



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Modal particles and aspectuality: znaj and sebe in Russian

Fortuin, E.L.J.; Israeli, A.

Citation

Fortuin, E. L. J., & Israeli, A. (2012). Modal particles and aspectuality: znaj and sebe in Russian. *Russkij Jazyk V Naučnom Osveščeenii*, 2(24), 107-131. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/81558>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/81558>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

E. FORTUIN, A. ISRAELI

MODAL PARTICLES AND ASPECTUALITY: *ZNAJ* AND *SEBE* IN RUSSIAN

1. Introduction

Consider the following sentences where the verb *guljaet* ‘walk’ is used with the semantically related particles *znaj* and *sebe* and the combination *znaj sebe*¹.

- (1) Дома щей и тех нет, а она **знай гуляет** (В. Кавторин. Чужая собственная жизнь).

There is even no soup in the house, yet she just goes out.

- (2) Ну, вообще-то, он мог просто купить уже ворованный телефон, тогда получится ни за что нос сломали. А вор **себе гуляет** и пропивает денюжку закалымленную (www2.amit.ru/forum/index.php?allmes=1...1...). Well, of course it could be that he simply bought an already stolen phone, in which case it will mean that they broke his nose for nothing. And the thief is just walking around and toasting his ill-gotten gains.

- (3) А в лесу все удивлялись, — и чего ему дома не сидится, все ходит куда-то, бродит — говорили. А Заяц **знай себе гуляет**, лапы в грязиюке осенней пачкает (<http://solnce-vorot.blogspot.com>).

And in the forest everyone was surprised, why can’t he stay home, he keeps going somewhere, wanders, they say. And the Rabbit just takes walks, dirties his paws in the autumn dirt.

It is generally assumed in the literature that *znaj* and *znaj sebe* are identical in meaning (e. g. [Луценко 1984: 129; Ожегов 1990; Шведова 1960: 101]). The particles *znaj* (*sebe*) and *sebe* are usually discussed separately (e. g. [Klenin 1975; Weiss 2008] on *sebe* and [Луценко 1984] on *znaj* (*sebe*)), but Švedova [Шведова 1980: 225] assumes that *sebe* and *znaj* (*sebe*) are in fact synonymous. The goal of this paper is to provide a semantic analysis of these particles and to show that, despite their semantic similarity, they are *not* identical in meaning.

¹ If not indicated otherwise, the examples are taken from the Russian National Corpus [НКРЯ].

Furthermore, we will show that both particles have interesting aspectual properties. In particular we will explain why *znaj* is inherently combined with imperfective verbs, whereas *sebe* is combined with imperfective verbs in the majority of cases, but also allows for some types of perfective verbs in certain contexts. We will first discuss the particles in the following order: (i) *znaj*, (ii) *sebe*, (iii) *znaj sebe*. The last section is devoted to the aspectual properties of the particles.

2. *Znaj*

The form *znaj* is always non-stressed and occurs with a verb (present tense, past tense, conditional (*by*)² or imperative). The data from the [НКРЯ] show that in most instances the particle occurs before the verb, but sentences where it occurs after the verb are also found, especially with the imperative. The verb with which it is combined is almost exclusively imperfective (its aspectual use will be discussed separately in section 5). An example with an imperative is given below³:

- (4) — Намокнем! — испугалась Таня. [the other person answers:]
 — От такого дождя намокнешь! **Иди знай!** Теперь не зима: высохнешь (С. Н. Сергеев-Ценский. Верховод).
 «We'll get wet!» Tanya got scared.
 «Sure, you would get wet from such a rain! Just walk! It's not winter now, you'll get dry».

² While the conditional is not common, such examples do occur:

- (i) А ведь не отказался б я от сотового — **знай звонил бы** прямо с дачи (Петр Алешковский. Седьмой чемоданчик. 1997—1998). — But I wouldn't've turned down a mobile, would have called straight from the summer house.
 (ii) Если бы мне когда-нибудь в жизни посчастливилось написать одну такую вещь, как повесть Бориса Хазанова «Час короля», — в течение всей остальной биографии не ударил бы пальцем о палец, а **знай слушал бы** музыку и выпивал понемногу, спокойно ожидая, пока принесут на дом Нобелевскую премию (С. Гедройц. Колоколь. Александр Мильштейн. Школа кибернетики. Борис Хазанов, Джон Глэд. Допрос с пристрастием. Харри Мулиш. Зигфрид // «Звезда», 2003). — If I ever had the luck in my life to write a tale like Boris Hazanov's «The King's Hour», during the rest of my whole biography I would not lift a finger, just listened to music, drank a little waiting for the Nobel prize to be delivered to my home.

³ Here we must digress for a moment. In this example there is a sentence stress on *idi*, and *znaj* acts as a clitic. Such uses must be distinguished from the regular imperative use of *znaj* in the expression *иди знай* meaning 'go figure' where *znaj* has the syntagmatic stress:

- (iii) Иди знай, что они там напортачили (<http://www.waronline.org/forum/viewtopic.php?t=3031>). — Go figure out what they bungled.

To our knowledge, the most elaborate analysis of the meaning of this particle is given by Lucenko. According to Lucenko [Луценко 1984: 129] the particle *znaj* (*sebe*) expresses that a «действие продолжает осуществляться, несмотря на наличие каких-либо помех, противоположных процессов, препятствующих обстоятельствам». In his analysis, Lucenko tries to account for the modern use of the particle *znaj* with reference to an older meaning of *znat'*. According to him, in the nineteenth century, *znat'* could be used in the meaning of *deržat'*, *uderživat'*, *ne otpuskat'* in phrases like *znaj pro sebja*, and «*знай про себя можно сопоставить с выражениями удержи про себя (при себе), удержи в тайне, сдерживайся...*» [Ibid.: 130]. Lucenko therefore concludes that «[н]аша догадка относительно того, что глагол *знать* когда-то мог иметь значение ‘держат, удерживать, не отпускать’ или ‘удерживаться’, подтверждается особенностями употребления слова *знай* как частицы» [Ibid.: 131]. In his view, the element of continuation of the particle use in modern day Russian is very clear in the context of the imperative. In the case of the imperative, he argues, the speaker directs the addressee to *continue* with an action that was already started, in a context where the addressee is inclined to stop doing the action, as is the case for example in (4).

The data from the [НКРЯ], however, show that contrary to Lucenko the action does not need to have started prior to the moment of utterance of the imperative. In many instances the speaker wants the addressee to do a particular action (and nothing else but that action), while expecting the addressee not to be inclined to do it, either because the addressee might not be inclined to follow the instructions of the speaker, or else because he is engaged in an altogether different type of activity. This is the case in (5). In this example the speaker does not use *znaj* to stress that the addressee should continue to run, as is suggested by Lucenko's description, but to reinforce an earlier direction, emphasizing that the addressee should now really start running:

- (5) Взяв рупор, он [Трифонов] закричал на берег:
 — Эй, казак! Беги скоро на кордон, скажи, «Ловца» гнали бы, Трифонов просит.
 — И без рупора слышно, — ответил человек, держа в руке ломоть хлеба и наблюдая, как течение подбивает баркас ближе к нему. Трифонов грозно взмахнул рупором:
 — А ты **беги, знай!** (М. Горький. Жизнь Клима Самгина. Часть 2. 1928).

Taking the megaphone he [Trifonov] shouted toward the beach: «Hey, Cossak! Run quickly to the cordon, tell them to send “Catcher”, Trifonov asks». «I can hear without the megaphone», the man answered holding a piece of bread and watching how the current was carrying the launch closer. Trifonov menacingly shook the megaphone: «You just run, mind you».

Put differently, *znaj* means that all the subject (the addressee) must focus on ('know') is on doing the action, disregarding all other information. In fact, there

are instances where a direct question is not answered; in other words, requested information is being withheld while the speaker is directing the addressee to either begin or continue the action. This is the case in (6)–(9) (in (7) only with regard to the second use):

- (6) — Ну, пойдем, что ли! — выкрикнул кто-то под моим окном. Я приподнялся со стула, выглянул в окошко и увидел Трофимыча...
— А ты поскорей, чтобы к закату поспеть!
— Да куда?
— А ты **знай собирайся!** Я тебя в такие места предоставлю, что и-и-и!.. Мое почтение! (Е. Н. Чириков. С ночевой).
«Well, shall we go, or what?» screamed someone under my window. I lifted myself off the chair, looked out of the window and saw Trofimych...
«Hurry up, so that we make it by sunset!»
«But where to?»
«You just get ready! I'll take you to such places that — wow! You'd be surprised!»
- (7) — Гляди, внук, сколько сапожонков, рубашонков, портков, картузов на берег волны выбросили. Знай собирай в мешок, — говорит дед Гордей и не смеется.
— Да это же раковины, дедушка. Как их наденешь?
— А ты, внук, **знай собирай.** Дома разберемся (Е. Пермяк. Тайна цены).
«Look, grandson, how many booties, shirts, pants, and caps the waves have thrown onto the beach. Just keep collecting them in the bag», says grandpa Gordey and doesn't laugh.
«But these are shells, grandpa. How can you put them on?»
«And you, grandson, just keep collecting. We'll figure it out at home».
- (8) — Эй, земляк, — крикнул Сысоев, — а почему нынче потонуть?
— Дорого не возьму, — ответил лодочник, — **сиди знай!** (Б. Окуджава. Искусство кройки и шитья).
«Hey, fellow [countryman]», Sysoev called, «how much does it cost to drown these days?» «I won't charge much», the boatman said. «Just stay put [sitting]».

A similar meaning occurs in non-imperative constructions, in past tense or present tense utterances. In such instances the subject keeps on doing V (does only V) or focuses only on doing V, where this is either unexpected or contrary to some contextually given norm. In (9) the subject keeps on digging despite losing blood, and in (10) kept on eating *pelmeni* (ravioli) despite the seriousness of the questions:

- (9) Из меня кровища течет, а я, **знай, копаю да копаю** (Б. Васильев. Дом, который построил Дед. 1990—2000).
I am losing blood but I just keep on digging.

- (10) ... и я, забыв про Нату, глазел на пышную сорокалетнюю армянку. Та спрашивала, надеюсь ли я, что в Москве жизнь наладится или здесь тоже пойдет кувырком, как в Баку, в Тбилиси. А я **знай** ел пельмени и пожимал плечами: будет как будет (В. Маканин. Андеграунд, или герой нашего времени. 1996—1997).

And I, having forgotten Nata, was eyeing the plump forty-year old Armenian woman. The latter was asking if I hoped that life in Moscow would straighten out or if it would here again go topsy-turvy, like in Baku and in Tbilisi. And I just ate *pelmeni* and shrugged my shoulders: whatever will be, will be.

It should be noted that the idea of «keep on doing V», «do only V», or «focus only on V» should not be interpreted literally in the sense that the subject is only involved in the action modified by the meaning of *znaj*. The idea is that the new information or event does not change the focus of the participant. Therefore the use of *znaj* in (10) does not contradict the idea that the speaker looks at the Armenian woman, but the use of *znaj* emphasizes that he pays no attention to the questions and just shrugs his shoulders while eating.

Note that the element of persevering is often correlated with the use of iteration or reduplication; to emphasize the ongoing long-term action, such verbs as *posmeivat'sja*, *poxoxatyvat'*, *pomalkivat'*, *pomaxivat'* and the like are often used⁴:

- (11) — Дело твое старое, **знай полеживай**, — нам так от тебя безопаснее (О. Д. Форш. Одеты камнем. 1924—1925).
«You have your old folks business, just keep on lying down [on and off], we feel safer from you this way».
- (12) Любо дураку, а кругом собрались, столпились посторонние зрители — французы, англичане, немцы — и только, **знай, посмеиваются** над веселым дураком, а немец еще и подзуживает... (А. Т. Аверченко. Дюжина ножей в спину революции. 1921).
The fool is glad, and around him there have crowded outside spectators — French, English, German — and they just keep on laughing at the cheerful fool, and the German even eggs him on...
- (13) На две-то руки у нас и пошла работа, а купец, **знай, обсчитывает да обсчитывает**... (П. П. Бажов. Тяжелая витушка. 1939).
So we started working in two hands, and the merchant keeps on cheating us (in count) and cheating us...

The same type of use can also occur with an inanimate subject, as in (14) where the action keeps on going, whereas one might expect it to stop, or not to occur at all:

⁴ One reviewer pointed out that verbs like *posmeivat'sja*, *poxoxatyvat'* may refer to a particular type of laughing. Even though this is true, in contexts like these the type of laughing is always open-ended and durative.

- (14) Отвлекал себя (а сердце зная подстукивало), шаг за шагом, все ближе к спросу — к столу, где этот здоровенный малый (В. Маканин. Андеграунд, или герой нашего времени. 1996—1997).

I tried to divert myself (yet my heart just kept on beating), step by step, ever closer to the questioning, to the table with that large size guy.

In this sentence we conceptualize the heart as if it has a mind of its own, because it does something, which is not in accordance with what its ‘owner’ wants. In other contexts, *znaj* cannot occur with an inanimate subject. A Google search (18.IX.2010) has revealed a number of examples with *motor znaj sebe* (*určit / revel / bezropotno tjanet / nakručivaet kilometry*), but not a single example with *motor znaj* has been found. We find a similar situation with other inanimate nouns that form utterances with *znaj sebe* but never with *znaj* alone. We will come back to this later.

3. *Sebe*

Now we will turn to the particle *sebe*, which also occurs with a verb (present tense, past tense, imperative, infinitive). The particle can be placed before or after the verb and is never accented.

According to Klenin [1975: 191], «the information that *sebe* provides is that the behavior of the subject is completely self-interested». This is illustrated by the following example:

- (15) Он себе сидит — ‘He just sits’ [Ibid.].

Weiss [2008: 328] adheres to the meaning of *sebe* given by the [MAC]: «себе — (без удар.), частица. разг. Употребляется (обычно постпозитивно) при глаголе или местоимении, подчеркивая, что действие совершается свободно, независимо».

This definition suffers from two formal mistakes: a) if there is a verb in a clause, *sebe* is a particle associated with the verb, and b) it can be used preverbally and postverbally, i. e. prepositively and postpositively. The particle *sebe* cannot be associated with a pronoun. It can be associated with a noun in reduplicated phrases, such as (21) below.

In addition, we would like to propose a more specific meaning of *sebe*: the particle underscores not only that the action is performed freely and independently, as stated in [MAC], but also that it is performed in complete disregard of the outside world from the point of view of the speaker. This can be illustrated by (16), where the subject does not care about the rumors around him and just keeps on working:

- (16) А **мужик себе работает** и хоть бы что. Докторскую защитил, кафедру организовал, по заграницам всё время разъезжает и по бара-

бану ему на все эти сплетни (<http://showtopic.ru/index.php?mod=topic&topic=873359&page=4>).

And the guy keeps on working and it's nothing to him. He defended his second doctoral dissertation, organized a department, travels abroad all the time and he doesn't give a hoot about all this gossip.

So in this case the participant presumably knows about the gossip but does not care and just keeps on working. We find a similar situation with other verbs. In (17) the protagonist lives calmly without letting people's sufferings bother her, while in (18) the father does not care that his wife curses him and continues to sing:

- (17) А их не смущает, что Аня — врач и скрывает это в то время, когда врачи на вес золота. Она **себе живет** спокойно, не думая, что, может быть, кто-то без ее помощи страдает или просто умирает. А она ведь клятву Гиппократова давала (<http://rutracker.org/forum/viewtopic.php?t=2637218>).

And it does not bother them that Anya is a doctor and hides this fact while doctors are worth their weight in gold. She just keeps on living calmly not thinking that maybe someone is suffering or simply dying without her help. Yet after all she did take the Hippocratic oath.

- (18) — Папа у нас, как напьется, так берет песенник и поет все песни подряд. И все на один мотив, — сказала Невеста, с любовью глядя на отца.

Довольный Отец засмеялся.

— Ну, ты уж скажешь, дочка.

— А что, неправда? Мама его ругает матом, а **он себе поет** (В. Шукшин. Точка зрения).

«As soon as Dad gets drunk, he takes the song book and sings all the songs one after another. And all with the same melody», said the Bride looking with love at her father.

The happy Father started laughing.

«Well things you would say, daughter».

«Isn't it true? Mom scolds him with curses and he keeps on singing».

Such examples are plentiful. One of the most famous uses of this *sebe* depicting disregard of the participant is found in Krylov's fable:

- (19) Слон и моська

По улицам Слона водили,

Как видно, напоказ.

Известно, что Слоны

в диовинку у нас,

Так за Слоном толпы зевак ходили.

Отколе ни возьмись, навстречу

Моська им.

Along the streets Big Elephant was led,

To show him off, most likely.

Since Elephants are not a common

thing to see

A crowd of gapers followed on his heels.

All of a sudden Pug springs up in front

of them.

Увидевши Слона, ну на него
метаться,
И лаять, и визжать, и рваться;
Ну так и лезет в драку с ним.
«Соседка, перестань срамиться, —
Ей Шавка говорит, — тебе ль
с Слоном возиться?
Смотри, уж ты хрипишь,
а он себе идет

Вперед
И лаю твоего совсем
не примечает». —
«Эх, эх! — ей Моська отвечает, —
Вот то-то мне и духу придают,
Что я, совсем без драки,
Могу попасть в большие забияки.
Пускай же говорят собаки:
“Ай, Моська! знать, она сильна,
Что лает на Слона!”».

And seeing Elephant, it raises a great
rumpus,
It lunges, barks and howls
And does its best to pick a quarrel.
«Hey neighbor, stop the fuss»,
A mutt intones, «You? Deal with
Elephant?
Look at you barking yourself hoarse,
and he just strolls
Nonplussed
And doesn't care one bit about your
noise».

«Ho ho!» Pug says,
«That's just what I enjoy,
Since I can be a real tough guy
Without a single blow or bruise.
That way, the other dogs will say:
“To bark at Elephant this Pug
Must be a real strong mug!”»

(translation: http://web.mmlc.northwestern.edu/~mdenner/Demo/texts/elephant_pug.htm)

In other words, it is not that the Elephant freely performs the action of walking, but that it is walking along despite the barking of the dog, totally disregarding it. And we can see a reference to this fable in a political cartoon with the Elephant representing the crisis that keeps on going no matter what is going on around him or what is done to him.



Бауржан Избасаров (<http://ccra.ru/D21>)

In order to explain the semantic contribution of *sebe*, it is worthwhile to take a closer look at instances where we find the particle in reduplicated constructions with nouns and verbs, as mentioned earlier. Let us compare parallel reduplicated constructions [N *sebe i* N] and [V *sebe i* V], as in *Student sebe i student* and *Živet sebe i živet*. It would be difficult to ascertain that these are fully unrelated *sebe*'s only because we are dealing with different parts of speech. Judging by these two phrases, particularly without any larger context, one could assume that Klenin's definition or definition of [MAC] works for both cases. However, the nominal phrases often occur with inanimate nouns:

- (20) a. Дом себе и дом⁵. — A house, just a house.
 b. Палка себе и палка. — A stick, just a stick.
 c. Конституция себе и конституция. — A constitution, just a constitution.

One could hardly imagine that the stick, the house and even the Constitution are self-interested or acting freely. All of them *serve a purpose* for some particular participants while being ordinary objects. Unlike *dom kak dom* or *palka kak palka*, which simply state the ordinariness of the object, the objects in the above examples had a potential of being more than ordinary objects from the participant's point of view, but they failed to live up to their more unusual potential. Let us examine their larger contexts:

- (21) Посох, прислоненный к стене, не светился — **палка себе и палка** (<http://tinwet.livejournal.com/32534.html>).

The walking stick that was leaning on the wall was not glowing, it was just a stick.

⁵ There is a difference between the constructions [ну N_{nom} и N_{nom}] and [ну N_{nom} себе и N_{nom}]. The latter is less common and for good reason. The first one asserts that N is nothing but N, one cannot expect from N anything beyond its definition. That is why a Google search offers over six thousand examples of «ну дурак и дурак» and only one of «ну умник и умник». The difference between [ну N_{nom} и N_{nom}] and [ну N_{nom} себе и N_{nom}] is that the first construction is a free statement of the speaker, his judgment of a certain person deemed to be a fool:

- (iv) Но и прощали ему при этом тоже все. Мол, какой спрос с убогого?... Ну — дурак и дурак. Какой с дурака спрос (С. Зелинский. Дурак). — But at the same time they also forgave him everything thinking «what can you expect from a wretched one?»... Well, a fool is just a fool. What can you ask of a fool?

The second construction is the answer to another speaker's statement. In this case one speaker called another 'a fool' who in turn replied, saying that as such he should be ignored:

- (v) Но вы себе тут противоречите. Обычно на дурака не обращают внимания. Тем более, если он дурак по определению. Ну, дурак себе и дурак — что с него взять! — But you are contradicting yourself. They usually don't pay attention to a fool, especially if he is a fool by definition. Well a fool is a fool, you cannot expect anything from him!

- (22) Какие ассоциации вызывает слово «дом»? Нечто милое и уютное, мягкие тапочки у порога, занавески в цветочек на кухне. А внешне?.. **Дом себе и дом**. Прямоугольный. С треугольной крышей. Ну, может, что-то в колониальном стиле или, там, хай-тек какой-нибудь (Самые необычные дома в мире. <http://gazeta-pro.ru/poleznostnat/samyie-neobyichnyie-doma-v-mire.html>).

What are your associations with the word «house»? Something nice and cozy, soft slippers at the threshold, curtains with a floral pattern in the kitchen. And on the outside? Just a house. Rectangular. With a triangular roof. Well, maybe something in colonial style or maybe something high-tech.

- (23) Так, **рыбка себе и рыбка**, незатейливая закуска под пиво. Однако у неё есть другое романтическое и загадочное имя — МАКРЕЛЬ. Имя, достойное феи (www.liveinternet.ru/users/1809148/rubric/625243/page2.html).

Nothing much, just a little fish, a simple chaser for beer. However, it has another romantic and mysterious name — MACKAREL. A name worthy of a fairy.

In all of these examples, the *sebe*-objects are simple, even primitive; they either did not live up to the potential of something unusual, romantic, or fantastic or hide inside themselves this possibility while outwardly being simple and primitive. Clearly, a house, primitive or unusual, as the article suggests, is not by itself or for itself, but for its inhabitants, and a fish is for eating, and a glowing walking stick may have some magical powers for others to use. The *sebe*-object failed to rise above ordinariness and carries nothing emotionally charged for the participant who is interacting with the object.

Let us examine similar verbal constructions (V + *sebe* + V) using the larger context.

- (24) А вскоре ты узнаешь, что у него есть ребенок от предыдущего брака, который живет в другом городе с матерью. Ну **живет себе и живет**, но вот настает прекрасный день, когда ребенок приезжает к вам в гости... Как себя вести и что делать? (<http://www.women.ru/s.php/2408.htm>).

And soon you find out that he has a child from a previous marriage who lives in another town with her mother. Well, she just lives there no big deal, but one fine day comes when the child arrives to visit you... How should you behave and what should you do?

In this example, the stepmother does not care about the stepchild, who lives somewhere else and who does not bother her, until the moment of the visit arrives and her interaction with the stepchild becomes an issue.

- (25) — ... за прошедшие сутки я тут перетрогала все, что можно, и даже то, что трогать не рекомендуется.

— Например? — с детским любопытством спросил Исмаил-бей.

— Например кондиционер. **Работает себе и работает**, зачем его трогать? Но мне было интересно... (<http://www.myjane.ru/articles/text/?id=183>).

«... during the last 24 hours I touched everything possible here as well and even things that are not recommended to touch».

«For example?» Ismail-bey asked with childish curiosity.

«For example, the air conditioner. It works and it's okay, why touch it, but I was curious...»

In other words, it [the air conditioner] works and we should stay away from it. The second participant in the narrated event, i. e. the human (the female speaker of the first and third utterances) should not be concerned with the first participant, i. e. the air conditioner.

One may come to a conclusion that this particular meaning is a feature of the reduplicated construction. This is not the case; we can find very similar non-reduplicated examples, which can be seen as regular instances of the use of *sebe* under discussion:

- (26) Хорошо — **кондиционер себе работает**, прохладно, тихо... (<http://mdb61.livejournal.com/4213.html>).

It's nice, the air conditioner is working, it is cool, quiet...

And in this case, just like in the previous one, everything in the example points to the fact that it is the second participant, i. e. the speaker, whose well-being is in question. And the air conditioner is certainly not working for itself, but for the good of those around it.

Weiss [2008: 331—333] also discusses several examples with non-animate subjects. According to him, one can speak of metaphorization in such cases [Ibid.: 333] or personification [Ibid.: 332]. For some examples, such an analysis can indeed be given:

- (27) И вот сегодня точно такой же снег пошел в Саратове. Вроде бы техника уборочная там быть должна. ... Однако снег **лежит себе** спокойненько, и никто его убирать не собирается. Правда, люди у нас привычные и завтра город будет жить обычной жизнью... (<http://vilianov.com/world/istoriya-kotoraya-povtoryaetsya/>).

— And today exactly the same kind of snow fell on Saratov. They must have the snow plowing equipment. ... However, the snow is just lying there quietly, and no one is planning to clean it up. It's true however, that our people are used to it and tomorrow the city will live a normal life...

In this case one could argue that the use of *sebe* stresses that the snow is lying around *as if* it is being oblivious to the outside world, not taking into account that the situation is remarkable for us people. However, it is also possible and perhaps even more appropriate to speak of metonymy. The human carelessness

vis-à-vis the snow, not paying enough attention to it and not cleaning it up is transferred onto the snow. A metonymical relation can also be perceived in (26). It is more appropriate to speak of a metonymic relation between the idea of ‘disregarding the outside world, not caring about the outside world’ and cases where the realization of the action is ‘to everyone’s satisfaction’. More specifically, if the subject performs an action, not caring about the outside world, he may very well enjoy this specific action (or put differently, it is because he does not care about the outside world that he is enjoying it so much). In the case of inanimate subjects it is not the subject itself that enjoys the action, but the speaker for whom this action is enjoyable. A similar relation can in fact be found in Dutch, where the adverb *lekker* (lit. ‘tasty’, but used to mean ‘for X’s enjoyment’) can be used both to indicate that the action is pleasurable for the subject, and for the speaker:

- (28) a. Hij is lekker aan het voetballen.
He is playing football (and enjoying it).
b. De kachel staat lekker te branden.
The fire is burning (and we enjoy that).

Let us recapitulate the basic meanings of the various uses of *sebe* that we have discussed above. The *sebe* phrases signify obliviousness of the participant, if it is an animate participant, while in those cases where the participant is inanimate, there are metaphorical or metonymic relations with this basic meaning. Reduplicated constructions where *sebe* occurs should be compared with reduplicated constructions without *sebe*. Those with *sebe* either have a hidden potential or the subject failed to live up to a potential as far as the Speaker is concerned. Those without *sebe* never had such an option from the Speaker’s point of view; they simply underscore the ordinariness of the object or the action. Unlike the examples with *sebe* they have no potential for the other participant/Speaker. The following examples have been deliberately chosen to have the same object *dom* ‘house’ as in (22) and *živet* ‘lives’ as in (24). While in (22) the apparently simple house is actually one of the most unusual houses in the world, the one in (29) is nothing but a promotional photograph. In (24), the girl living in another town has an explosive potential for the protagonists, while in (30) the Speaker and his ex-wife live in close proximity without ever meeting:

- (29) Костя обернулся, посмотрел на фотографию особнячка. Ну, **дом и дом!** Чего тут шеф разглядел? Рекламная картинка, не более того (В. Рыжков. Срочно требуется лох).
Kostya turned around, looked at the photograph of the little villa. Well, just a house. What did the boss see there? A promotional picture, nothing more.
- (30) Петербург — город маленький, разумеется, всю его центральную часть можно пройти — так, без лишней спешки — минут за сорок. ... Лет пятнадцать назад... я развелся... со своей первой женой. ... но с тех пор... я ее уже ни разу не видел. Представляешь, целых пят-

надцать лет — нигде, ни разу, хотя бы мельком. ... Кстати, кто-то мне недавно сказал, что она теперь тоже живет на Васильевском. Ну, **живет и живет**. Вот тебе, пожалуйста, и «маленький город» (А. Столяров. Наука расставаний).

Of course St. Petersburg is a small city, you can walk through its central part without any hurry in about forty minutes. ... About fifteen years ago... I divorced... my first wife ... but since then... I have not seen her a single time. Imagine, the whole fifteen years — nowhere, not once, not even in passing. ... By the way, recently somebody told me that she now also lives on Vasilyevsky island. Well, she lives and never mind. There you have it, some “small city”.

A few words should be said about the relation between the use of *sebe* as a particle and its regular reflexive (dative pronominal) use. Discussing (31) (Weiss's example (1)) Weiss [2008: 331] states that the non-reflexive meaning of *sebe* is achieved by insertion of *spokojno* ‘calmly’, although the reflexive meaning could not be completely ruled out:

- (31) В одной адвокатской конторе на стене висит картина, точно отражающая сущность данной профессии: двое мужиков спорят, кому принадлежит корова, один тянет ее за рога, другой — за хвост, а адвокат в это время спокойно **себе доит** эту самую корову...

In one lawyer's office there is a painting on the wall, precisely depicting the essence of this profession: two guys are arguing about who owns the cow, one is pulling it by the horns, the other by the tail, meanwhile the lawyer is calmly milking this very cow...

The situation is, however, more complicated because with verbs like *doit* 'the pronoun *sebe* is not easily interpreted as a reflexive at all (whereas such an interpretation is much easier with other verbs, for example *nalit' sebe čaj*). While we do not think there is a possibility of a reflexive reading in example (31), it is important to add that *spokojno* underscores the fact that the verb it accompanies is an Activity in Vendler's sense, particularly in the case of transitive verbs:

- (32) **Ковал себе спокойно**, нигде не высовывался, но в одну прекрасную ночь уснул кузнецом, а проснулся пророком (www.proza.ru/2002/08/18-58).

He was calmly blacksmithing, not sticking out, but one fine day he went to bed a blacksmith and got up a prophet.

- (33) Мы, например, племяннику манеж покупали в подарок... оказалась полезная штука... мужа сестра ставила его на кухне, накидывала туда игрушек и **готовила себе спокойно еду**, мыла посуду... (<http://forum.natali.ua/viewtopic.php?f=14&t=10164&start=625>).

We for example bought a playpen for our nephew... it turned out to be a useful thing... my husband's sister would put it in the kitchen, throw a lot of toys inside and keep on calmly cooking food, washing dishes...

In the case of transitive verbs as in (33) the idea of a *telos* (natural end point) is pushed to the background, and the situation «preparing food» is conceptualized as something durative, not aimed at a specific result. In such sentences the reflexive meaning of *sebe* is ruled out altogether precisely because of the adverbial. Furthermore, Weiss [2008: 335] also mentions that reduplication of the verb can replace these adverbials, for example *komp rabotal sebe rabotal* ‘the computer kept on working’; both devices underscore the Activity quality of the verb within a narrative. There is, however, one difference; reduplication precedes an abrupt interruption, which can happen for two reasons: either something interrupted the action in progress as in (34) or the action accidentally reached its final point of production, as in (35).

- (34) **Работал себе работал комп**, как вдруг завис — картинка на экране, ни на что не реагирует, даже на «Выкл», только на «Ресет» (<http://www.forum-volgograd.ru/archive/topic/28965-1.html>).

The computer kept on working and then all of a sudden froze — the picture on the screen does not react to anything, even to «Off», only to «Reset».

- (35) Это я случайно... **ленил себе ленил** и на тебе, морда получилась (<http://ilkraret.livejournal.com/25533.html?view=103101#103101>).

This happened by accident... I’ve been molding and molding and there you go: a mug appeared.

Finally, one verb deserves a separate discussion if we are talking about *sebe*: the verb *dumat*. As has been observed by Švedova [Шведова 1960: 162—163], the meaning of the particle *sebe* if it occurs with the verb *dumat* (and verbs with a similar meaning such as *zadumat*, *podumat*, *smekat*) differs from its meaning with other verbs. In our view, there are two types of meanings that a *thinking* verb can acquire in combinations with *sebe*. First, in some sentences *dumat* *sebe* means something similar to English ‘think for oneself’ (cf. Švedova’s description «в них подчеркивается внутренний “для себя” процесс мысли»). More specifically, *sebe* stresses that the subject keeps his or her thoughts private. This is the case in examples (36)—(37):

- (36) — Думай себе что хочешь, — сказал Данило, — думаю и я себе (Н. В. Гоголь. Страшная месть. 1831—1832).

«Think to yourself whatever you want», said Danilo, «I also think to myself».

- (37) «Он любит Марьяну, — **думал себе** Оленин, — а я бы мог любить ее» (Л. Толстой. Казаки).

«He loves Mariana», Olenin thought to himself, «yet I could love her».

Švedova [Шведова 1960: 162] argues that this meaning can be seen as a derived, «weakened» use of the regular particle meaning of *sebe*. Weiss [2008: 338] sees a diachronic relation with the meaning of «segregation» that was part of Old Russian Dative *sobě* (‘independently’, ‘separately’), and argues that in

modern Russian this use of the particle *sebe* has become almost fully semantically bleached. Diachronic research would be necessary to investigate these hypotheses. It should be noted, though, that these uses seem to be more typical of nineteenth century Russian than contemporary Russian, and are rather old-fashioned.

The second type of meaning is exemplified by sentences where *dumat'* *sebe* occurs with the interrogative form *čto*. This type usually occurs in questions, even though non-interrogative sentences occur as well:

- (38) Родимый ты мой батюшка, **что** ж ты **себе** **думал**, что ты над нами сделал? (И. Бунин. Худая трава).
My dear old man, what were you thinking, what did you do to us?
- (39) Но таким Скелетам папиросок не вставляют, неудобно как-то, потому что — жил ведь человек, жил, может быть, даже **чего-то себе думал** (www.erlib.com/Дмитрий_Горчев/План_спасения/10/).
But they don't insert cigarettes to such Skeletons, it's somehow embarrassing, because after all a man lived and lived, and maybe even thought of something.
- (40) «С этих молодых дураков, — сказал он про нас с Эмилем, — станет-ся, но вы-то, старый, прожжённый еврей, **о чём себе думаете?** Вас же просто посадят!» (И. Э. Кио. Иллюзии без иллюзий. 1995—1999).
«One could expect it from these young fools», he said about Emil and me, «but you are an old seasoned Jew, what are you thinking? You'll simply get arrested».

In such sentences the speaker expresses that he does not know and/or disagrees with what the subject is thinking (cf. [Weiss 2008: 338—339]). This is due to the opaque nature of the action described by the verb *dumat'* and other thinking verbs; an outsider can surmise what the subject was thinking if and only if the subject produced some action as a result of thinking. These uses are related to the first, mostly nineteenth century type of *dumat' sebe*, discussed above, because of the opacity.

Finally, there are also sentences with *dumat'* where the particle *sebe* occurs in its regular, prototypical meaning:

- (41) Он опустился на колени и молча слепил заново все разрушенное [песочные домики]. Больше в тот день он никого не трогал. Лежал на диване у телевизора и думал: мазохист он или садист? **Думал себе**, грустил, а рано утром пошел и повырывал с корнями все цветы в саду соседа (<http://2lib.ru/getbook/3485.html>).
He dropped to his knees and silently made anew all [the sandcastles] that he had destroyed. That day he did not touch anyone anymore. He lay on the couch by the TV set and thought: is he a masochist or a sadist? He just thought, grieved and early in the morning he went to pull out all the plants with roots in his neighbor's garden.

In (41) the verb *dumat'* is clearly intransitive, in contrast to the previous examples where it appears with a regular transitive object. In this sentence, *sebe* is used to stress that the subject was actually spending some time thinking, that he was doing it quietly, being oblivious to the outside world.

4. *Znaj* versus *sebe*, *znaj sebe* and *pust' sebe*

We have discussed the meanings of the particles *znaj* and *sebe* and shown that they are semantically comparable, yet not identical and even to some extent opposite. Let us compare parallel examples:

- (42) Но даже в самый благоприятный 1913 год будущие революционеры изумлялись: почему это они пашут до седьмого пота, а их хозяин **знай сидит** в кабинете и только то и делает, что гоняет косточки на счетах (<http://1stolica.com.ua/5852-2.html>).

But even in the most favorable year of 1913 the future revolutionaries were astonished: why is that that they slave breaking their backs while their master just sits in his office and does nothing but move stones on the abacus.

- (43) В общем, если раньше Слона просто не любили, то теперь его стали по-настоящему ненавидеть. «Хорошо было бы, если бы этого отвратительного толстого слона вообще не существовало на свете», — думали некоторые работники зоопарка, а самые злобные думали так: «Стреляли бы в него не слоноусыпляющими, а настоящими разрывными снарядами!» А слону — хоть бы хны! **Сидит себе и сидит**, уши развесив (<http://ezhe.ru/ib/issue1041.html>).

So if previously they simply didn't like the Elephant, now they started hating him for real. «It would have been nice if this disgusting fat elephant did not exist at all», thought some of the zoo workers. The most evil ones thought: «If only they shelled him with real explosive shells and not with elephant somniferous». But the elephant does not give a hoot! He keeps on sitting with his ears hanging.

Clearly, in the former example with *znaj* it is inferred that the revolutionaries perceived the owner as not doing anything else other than sitting in his office and fooling around with his abacus, as if that is all he knows how to do. In the second example with *sebe*, it is stated that the elephant kept on sitting despite the loud explosions around him and all the commotion.

In the following example, which combines *znaj* and *sebe*, one can see that the protagonist does not know anything other than sitting in the room and does not care about anything else:

- (44) Когда Семен Аркадьевич поутру нажал на «switch on», телевизор показывал уже совсем не рыжего карлика, а бегущих бурундуков. «Сломался», — с бурым ужасом на лице, подумал Морштейн. С этим словом он отыскал отвертку, открыл заднюю крышку теле-

визора и принялся ковыряться во внутреннем устройстве, в тайной надежде увидеть на экране рыжего клоуна. Он бы ковырялся целую вечность, вот только его тряхануло током. Он отлетел к стене да там и сник.

С тех пор Морштейн Семен Аркадьевич не музицирует, а к работе в канцелярии и вовсе не пригоден. **Знай, сидит себе** в закрытой камере и в потолок глядит. На языке одни рыжие клоуны крутятся, но доктора говорят, что это лечится. Не скоро, но вроде бы лечится (<http://www.kovmax.idknet.com/index5.php>).

When in the morning Semen Arkadievich pushed the «switch on» button, the TV no longer showed the red-haired midget at all, but running chipmunks. «It's broken», Morshtein thought with brown horror on his face. With this word he found a screwdriver, opened the back panel of the TV set and started poking in the inner mechanism with the secret hope of seeing the red-haired clown on the screen. He would have poked there forever, except that he got zapped. He got knocked back to the wall and collapsed there.

Since then Morshtein, Semen Arkadievich does not play music and is totally not fit for office work. He just sits in the closed chamber and looks at the ceiling. He speaks only of red-haired clowns, although doctors say that this can be cured. Not soon, but it can be cured, sort of.

Such examples are plentiful. The particles *znaj* and *sebe* can be separated by the verb, as in (44), but they can also both precede or both follow the verb, as in (45)–(46):

- (45) **Знай себе** паши и собирай урожай! (В. Ляпоров. Контракт нерезидента (2004) // «Бизнес-журнал», 2004.03.03).
Just plough and harvest.
- (46) Пиши **себе знай** (К. М. Станюкович. Жрецы. 1897).
Just keep on writing.

The particle *znaj* tends to precede the particle *sebe*. In [НКРЯ] we find four examples of «*sebe znaj*» and 106 examples of «*znaj sebe*». In all of the examples «*znaj sebe*» precedes the verb.

Going back to the very first examples:

- (47) — Дома шей и тех нет, а она **знай гуляет** (В. Кавторин. Чужая собственная жизнь) ((1) repeated).
There is even no soup in the house, yet she just goes out.
- (48) Ну, вообще-то, он мог просто купить уже ворованный телефон, тогда получится — ни за что нос сломали. А вор **себе гуляет** и пропивает денюжку закалымленную ((2) repeated).
Well, of course it could be that he simply bought an already stolen phone, in which case it will mean that they broke his nose for nothing. And the thief is just walking around and toasting his ill-gotten gains.

- (49) А в лесу все удивлялись, — и чего ему дома не сидится, все ходит куда-то, бродит — говорили. А Заяц **знай себе гуляет**, лапы в грязюке осенней пачкает (<http://solnce-vorot.blogspot.com/>) ((3) repeated). And in the forest everyone was surprised, why can't he stay home, he keeps going somewhere, wanders, they say. And the Rabbit just takes walks, dirties his paws in the autumn dirt.

The difference in meaning is that in (47) she knows only one thing (going out), and indeed, the larger quote talks about her emotions regarding her date:

- (50) — Явилась! — сказала она Ольге. — Дома шей и тех нет, а она **знай гуляет**. Не слушая, прошла за ширмочку. Ее била дрожь. Наверное, уже поднимался жар, но казалось, что это дрожь обиды (В. Кавторин. Чужая собственная жизнь).
«There you are», she said to Olga. «There is even no soup at home, yet she just goes out». Without listening she went behind the screen. She was shivering. She probably already had a fever, but it seemed that it was from being offended.

Example (48) means that the thief could not care less about the events. And (49) means the combination of those two meanings: the Rabbit does not want to know nor does he care about the negative sides of autumn. Here is the extended quote:

- (51) Один Заяц очень любил осень. Он любил ее со всеми ее невзгодами и непогодами. И воющий осенний ветер, и серые тяжелые облака, и дождь с грозой, и слякоть, и листопад. Частенько Заяц гулял по лесу даже в самую ненастную погоду. А в лесу все удивлялись, — и чего ему дома не сидится, все ходит куда-то, бродит — говорили. А Заяц **знай себе гуляет**, лапы в грязюке осенней пачкает. Only the Rabbit liked autumn very much. He liked it with all of its hardship and bad weather. He liked the howling autumn wind, the heavy grey clouds, the rain with storms, the slush, and the falling leaves. Oftentimes the Rabbit took walks through the woods even in the most foul weather. And in the forest everyone was surprised, why can't he stay home, he is always going somewhere, wanders, they said. And the Rabbit just kept on taking walks, dirtying his paws in the autumn dirt.

Our view that *znaj sebe* can be seen as the combination of *znaj* and *sebe* differs from Ožegov [Ожегов 1990], who argues that «[з]най себе то же, что *знай*». Our hypothesis is corroborated by the fact we noted earlier at the end of section 2, that *znaj* can only combine with inanimate subjects in very specific contexts, whereas *znaj sebe* freely combines with inanimate subjects. This feature of *znaj sebe* can be explained with reference to *sebe*, which can combine with inanimate subjects, as we discussed in the preceding section.

Finally, what is interesting in the opposition of *sebe* and *znaj* is that *sebe* frequently combines with *pust'* or *puskaj*, while *znaj* never does, for example:

- (52) Но и распускать никого нельзя: чуть-чуть послабь — сразу почувствуют. — Пасмотрым, — устало ответил Сталин и моргнул. — Нэ знаю. — Ну, **пусть себе едет** (А. Солженицын. В круге первом. Т. 1. Гл. 1—25 (1968) // «Новый Мир», 1990).

But you cannot let anyone loose either: just let them a tiny bit loose, they will feel it immediately. «We shall see», Stalin answered tiredly and blinked. «Don't know». «Well let him just go».

This can be explained based on the semantics of the particles. Since *sebe* means not caring (emotionally) about the outside world and not bothering the outside world, *pust' sebe* means 'I allow him to emotionally disregard me (and other people and things) and do V (it does not bother me and/or I do not care)'.

- (53) «А что старик? Он своё прожил, его не переделаешь. **Пусть себе сидит пишет**» (Ю. О. Домбровский. Факультет ненужных вещей. Ч. 3. 1978).

«What about the old man? He lived his life, you can't change him. Let him sit and write».

If the subject is inanimate, *pust' sebe* also signals that the speaker does not want to block the action, and does not care:

- (54) Он журчал, щебетал, чирикал. Он точил, расточал. Федору Филатовичу было всё равно. **Пусть себе течёт**, пусть надорвётся, пусть разорвётся этот кран! ... Федор Филатович ничего этого уже не слышал, потому что он умер (И. Грекова. Фазан. 1984).

It was babbling, twitting, chirping. It was exuding, it was wasting. Fedor Filatovich did not care. Let it flow, let it break, let this faucet break! ... Fedor Filatovich did not hear any of it, because he had died.

Znaj presupposes that the speaker views the subject's action negatively, as in (55), or his/her inability to do what is supposed to be done instead of action V, as in (56):

- (55) — Твоя судьба Недоля — белоручка. Она **знай спит** днем и ночью, так что ты обречен на бедность (Девы судьбы. <http://www.rusizn.ru/pred84.html>).

Your fate Badlot is a shirker. She only sleeps day and night, so that you are doomed to be poor.

- (56) — **Спи знай**, спи, — сказал я. Он послушно замолчал, затих и скоро заснул (<http://bortmehanik.ru/desyat-chasov/o-vas-vse-zabyli.html>). «Just go to sleep, go to sleep», I said. He obediently stopped talking, became quiet and soon fell asleep.

The negative view of the subject's actions cannot combine with the permissive *pust'*⁶.

5. *Sebe* and *znaj* and aspectuality

As we have already mentioned, both particles are strongly associated with the imperfective aspect. This can be explained with reference to the meaning of the particles, which presuppose a durative action. *Znaj* expresses that the subject focuses or should focus, in the case of imperative, only on doing V. This is clearly in full accordance with the idea of durativity because it implies focusing on one action and realizing just one action without consideration of the natural endpoint of the action. Similarly, the particle *sebe* expresses that the subject realizes just one action, while being oblivious to the outside world. Again, this meaning is in full accordance with the idea of durativity.

However, there are some interesting differences between the two particles. While the particle *znaj* occurs almost exclusively with imperfective verbs (based on the Russian National corpus), we found one perfective verb that combines with *znaj* — verbum dicendi *zalatit'* meaning 'starting to repeat':

- (57) А тот **знай** **заладил**: «Порядок один — обеспечить свободный проезд!» (М. Бонч-Осмоловская. Рождественский романс).

And he started repeating one thing: «There is one rule: ensure free passage!»

However, this does not present an aspectual contradiction; the inchoative *zalatit'* signifies the beginning of an atelic action, which has an inherent durative meaning lexically because of the concept of repetition. As we noted earlier, the use of long-term actions, or habitual actions such as *posmeivat'sja* are typical for *znaj*.

The particle *sebe* also typically occurs with imperfective verbs. However, the [НКРЯ] data show that the particle *sebe* can be combined with perfective verbs more easily than *znaj*. There are three types of instances that we can distinguish. First, sentences with *pust'* *sebe* with perfective delimitative and perdurative:

⁶ Interestingly, some examples can be found on the internet with *znaj sebe* and *pust'*, for example:

- (vi) Вот тут многие рассуждают типа «стрелять я и сам умею, а жена **пусть** **знай себе** меня, любимого, обслуживает» (<http://popgun.ru/viewtopic.php?f=335&t=361044&start=210>). — Here many people are discussing things like «Shooting I can do myself, so let the wife serve me, her loved one».

In this example, the speaker does not only express that he is fine with his wife serving him (in fact, it seems to be the husband rather than the wife that wants this), but he also wants her to focus on doing only that. The exact same meaning could not have been expressed by *pust' sebe* without *znaj*. This use seems to corroborate our hypothesis that the combination of the two modal particles cannot be seen as identical to *znaj*.

- (58) Поэтому осторожность прежде всего... Пусть уж там **себе полежит**. Надо выждать, выждать... (Ф. М. Достоевский. Крокодил).
Therefore carefulness is above all... Let it lie there a bit. We must wait it out, wait it out...
- (59) «Ну и **пусть себе погуляет**, главное, чтобы не ушла», — забыв о гордости, решил любящий муж (<http://gazeta-dona.ru/gizn/1302-kovarstvo-i-lyubov.html>).
«So let her fool around a bit, the main thing is that she should not leave», thought the loving husband, forgetting his pride.
- (60) Вот я и подумал — **пусть себе потренируется** (Тропой Койота. http://www.litsovet.ru/index.php/material.read?material_id=313723).
That's why I thought: let him get practiced a bit.
- (61) **Пусть себе прогуляется** по Владимирке (В. А. Дьяченко. Драматические произведения).
Let him take a walk along Vladimirk [the road by which prisoners went to Siberia].

The prefixes all denote a particular extension in time and are in accordance with the idea of durativity.

Second, the perfective is possible with past tense verbs of motion, to indicate the beginning of an action:

- (62) Положил Иван Романыч деревянный крест сверху карт, перекрестил обоих — и **пошёл себе** (Е. И. Замятин. Север. 1918).
Ivan Romanych put the wooden cross on top of the cards, made the sign of a cross over both and went away.
- (63) Он огляделся вокруг и, до земли поклонившись могиле, — словно бы прощался с нею, — встал и **побрел себе** по тропинке (В. В. Крестовский. Петербургские трущобы. Книга о сытых и голодных. Роман в шести частях. Ч. 6. 1867).
He looked around and after he bowed low to the grave, as if saying good-bye, got up and wandered off along the path.

In these contexts the perfective verb has an ingressive⁷ meaning, and the particle refers to the (instantaneous) reaching of the telos and its resulting state.

Third, there are cases which are neither ingressive nor inchoative, but just perfectives of verbs of motion and verbs of position change, for example:

- (64) — Что же было потом?
— Да ничего, — развела руками старушка, — «Скорую» вызвали.
— А куда «Мерседес» подевался?

⁷ We follow Zaliznjak and Šmelev's [Зализняк, Шмелев 2000] distinction between inchoative and ingressive actions.

— Уехал.

...

— Я в окно высунулась и давай кубиками в нее швырять, только толку? Сели и **уехали себе**.

— Их двое было? (Д. Донцова. Уха из золотой рыбки. 2004).

«What happened afterwards?»

«Nothing», the old woman shrugged her shoulders. «Called the ambulance».

«And where did the Mercedes disappear?»

«It left».

...

«I looked out the window and started to throw toy blocks at her, only what for? They got into the car and drove off».

«There were two of them?»

- (65) **Развалился себе** на постели и только трубку снимает да кнопки свои жмет (Э. Лимонов. Подросток Савенко. 1982).

He reclined at ease in bed and only picks up the receiver and punches his buttons.

The same aspectual context for *sebe* can also be found with state changing verbs, such as *prosnut'sja*, *zasnut'* and *umeret'*:

- (66) А он **проснулся себе** тихонечко, даже ни пискнул, и пошел осваивать территорию вниз головой. В коляске спать боюсь оставлять — он на ножки встает уже... (edem.2x2tv.tv/forum-f51/tema-t58-15.htm).

He woke up quietly, did not even squeak, and went to familiarize himself with the territory head first. I am afraid to leave him sleeping in the stroller, he can already stand up.

- (67) Ты сама и **заснешь себе** во гробе (Ю. Мамлеев. Конец света / Прыжок в гроб. 1997).

You yourself will fall asleep in the coffin.

- (68) Его смерть с ней связать они никак не могли, потому что она стерла всю переписку с ним. Свидетелей их знакомства тоже не было. Ну, **умер себе** человек в своей кровати, во сне и умер (http://www.mamba.ru/diary/post.phtml?user_id=125516207&post_id=808).

They could not in any way connect his death with her because she erased all correspondence with him. There also weren't any witnesses of their being acquainted. So a man quietly died in his bed, died in his sleep.

As in the other examples with the verbs of motion, *sebe* refers to (instantaneous) reaching of the telos and its resulting state. In the example with *prosnut'sja*, the particle *sebe* stresses that the baby has woken up quietly, without a fuss. The perfective is used because it is the instantaneous event of waking up to which *sebe* refers.

The verb *umeret* 'to die' deserves a more elaborate discussion. Weiss [2008: 333—334] discusses the unusual usage of *umeret* *sebe* / *umirat* *sebe*. He argues that this use emphasizes that the dying of the subject is realized without any disturbance, without the presence of any outside force. In some cases, he argues, the use may also have an ironic character, even though such uses are rather infrequent according to him. We would like to add that in our view the aspect of the verb also plays an important part. Based on the data that we found on the Internet, we conclude that the perfective *umer sebe* is much more common than the imperfective *umiraet sebe* and especially *umiral sebe*. The meaning of the particle *sebe*, as we have outlined it earlier, explains the discrepancy. Since the particle means 'disregard for the outside world' *umer sebe* means in most sentences 'died without any concern for those left behind'. Present tense imperfective process *umiraet sebe* means virtually the same thing, except one cannot reasonably suggest that a person is deliberately dying to spite or disregard the other people's wishes or interest:

- (69) ... **а он себе умирает** и в ус не дует ... (http://offtop.ru/smoon/v7_119511_.php?of2609=e606620440c373e0297a0fd94c3d40fc).
... and he is dying and does not give a hoot ...

One can imagine black humor statements similar to the following:

- (70) Детям не в чем ходить, а он **себе умирает**.
The children have nothing to wear, while he is dying (and doesn't give a hoot).

The second example that we found exhibits a metonymy, which is not surprising since this is a dream; it is others who do not care about his dying:

- (71) А во сне происходит следующее: обычно те, кто в реале считают его хорошим человеком, сидят за столом, а **он себе умирает** (со стонами и хрипами), а они не обращают внимания, или спокойно комментируют:
— Так он же давно был неизлечимо болен. Нормально, что умирает. Фиг с ним (<http://socionics.org/forums/thread/259786.aspx>).
And in the dream the following is going on: those who in real life usually consider him a nice person are gathered around the table, and he is dying (with moans and groans), and they pay no attention, or comment calmly:
— Well, he has been terminally ill for a long time. It's normal that a person dies. To hell with him⁸.

⁸ The verb *umirat* also provides us with an insightful difference between *sebe* and *znaj*. As one reviewer remarked, one can say *Oni sidjat, vypivajut, a on sebe umiraet*; but not **Oni sidjat, vypivajut, a on znaj umiraet*. The explanation, as we see it, is that only *sebe* contains the element «despite the outside world, not caring (emotionally) about the outside world», which is an essential element here, even its ironic or metonymical use.

6. Conclusion

We have demonstrated that semantically the particles *znaj* and *sebe* are different and that the difference is two-fold: focus and combinatory ability with the particle *pust*'. The meaning of the utterances with the particles could be summarized as follows:

- X znaj V*: all that *X* focuses on ('knows') is doing *V*, disregarding all other information.
X sebe V: *X* realizes *V*, disregarding the outside world, despite the outside world, not caring (emotionally) about the outside world.

If we view the situation schematically, with *W* symbolizing the outside world, *znaj* designates the emphasis on the action (*V*): +*V* (*W*), while *sebe* designates the negative emphasis on the outside world: –*W* (*V*).

Sentences with *sebe* can occur with non-animate subjects, in which case there is a metaphoric or metonymic relation with the basic meaning given here. Such cases indicate that the action is performed despite the outside world, which is either evaluated positively or negatively. In contrast to that, similar instances with inanimate subjects are very rare with *znaj*. This is because this particle presupposes an entity that can actually focus or think or know only one thing. This would require a personified inanimate object with a mind of its own. Another entity instance of difference is the combinatory possibility with the particle *pust*' 'let'; it can combine with *sebe* but not with *znaj*.

What both particles (and their combination) have in common is the aspectual — durative, imperfective — nature of the verb that combines with them, the verb primarily indicating an activity or a state in Vendler's terms. The particle *sebe*, however, does combine more easily with some perfective verbs.

There are two directions for further research that we would like to mention. First, there seem to be differences in style and register with respect to the particles we discussed (*znaj*, *sebe* and *znaj sebe*). Further research could focus more on this issue. Second, we have argued that the meaning of *znaj sebe* can be seen as the combination of the meanings of *znaj* and *sebe*. Even though we have provided several arguments for this claim, further research could test our hypothesis, for example by conducting a survey with native speakers to see if there are preferred contexts for *znaj sebe* as opposed to *znaj* or *sebe*.

References

- Зализняк, Шмелев 2000 — А. А. Зализняк, А. Д. Шмелев. Введение в русскую аспектологию. М., 2000.

Znaj would suggest that the subject deliberately and consciously focuses on dying, which is rather absurd.

Луценко 1984 — Н. Луценко. О глаголе *знать* и частице *знай* // Русская речь. 1984/1. С. 128—132.

МАС — Словарь русского языка: В 4 т. / Под ред. А. П. Евгеньевой. М., 1957—1961.

НКРЯ — Национальный корпус русского языка (<http://ruscorpora.ru>).

Ожегов 1990 — С. И. О ж е г о в. Словарь русского языка. 22-е изд. М., 1990.

Шведова 1960 — Н. Ю. Ш в е д о в а. Очерки по синтаксису русской разговорной речи. М., 1960.

Шведова 1980 — Н. Ю. Ш в е д о в а. Русская грамматика. Ч. 2: Синтаксис. М., 1980.

Klenin 1975 — E. K l e n i n. The Pronoun *sebjja*, Particle *sebe*, and Affix *-sja* // The Slavic and East European Journal. 19/2. 1975. S. 188—199.

Weiss 2008 — D. W e i s s. Živi sebe normal'nenko! Zur Lexikalisierung von russ. *sebe* als Partikel // Schweizerische Beiträge zum XIV. Internationalen Slavistenkongress in Ohrid, September 2008. Bern; Frankfurt am Main, 2008. S. 327—344.

Э. ФОРТЕЙН, А. ИЗРАЭЛИ

МОДАЛЬНЫЕ ЧАСТИЦЫ И АСПЕКТУАЛЬНОСТЬ: *ЗНАЙ* И *СЕБЕ* В РУССКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

В статье рассматривается семантика и грамматические особенности частиц *знай* и *себе*, а также сочетания *знай себе*, до недавнего времени мало исследованных и обычно считающихся синонимичными. Обе частицы и их комбинация используются при глаголе несовершенного вида длительного значения. Однако, несмотря на видимое сходство, частицы *знай* и *себе* различаются семантически и должны считаться квазисинонимами. На основании исследования данных Национального корпуса русского языка мы продемонстрировали, что семантические различия проявляются в (не)возможности использования при неодушевленном подлежащем, в сочетании с частицей *пусть*, а также с глаголом совершенного вида.

Ключевые слова: модальные частицы, квазисинонимия, семантика.