.

The described situation puts us before the question: how does the norm of usage of the reflexive pronouns fixed by the grammarians and dictionaries reflect the real speech practice? What is the correlation of the system, norm and usage in this case? The question doesn't seem to be inactive, especially if take into account the linguists' observations for functioning of the reflexive pronoun in the contemporary Polish literary language: for the usage exclusion of the reflexive pronoun «*siebie*» by the respective forms of the personal pronouns increasingly becomes typical that, in the specialists' opinion, reflect the process of the active interaction of the Polish with German and Roman languages (Glovinskaya, 2000, pp. 300-301; Glovinskaya, 2011, 2013).

At the beginning of XX century A. M. Peshkovskii wrote that the replacement of the reflexive pronoun *себя* by the indirect forms of the personal pronouns was not typical for the Russian language. Formulating the norm, the linguist stated that the pronoun *себя* "as opposed to non-Slavic languages must relate to all three persons" (Peshkovskii, 1956, p. 162). Appeal to the wide material of the basic subframe of NFRL allows following the realization of this principle in the usage during the long period and evaluating the degree of stability of the grammar norm.

The data of NFRL demonstrate that in the literary language of XIX and XX centuries there are absent the cases of exclusion of the reflexive pronoun used in the role of direct object by the personal pronouns. Nevertheless, we mark separate cases of using the personal pronoun of the first person in the singular *я* in the place of traditional *себя*: this refers to usage with prepositions *у, вокруг, около, подле, рядом с* in the function of adverbial modifier and uncoordinated attribute. We meet 5 similar usages, which relate to the mid of XIX century, 4 – to the first half of the XX century and 4 – to the second half of XX century.

(1) *Вдруг **рядом со мной** я увидел два открытые глаза, любопытно и упорно меня рассматривавшие* (Dostoevskii, F. M. *Notes from the Underground*, 1864);

(2) *Помню ночь **у меня** на Серпуховской, где в зимы 19-го, 20-го и 21-го гг. и Гумилев, и многие другие поэты бывали очень часто* (Отсурб N., Gumilev N. S., 1926);

(3) *За спиной **у меня** слышу шурианье, оклик вполголоса* (Knorre, F. *Stone Wreath*, 1973) (NFRL).

At that if the above-stated context represents deviation from the norm, then "non-normativity" of following usage is not obvious that is defined by the availability of non-direct, and direct connection by the personal pronoun with the subject of action (through dependence on the direct object and predicate):

(4) *Я было хотел и ему купить место **подле меня**; но он уселся у моих ног и объявил, что ему очень ловко* (Dostoevskii F. M. *Notes from the Dead House*, 1862);

(5) *Я показала на свободное место **рядом со мной**, и он стал пробираться к нам* (Rubina D. *The Lessons of Music*, 1982) (NFRL).

Generally, the similar samples in spite of their extremely limited quantity are informative. On the one part, they confirm our idea that the capacities of the personal pronouns laid down in the grammatical system are wider than those defined by the norm, on the other part, they point out that the usage almost doesn't use these capacities, not only without coming into collision with the norm in this aspect, but vice versa, supporting it. Thus during two centuries, the norm is characterized by the stability.

In our opinion, two recent cases of exclusion of the reflexive pronoun by the personal pronoun *я* in the position of the indirect object with preposition *для* marked in the newspaper frame of NFRL are interesting. The first violation of the norm is met in the spontaneous verbal speech rendered in writing:

(6) *Именно на этом этапе, судя по опыту Ивановой, и начинаются главные проблемы. «Я теперь должна сделать визы для меня, ребенка и няни, – рассказывает собеседница РБК daily (RBK Daily, 03.25.2011) (NFRL).*

The second violation of the norm is a result of calquing of the grammar construction peculiar to the German language at translation into Russian:

(7) *А я во время исполнения гимнов обычно молюсь, – заявил Месут Озил. – Я прошу у небес удачу для меня и моих партнеров (Soviet Sport, 06.05.2010) (NFRL).*

Und dann bete ich während der Hymne. Ich bete für Glück und Gesundheit, für meine Mitspieler und mich (Bild, 03.06.2010).

Certainly, the single cases of contradiction of the usage to norm still do not give possibility to make any generalizations but allow supposing that in future at absence of the proper control and further democratization of the newspaper language, the number of such contexts can considerably grow up.

3. Functioning of себя (from Usage to Norm)

The direction of the earlier said remarks relating to the usage of the reflexive and personal pronouns can be designated as “from norm to usage”, however at studying the reflexive pronoun the productive approach is an approach that is connected, first of all, with imperfection of the last one. On the one part, as it was already shown, the norm limits the system possibilities of the personal pronouns but they do not receive realization in the speech practice, from the other part, the norm limits the possibilities of functioning of the reflexive pronouns, which, on the contrary, are widely applied in the usage. The rule of identity of the subject and object contained in the grammars and dictionaries of the Russian language has too common character (even compare the formulations from the Russian grammar stated above and works of Y.V. Koprov: in the last one, except for the function of the object of action the functions of addressee and localizer are fixed behind the pronoun себя). It is undoubtedly, today the most complete data about diversity of the contexts of functioning of the reflexive pronoun are contained in the research of E. V. Paducheva. In the scientist’s opinion, “it is necessary to acknowledge the existence of several reflexive constructions a little similar to each other, but not brought together without loss of the description richness of content”. E. V. Paducheva describes seven reflexive constructions (co-predicate capacity of the reflexive pronoun with the subject, semantic subject and further co-predicate capacity etc.) pointing out to which the reflexive pronoun in each of them is co-referential, as well as which limitations for the usage of the pronouns exist and what caused them (Paducheva, 1985, pp. 186-203). In our opinion, the context of the nominal-adjective chain (in the terms of E. V. Paducheva) requires proper consideration.

We understand the nominal-adjective chain as the attributive construction with the determinate word consisting of the adjective, preposition для and pronoun (важный для него документ). At that we are interested in the cases, when the determinate word depends on the predicate, and the pronoun is co-referential to the subject of action, as in the usage in this contexts we observe the competition of the forms of reflexive and personal pronouns, while the existing norm is incapable to explain its reasons and establish its relevancy/irrelevancy.

(1) *Он выступает в привычном для него амплу борца за права угнетенного народа (Izvestiya, 2006.03.31) (NFRL).*

Сам Юрий Башмет в этом фильме впервые выступил в новом для себя амплу – снялся в одной из ролей (Izvestiya, 2007.11.16) (NFRL).

If orient on the rule of identity of the subject and object of action, then the statement of the reflexive pronoun in this context should be considered to be impossible. On the other part, the usage of the pronoun себя for indication to co-reference with the subject of action is considered to be logical, especially if the unambiguity of context is reached by that.

(2) *Дело в том, что губернатор Карлин пошел на смещение мэра в заведомо неблагоприятной для себя обстановке: городская дума состоит из сторонников смещенного мэра, а региональные СМИ контролируются крупным алтайским предпринимателем Анатолием Банных, чьи интересы, как говорят в регионе, представляет мэр (Kosobokova, Tatyana. The Last Kremlin Warning. RBK Daily, 2010.08.27) (NFRL).*

Appealing to the database of NFRL allows evaluating the prevalence of competition of the reflexive and personal pronouns in the context of substantive-adjective chain, as well as to outline some tendencies of functioning of the pronoun себя. We used for analysis the subframe of the fiction texts for the period of 1860-1900, subframe of the fiction texts for the period of 2000-2010 and subframe of the newspaper texts for

2010 that includes the materials of such newspapers as “Izvestiya”, “Komsomolskaya Pravda”, “Novyi Region 2”, “RBK Daily”, “RIA Novosti”, “Sovetskii Sport”, “Trud-7”. These subframes have approximately equal vocabulary volume (15 200 243 words, 15 400 616 words, 15 541 660 words respectively) and allow covering both the works of classical Russian literature of XIX century, and literary and newspaper texts of the new time.

As our study shows, the contexts of substantive-adjective chain with the pronoun, co-referential to the subject of action are met in all three subframes, at that in this construction both personal and reflexive pronouns are used. Among the first ones forms of the third person prevails (*для него, для нее, для них*); there are less forms of the first person in singular (*для меня*); the forms of the first and second person in plural (*для нас, для вас*) and the second person in singular (*для тебя*) are single. The reflexive pronoun in such word-combinations also predominantly indicates on the subject of action of the third person that confirms the idea about importance of usage of the pronoun *себя* as a means of removal of ambiguity.

Let’s consider the quantitative data. In the works of the Russian literature of the second half of XIX century we found 192 contexts, which interest us, from which the personal pronouns are used in 143 and the reflexive pronouns in 49. It is important that the contexts of substantive-adjective chain both with personal and reflexive pronouns are present in the works of recognized masters of word: L. N. Tolstoi, I. S. Turgenev, F. M. Dostoevskii, and A. I. Kuprin etc. In the literary works of 2000 we meet 113 relative usages, from which 70 contain personal pronouns and 43 contain reflexive pronouns. Finally, in the texts of the specified periodicals for 2010 we mark 164 cases of usage of the considered model, at the same time 116 contexts include the reflexive pronouns and 48 – the personal ones.

As we can see the existence of competition of the forms of reflexive and personal pronouns in the context of substantive-adjective chain is doubtless. Obviously, until now the big quantity of empirical material was accumulated that is not covered by the norm and requires codification. Particularly, as the statistical data show, the serious differences are outlined in the usage of the substantive-adjective chain in the different functional styles of the Russian language: predominance of the personal pronouns in the language of fiction literature and, vice versa, considerable reflexive pronouns in the newspaper language.

In our opinion, we should acknowledge the variability of the statement of reflexive and personal pronouns in the context of substantive-adjective chain in the case of their co-reference to the subject of action. Let’s try to define some reasons of existence of forms of reflexive and personal pronouns opposed in the norm in these contexts.

First of all, let’s consider the possibility of the semantic nature of specified variability. Thus, according to E. V. Paducheva, the statement of reflexive or personal pronoun of the third person at the adjective with preposition *для* is defined by the different empathy of a speaker. We mean that choice of the pronoun depends on the fact if a speaker gives evaluation (personal pronoun is used) or denotation of the subject (reflexive pronoun is used). Accordingly, as E. V. Paducheva points out, the majority of adjectives, which allow entering into reflexive construction of this type, belongs to the number of “substantive”, i.e. supposing subject of evaluation as an important component of the sense (Paducheva, 1985, p. 207).

In our opinion, such semantic opposition of pronouns reflecting differentiation of the views of a speaker and character are apparent the most vividly in the texts of classical literature. For example, the choice of personal or reflexive pronouns maximally close to the structure of phrases from the novel of L. N. Tolstoi “Anna Karenina” (1978) can be explained if we appeal to the expanded context:

(3) *Вы мне гадки, отвратительны! – закричала она, горячась все более и более. – Ваши слезы – вода! Вы никогда не любили меня; в вас нет ни сердца, ни благородства! Вы мне мерзки, гадки, чужой, да, чужой! – с болью и злобой произносила она это ужасное для себя слово чужой* (NFRL).

In this case a reader becomes a witness of quarrel of a married couple, when a heroine (Dolly) for the first time clothes her feelings in words, and pronouncing them and hearing her on their own, realizes the force and meaning of these words – determination «ужасное» belongs to her.

While the following example describes the situation after the quarrel, when the heroine remains alone and “all-knowing” author passes her thoughts, at that indication «с особым значением» evidently supposes outside observer. It is difficult to imagine that the heroine appreciated “tone” of own thoughts, but it is logical to suppose that definition «страшное» is author’s one that is indicated by the personal pronoun:

«Уехал! Но чем же кончил он с нею? – думала она. – Неужели он видает ее? Зачем я не спросила его? Нет, нет, сойтись нельзя. Если мы и останемся в одном доме – мы чужие. Навсегда чужие!» – повторила она опять с особенным значением это страшное для нее слово (NFRL).

In the following context the description of the house corresponds to the view of a heroine, and her appreciation of what was seen is offered to a reader, correspondingly, the definition of the luxury as «*новой*» is heard from her mouth that is reflected in the usage of the reflexive pronoun:

(4) *Обед, столовая, посуда, прислуга, вино и кушанье не только соответствовали общему тону новой роскоши дома, но, казалось, были еще роскошнее и новее всего. Дарья Александровна наблюдала эту новую для себя роскошь и, как хозяйка, ведущая дом, – хотя и не надеясь ничего из виденного применить к своему дому, так это все по роскоши было далеко выше ее образа жизни, – невольно вникала во все подробности и задавала себе вопрос, кто и как это все сделал* (NFRL).

Conversely, in the following example the definition «*непонятная*» doesn't belong to a heroine herself, but is an estimate of the outside observer, which in this case is not an author, but the second character (Levina):

(5) *Но только что он двинулся, дверь его номера отворилась, и Кити выглянула. Левин покраснел и от стыда и от досады на свою жену, поставившую себя и его в это тяжелое положение <...> Первое мгновение Левин видел выражение жадного любопытства в том взгляде, которым Кити смотрела на эту непонятную для нее ужасную женщину; но это продолжалось только одно мгновение* (NFRL).

As it is evident in both cases the usage of the reflexive or personal pronoun can be substantiated based upon semantic opposition. Nevertheless, it is necessary to note that although the distribution of this explanation on all cases of functioning of pronouns in substantive-adjective chain looks like tempting, but it doesn't always turn out to be productive. Particularly, it is inapplicable to the choice between reflexive pronoun and personal pronoun of the first person, which example of opposition also can be stated:

(6) *А тогда, получив эти шесть, узнал я вдруг заведомо по одному письму от приятеля про одну любопытнейшую вещь для себя* (Dostoevskii, F. M. *The Brothers Karamazov*, 1880).

(7) *«Друг мой, – говорил мне Степан Трофимович через две недели, под величайшим секретом, – друг мой, я открыл ужасную для меня... новость: je suis un простой приживальщик et rien de plus!* (Dostoevskii, F. M. *The Devils 1871-1872*) (NFRL).

It is hardly possible to speak about empathy of a speaker to himself. Consequently, it is necessary to reveal the other circumstances, which influence on the choice of that or other form.

The usage of the reflexive or personal pronouns in substantive-adjective chain can depend on the range of syntactic conditions. At that the choice in favour of the reflexive pronoun can be supported by several factors.

Firstly, consecutive usage of *себя* at adjective that is the part of compound predicate (direct connection with predicate dictates obligatory usage of the reflexive pronoun):

(8) *Подсудимый уже обижается, он считает это почти обидною для себя мелочью и, верите ли, искренно, искренно!* (Dostoevskii, F. M. *The Brothers Karamazov*, 1880);

(9) *Иван Ильич женился по обоим соображениям: он делал приятное для себя, приобретая такую жену ...* (Tolstoi, L. N. *Death of Ivan Illyich*, 1886) (NFRL).

Secondly, the possibility of execution of substantive-adjective chain of adverbial function also peculiar to adverb, in combination with which only reflexive pronoun is used (at its coincidence with the subject of action):

(10) *Нехлюдов неожиданно для себя покраснел и замялся* (Tolstoi, L. N. *Resurrection*, 1899);

(11) *Одно есть счастье: кто счастлив, тот и прав», – мелькнуло в голове Оленина, и с неожиданною для себя силой он схватил и поцеловал красавицу Марьянку в висок и щеку* (Tolstoi, L. N. *The Cossacks*, 1863) (NFRL).

Moreover, it should be noted that the statement of the reflexive pronoun in the considered word-combinations sometimes helps to avoid ambiguity, as the personal pronoun of the third person can correlate not only with the subject of action, but with its object, as well as refer to the previous part of the complex phrase. For example, the usage of *для него* instead of *для себя* in the following context could generate some ambiguity, as it could be related to the object of the first part (*Алеше*):

(12) *Да и вовсе не для радости Грушенькиной он влек к ней Алешу; был он человек серьезный и без выгодной для себя цели ничего не предпринимал* (Dostoevskii, F. M. *The Brothers Karamazov*, 1880) (NFRL).

Such ambiguity can be evidenced in this phrase:

(13) *Он уважает врага-горца, но презирает чужого для него и угнетателя солдата* (Tolstoi, L. N. *The Cossacks*, 1863) (NFRL).

The usage of apposition at the personal pronoun of the third person by I.S. Turgenev in similar contexts evidences that the existence of ambiguity is understood by the author:

(14) *Он ел мало, большие катал шарики из хлеба – и лишь изредка вскидывал глазами на Каломейцева, который только что вернулся из города, где видел губернатора – но не совсем приятно для него, Каломейцева, делу (Turgenev, I. S. Nov', 1877) (NFRL).*

Along with the factors supporting the usage of the reflexive pronouns, we'll try to outline those ones, which oppose it. First of all, it is the complicated structure of the sentence that determines "detachment" of the pronoun from the subject and predicate of the sentence: the farther the pronoun is placed, the more difficult it is to restore its connection with the subject. In particular, this entering of substantive-adjective chain in the range of coordinated attributes:

(15) *Аратов имел вид человека, который узнал великую, для него очень приятную тайну ... (Turgenev, I. S. Klara Milych, 1882) (NFRL).*

Also entering of different unattached phrases (elaboration, comparison, detached attribute), which availability usually points out at the existence of another predicate situation, imbedded into the framework of the same phrase:

(16) *Она прислушалась радостно к той (как будто неожиданной для нее) прелести... (Tolstoi, L. N. War and Peace. V.2. 1867-1869);*

(17) *И довольно долго пришлось мне прожить в остроге, прежде чем я разъяснил себе все такие факты, столь загадочные для меня в первые дни моей каторги (Dostoevskii, F. M. Notes from the Dead House, 1862) (NFRL).*

The example stated above is instructive also because in the detached construction the personal pronoun of the first person neighbours with the possessive pronoun of the first person.

(18) *Но вот однажды вечером, после несноснейшего для меня дня, отстал я от других на прогулке, ужасно устал и пробирался домой через сад (Dostoevskii, F. M. A Little Hero, 1857) (NFRL).*

In the last example, the meaning for statement of the personal pronoun can also have position of the elaborated construction, namely its position before the subject. It should be noted that among all considered cases the reflexive pronoun is met in this position only once in the work of L.N. Tolstoi (see above).

Moreover, the cases of usage of the reflexive pronoun in substantive-adjective chain at the category of state and passive participle are absent:

(19) *Наташе так весело было на душе, так хорошо в этой новой для нее обстановке <...> (Tolstoi, L. N. War and Peace, V. 2, 1867-1869);*

(20) *Долли была несколько смущена и озабочена тою совершенно новою для нее средой, в которой она очутилась (Tolstoi L. N. Anna Karenina, 1878) (NFRL).*

Thus, the analysis of works of the Russian literature of the second half of XIX century shows that opposition of the reflexive and personal pronouns in the construction of substantive-adjective chain in addition to semantic basis is determined by the syntactic conditions, at that the usage of personal pronouns is more free, and the usage of reflexive pronoun impedes syntactic complication of the sentence. Consequently, we can speak about semantically and stylistically conditioned variants. At that the considerable predominance of the contexts with personal pronouns evidences both about view of the outside observer peculiar to the literary narration, and about general complexity of the syntactic constructions.

The literary texts of 2000 hold orientation at the predominant usage in the context of substantive-adjective chain of personal pronouns; however, in the recent newspaper texts the directly opposed tendency to exclusion of the personal pronouns by the reflexive one in the same context is observed. What can be it conditioned by?

In the newspaper texts it is much more difficult, and in most cases simply impossible, to speak about semantic opposition of the pronouns. Particularly, the usage of the reflexive pronoun *себя* in numerous contexts must not be connected with rendering the view of denotation of the subject and author's empathy. For example, in this context the evaluation of the film as traditional one, most obviously belongs to a speaker, rather than to his creator, however the reflexive pronoun is used:

Атом Эгоян снял традиционный для себя фильм с напряженным сюжетом (RBK Daily, 23.03.2010) (NFRL).

Similarly the following example reflects the position of a speaker that is evidenced by the form «представлялось», however the reflexive pronoun is used:

Спаллетти продолжал удивлять и дальше. Представлялось, что общегражданские выходные Лучано проведет в экскурсиях по новому для себя городу ... (Soviet Sport, 26. 01.2010) (NFRL).

Conversely, the evaluating adjectives «ненавистная» and «невыносимая» seemingly render the attitude of the heroine, but instead of the reflexive pronoun *себя* the personal pronoun appears in the text:

Она готова делить и радость, и печаль, она даже готова стоять за ненавистной конторкой и выполнять невыносимую для нее работу по оценке и скупке (RIA Novosti, 19.11.2010) (NFRL).

Nevertheless in the newspaper texts we can see some semantic opposition of the reflexive pronoun and personal pronouns in plural. The point is about possible distributive meaning of the pronoun *себя*. For example, in the phrase

Какие у них возможности выбрать интересную для себя профессию? (RIA Novosti, 24.05.2010) (NFRL).

The point is about opportunity of each of the pupils of children's home to choose the work that would be interesting to him namely, i.e. the great number of interesting professions is approved, while the usage of the personal pronoun in this case could point out on the existence of one work interesting for everyone at once.

The same could be said about the following example, in which we imply that for each of 6 persons the life would be unusual in its own way:

Сейчас за ними закроется дверь — и 500 суток изо дня в день шесть человек будут вести непривычную для себя жизнь в замкнутом маленьком пространстве (Трудь 7, 24.06.2010) (NFRL).

Conversely, uniformity of the evaluated phenomenon can be approved with assistance of the personal pronoun as it happens at indication on the way of life of the animals:

Так, если лабораторных животных поместить в естественную среду, они вернуться к естественному для них образу жизни (RBK Daily, 24.03.2010);

or one and the same equally unprofitable for all participants of the price:

... акционеры «Тройки Диалог» не были готовы к тому, чтобы уступить контроль над компанией по далеко не самой выгодной для них цене. (RBK Daily, 2010.04.08) (NFRL).

Nevertheless, the semantics of distributive property is realized not in all cases and cannot be considered universal basis of variability.

Mitigation of the semantic opposition inevitably must lead to that the choice of one or other variant of the pronoun in the context of substantive-adjective chain should be determined by the syntactic conditions. In this relation the bigger quantity of usages of the reflexive pronoun in this construction corresponds to the bigger distributive property of the simple syntactic structures in the language of newspapers in comparison with the language of the fiction literature.

Nevertheless, we see the main reason of the predominant usage of the reflexive pronoun in the considerable formalization of the contexts of substantive-adjective chain, in transformation of them into specific clichés, which are automatically reproduced in written speech of the journalists. Compare: *действовать в привычной для себя манере, выступить в непривычном для себя амплуа, осваивать новый для себя сегмент, одержать важную для себя победу, рассказать о необычном для себя опыте, продать/купить по выгодной для себя цене* etc.

Cliché capacity of similar combinations in many respects is supported by “the universality” of the reflexive pronoun, namely its indifference to the category of person, gender and number.

The considerable expansion of the adjectives used in the substantive-adjective chain is confirmed by the idea of formation of the contexts with the reflexive pronoun *себя*, at that in favour of those ones, which do not suppose the subject of evaluation as the important component of the sense, and on the contrary includes the sufficient objectivity based upon commonness of the opinion of some society (*экзотический, культовый, традиционный*).

4. Functioning of the Reflexive-Possessive Pronoun *свой* (Norm and Usage).

The grammatical norm determining functioning of the reflexive-possessive pronoun as opposed to the above-mentioned norm of usage of the reflexive pronoun *себя* allows variability: the synonymy of the pronouns *свой* and *мой, твой, наш, ваш* is spoken about in the reference books (Rosental, 2012), in the textbooks on the

contemporary Russian language morphology of the higher educational establishments (Balalykina, 2003). The variability of the reflexive-possessive and personal-possessive pronouns of the first and second persons reflects their system possibilities and is supported by the usage at that the variants continue to compete with each other, aspiring to occupy the first place in the speech practice. As the range of researches evidences, the reflexive-possessive pronoun experienced the serious fluctuations in the aspect of “being in demand” in the usage, then being subjected to limitation in using it, on the contrary, expands the area of influence on the different historical stages.

Thus, analyzing the Old Russian monuments, M. V. Fedorova determines the consecutive reduction of the usage of the pronoun *своѣ* as a synonym to *твоѣ* and *моѣ* in the different lists of one work (Fedorova, 1965, pp. 121-122). F. I. Buslaev appealing to the works of “the newest writers” (i.e. writers of the end of XVIII–XIX centuries) states that they prefer “the other possessive” pronoun *своѣ* under influence of the foreign languages. The same process is stated by them for the spoken language (Buslaev, 1959, p. 395). A. M. Peshkovskii (Peshkovskii, 2013, pp. 161-162) says about serious competition that was experienced by the reflexive-possessive pronoun from the part of personal-possessive pronouns in the literature of XIX century. E.V. Paducheva also draws attention to the limited usage of the reflexive-possessive pronoun in relation to the first and second person in literature of the first half of XIX century, while up to XX century she considers the reverse process to be active, namely enhancement of the strict observance of the reflexive capacity (Paducheva, 1985, p. 204).

What results did the competition of the forms on the modern stage lead to? How consecutively is the reflective capacity in the contemporary Russian literary language executed? Is the tendency to exclusion of the reflexive-possessive pronoun by the personal-possessive pronouns of the first and second person fixed by the researches of Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian languages typical, for example, for the Russian language?

In order to evaluate the distribution of this or that variant in the usage, we again appeal to NFRL at that firstly we are interested in the newspaper texts, and the notes of the verbal and non-verbal speech as the most operatively reflecting the changes of the language reality.

The subframes of the texts of newspapers “Izvestiya”, “Komsomolskaya Pravda”, “Novyi Region 2”, “RBK Daily”, “RIA Novosti”, “Soviet Sport”, “Trud” for four first months of 2011 (the last renewal of the newspaper frame) containing 9 274 667 words of verbal and non-verbal speech for 2005-2010 in the extent of 1 667 821 words were subjected to the analysis.

In spite of the difference in the volume of subframes and fixation time of the contexts both newspaper texts and spontaneous speech reflect one and the same phenomena.

The consideration of the constructions, in which the personal pronoun is the subject and at the distance from one to three word-forms the reflexive-possessive or personal-possessive pronoun, correlated with it, is used, shows that the tendency of reflective capacity in the contemporary Russian language is kept: the pronoun *своѣ* confidently keeps “the first place” in the specified position.

The advantage of the reflexive-possessive pronoun in the competition with possessive pronouns of the first and second person in singular is the most obvious. In the newspaper subframe 15 forms of pronoun *моѣ* fall at 328 forms of the pronoun *своѣ* in the context that is of interest for us, in the verbal subframe this correlation is equal as 280 to 10. In the considered notes of verbal speech we also meet 79 usages of the pronoun *своѣ*, correlated with the pronoun *ты* and only 2 pronouns *твоѣ* in the same case. In the newspaper subframe the last type of contexts is not met at all, but the usages of the pronoun *своѣ* opposing to them amount only 29 that is naturally determined by the general stylistics of the newspaper discourse not intending the usage of the appeal “you”.

The quantity of contexts with forms of the pronoun *вами* at the subject, expressed by the pronoun *вы* is limited: in the newspaper subframe there are 11 such contexts at 155 contexts with the usage of the pronoun *своѣ*, while in the verbal subframe this correlation looks like 4 to 62 respectively.

Nevertheless we should note that in the construction with imperative the usage of the personal-possessive pronoun of the second person in plural is more wide-spread: 28 cases of using the form of the pronoun *вами* at imperative and 162 corresponding usages of the pronoun *своѣ* in the newspaper texts and 11 to 19 in the verbal speech.

Forms of the pronoun *нами* are the most competitive. The statistic data speak for themselves: in the newspaper subframe 150 contexts with the pronoun *нами* corresponds to 215 contexts with the reflexive-possessive pronoun, while in the notes of the verbal speech 40 usages of the pronoun *нами* oppose to 55 usages of the pronoun *своѣ*.

The above-mentioned cases of functioning of the pronoun *свой* respond to the norm of the contemporary Russian literary language. However, recently the tendency to expansion of the possibilities of the reflexive-possessive pronoun in the usage at the expense of contexts violating the norm is seen more precisely. Particularly, it is evidenced by the research “Russian language of the end of the XX century”, which dealt with the cases of non-normative exclusion of the personal-possessive pronouns (firstly, of the third person) by the pronoun *свой*, as well as the samples of the distribution of the pronoun *свой* at the position, where any possessive pronoun is inappropriate (Glovinskaya, 2000).

In 2000 we note conservation of the specified tendency that is confirmed by the frequent mistakes observed in the verbal speech, at which *свой* does not correspond to the subject of action and is used in the place of the corresponding possessive pronouns. Let’s state some examples of the usages of similar type fixed by us:

Я хочу/ чтобы у меня все сложилось в своей жизни// (Modnyi Prigovor. The First Channel, 16.02.2010) – instead of «в моей жизни»;

Я смотрю/ где Чудов// Ему еще метров 70 до своего коврика// (The Broadcast of the mixed relay-race on biathlon. Russia, 2, 28.03.2010) – instead of «до его коврика»;

Они изначально в такой ситуации/ что действительно от них зависит уже не только своя жизнь/ но и других людей (Gevorkyan E.: “The Peculiar opinion”. Echo of Moscow, 02.11.2010) – instead of «не только их жизнь»;

Мне очень нравится свое имя (Slushatel: «Speak Russian», Echo of Moscow, 18.03.2012) – instead of «мое имя»;

откровенно говоря// за 4 года своего пребывания в должности/ как-то не возникло впечатления/ что большие трудные государственные работы ему подходят (Radzikhovskii, L. “The peculiar opinion”. Echo of Moscow, 10.02.2012) – instead of «его пребывания») (NFRL).

“The achievements” of the pronoun *наш* in the area of competition with reflexive-possessive pronoun *свой* are especially evident on the background of the “modest successes” of the pronouns *мой, твой, ваш* and can’t be occasional. The similar asymmetry is capable to indicate on the different degree of substantiation of the existing variability of the reflexive-possessive and personal-possessive pronouns. In our opinion, at present the pronouns *свой* and *наш* function as the semantically conditioned variants in the usage, while the variability of *мой/свой, твой/свой* and *ваш/свой* doesn’t have the evident semantic basis, at least in the considered type of contexts. Compare, for example, the following usages:

Я очень благодарен моей семье, жене Марине, которые меня поддержали: мы вместе решили, что буду тренироваться дальше. (Soviet Sport, 24.03.2011);

Решение тяжелое, и я очень благодарен своей семье, жене, что мы здесь (Trud, 7, 16.09.2009) (NFRL).

The usage of the pronoun *наш*, opposed to the pronoun *свой*, on the contrary, offers the interesting cases of semantic differentiation that requires special consideration. Compare the following example, in which *наш* unites all possible guests of the action, while *свой* would indicate on more outlined circle of the persons, connected with this museum:

Италия ассоциируется с теплом, солнцем, любовью, классическим искусством <...> Все это мы подарим нашим гостям (Komsomolskaya Pravda, 13. 05.2011) (NFRL).

The research shows that the system keeps its stability, in spite of the activity of processes, which take place in the contemporary Russian language in the area of the reflexive and personal pronouns. The changes, first of all, relate to the usage, speech practice and many of them evidence about the renewal of the norm and deviation from it.

References

- Balalykina, E. A. (2003). *Contemporary Russian language. Morphology*. Kazan: Publisher Kazan Federal University.
- Buslaev, F. I. (1959). *The Historical Grammar of the Russian Language*. Moscow: Uchpedgiz.
- Erofeeva, E. V. (2003). To the Question of Correlation of the Conception of the Norm and Usage. *The Problems of socio and psycholinguistics*, 2, 3-8.
- Fedorova, M. V. (1965). *The Lexico-Grammatical Essays on the History of the Russian Pronouns*. Voronezh: Publisher Voronezh State University.

- Glovinskaya, M. Y. (2011). Should the active processes in the grammar of the modern Russian language to be taken into account in teaching RL as a foreign one. *The Russian Language abroad*, 4, 33-39.
- Glovinskaya M. Y. (2013). Harmony in the Active Dictionary of the Russian Language. *Vestnik of RSUH. Linguistics Series*, 8(109), 40-45.
- Glovinskaya, M. Y. (2000). The Active Processes in the Grammar. In E. A. Voroncova, M. Y. Glovinskaya, & E. A. Zemskaya (Eds.), *The Russian language of the end of XX century (1985-1995)* (pp. 237-304). Moscow: Yazyki russkoj kul'tury.
- Itskovich, V. A. (2010). *The Essays of the Syntactic Norm*. Moscow: Librocom.
- Kolesov, V. V. (1989). *The Old Russian Literary Language*. Leningrad: Publishing House of Leningrad University.
- Koprov, V. Y. (2006). *The Variant Forms in the Russian Language*. Moscow. Russkij yazyk.
- Krysin L. P. (2013). *Typen slavischer Standardsprachen. Theoretische, methodische und empirische Zugänge*. Herausgeber: Wingender.
- Krysin, L. P. (2007). The Russian Literary Norm and Contemporary Speech Practice. *The Russian Language in the Scientific Coverage*, 2(14), 5-17.
- NFRL (The National Frame of the Russian Language). Retrieved May 26, 2014, from *Russian National Corpus website*: <http://www.ruscorpora.ru>
- Ozhegov, S. I., & Shvedova, N. Y. (1992). *Explanatory dictionary of the Russian Language*. Moscow: ITI Tehnologii
- Paducheva, E. V. (1985). *The Statement and its Correlation to the Reality: Referential Aspects of the Pronoun Semantics*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Peshkovskii, A. M. (1956). *The Russian Syntax in the Scientific Coverage*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Ministerstva Prosvescheniya USSR.
- Plungyan, V. A. (2005). Why do we do the National Frame of the Russian Language? *The Native Notes*, 2(23), 296-308.
- Rosental, D. E. (2001). *The Reference Book on Orthography and Literary Proof-Reading*. Moscow: Rolf.
- Shvedova, N. Y. (Ed.) (1982). *The Russian Grammar*. Moscow. Nauka.
- Yartseva, V. N. (Ed.) (1990). *The Linguistic Encyclopaedic Dictionary*. Moscow: Sovetskaya Enciklopediya.
- Zemskaya, E. A., & Glovinskaya M. Y. (2010). *The Modern Russian Language. System – norm – usage*. – Moscow. Yazyki slavanskikh kultur.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).