

Implicit and explicit reference to the addressee in dialogue communication in Slovak

Jana Kesselová, University of Presov, Slovakia

Slovak is a pro-drop language in which the expression of the personal pronoun is unnecessary thanks to inflection that indicates the person. The question arises as to why Slovak speakers refer to the person not only implicitly (by inflection) but also explicitly (by a combination of inflection together with personal pronoun). Existing research explains the explicit referencing to the addressee with a reference to functional perspective of the sentence, rhythm, emotionality, contrastive function, expressivity and pragmatic function. The study examines the relationship between the semantics of the verb and explicit reference to the addressee in the 2nd person singular/plural, in which it is used preferentially. In the study, we address two questions: (a) To which degree are explicit references used with verb forms in 1st, 2nd and 3rd person? (b) In which semantic classes of verbs is explicit reference used preferentially? In the study we examine oral dialogic communication in Slovak. The research methodology is based on a cognitive linguistic approach and salience theory that describe the pronouns as a means of emphasizing the semantic role and prominence of the person in communication context. Pro-drop languages allow the speaker to put a higher emphasis on the semantic role of the communication participant compared to languages that require the pronoun and therefore do not allow the speaker to use it according to their intention. The study on the data in the Corpus of Spoken Slovak shows that the pronoun is preferentially used with verbs from semantic classes that refer to the addressee's inner world invisible to their communication partner. The Slovak speaker emphasizes the semantic role of the addressee when referring to their inner world (cognition, emotions, evaluation, experiences, identification).

Keywords: *implicit reference, explicit reference, addressee, dialogue, Slovak*

1. Introduction

The study is part of a wider survey into the person and social deixis in Slovak.¹ It is also a partial contribution to finding an answer to the question: What is the nature of the component of Slovak which is primarily orientated towards the person? Such orientation has two aspects: one is of the person as a participant and non-participant in a communicative act; the second is the person as a bearer of social roles, status and relationships with communication partners. These are both based on the traditional categories of person and social deixis. According to Levinson (1983: 62), “*person deixis concerns the encoding of the role of participants in the speech event in which the utterance in question is delivered [...]*“. On the other hand, “*social deixis concerns the encoding of social distinctions that are relative to participant-roles, particularly aspects of the social relationship holding between speaker and addressee(s) or*

¹ This research is part of the VEGA 1/0099/16 *Person and social deixis in Slovak (person in language, language in person)* grant project. Person and social deixis is researched both synchronously and diachronously as well as from the viewpoint of ontogenetic speech. The subject of research are written and spoken texts in Slovak from various spheres of communication, with texts taken from the *Slovak National Corpus* and research text samples compiled by individuals for specific research purposes.

speaker and some referent“ (ibid.: 63). The subject of this study is references to the addressee in Slovak dialogue communication and follows on from studies of separate corpus surveys focused on autoreference, i.e. to the reference of speakers to themselves (Kesselová 2018a: 94–108; Kesselová 2018b: 7–22).

The theme of the study is motivated by various factors. The polarity between the speaker and addressee is a key element of communication. J. Mukařovský (1948: 132) states that the mutual relationship between communication participants is felt like a tension unconnected with any of the communicators but existing between them; it can be objectified as a *psychological situation* within the dialogue.

Deictic expressions related to the polarity of speaker versus addressee are specific means of reference. At the moment of speech they refer to separate participants of the speech act but they do not identify the individual person but instead their communicative role.

In Slovak this relates to the first and second person of the verb, the first-person pronoun ‘I’ (*ja*) and second-person pronouns ‘you’ (*ty*, *vy*), which are differentiated as follows:

a) The *ty* pronoun in the singular refers to an individual addressee who the speaker knows and has a close social relationship with. To use the pronoun in communication with an unknown adult person is considered impolite in the Slovak environment.

b) The *vy* pronoun in the plural refers either to a group of addressees or to an individual with whom the speaker has a less close relationship (the speaker does not know the addressee or the addressee has a higher social status than the speaker). In Slovak there has to be agreement between personal pronouns and the form of the verb. The *vy* pronoun always requires a plural form of the verb regardless of whether it is used to refer to a group or individual addressee.

The choice of the *ty* (‘you’ singular) and *vy* (‘you’ plural) pronouns is determined by social roles and the social distance between communication partners but also by rules of social behaviour in the Slovak culturo-linguistic context. The *vy* (plural) is a sign of respect towards the communication partner based on their social status.² The *vy* pronoun (plural) is one common means of honorification.³ The shift from using *vy* (plural) to *ty* (singular) is a result of agreement between communication partners and determined by the rules of etiquette.

Gender differences in Slovak are only expressed in third-person pronouns. In the singular there are three third-person pronouns: *on* ‘he’ (masculine), *ona* ‘she’ (feminine) and *ono* ‘he/she’ (neuter). In the plural, there are only two: *oni* ‘they’ (masculine plural) and *ony* ‘they’ (feminine and neuter plural).

² Social status is defined as the “social position of a person in a certain society or group bound by a degree of acknowledgement from other members“ (Petrušek 1996: p. 1226).

³ As well as the *vy* pronoun, the substantives *pán* and *pani* (*Sir/Mr* and *Madam/Mrs*) are also used for purposes of honorification. In direct contact they are used as forms of address or for purposes of identification (*Vy ste pani X?* ‘Are you Madam X?’). The substantives *pán* (*Sir/Mr*) and *pani* (*Madam/Mrs*) may also refer to non-participants of the communication. They are used mostly (but not exclusively) in formal and non-familiar dialogue when referring to people of a higher social status or of the church. Typical collocations using *pán/pani* in the Slovak spoken corpus are made up of substantives from an ecclesiastic context (*God, Jesus, priest, bishop*) or the naming of people of higher status (*professor, dean, manager, president, minister; teacher, doctor, associate professor, engineer, deputy, commander*). The expressions *pán/pani* serve as means of honorification between communication partners of the same social status (e. g. in dialogue between friends: *Ako sa má pani manželka?* ‘How is your wife?’) but also between communication partners of unequal social status (e. g. a teacher communicating with a student referring to another colleague but also friend: *Nech mi pán profesor napíše.* ‘Ask the professor to write to me.’).

Use these deictic forms constantly switches from one person to the other and requires speakers and addressees to adopt a reciprocity of perspective.⁴

The polarity between speaker and addressee does not only relate to the linguistic aspect of communication but has a wider anthropological dimension. According to I. Vaňková (2005: 24–55), the opposition of *I* versus *you*, but also modifications such as *I* versus *others*, *my*, *own* versus *someone else's* is not limited just to the semantics of language but represents one of the oppositions structuring our experience of the world in general. This is true both in sign systems as well as in life itself, the connotative element of language being enriched through this. The components *I*, *my*, *own* have more positive connotations whereas *you*, *your*, *other* are more negative.⁵

Reciprocity of perspectives does not just relate to the use of deictic structures in speech but affects the whole character of communication and social interaction. According to Schütz & Luckmann (1973: 59–60), reciprocity of perspectives is the first step from individual consciousness to the social world. It is thus essential that we overcome the barrier arising from the fact that my own consciousness and yours cannot be completely identical because each of us lives in different “reaches“ of the world.

*First, because the world in my reach cannot be identical with the world in your reach, his reach, etc.; because my here is your there; and because my zone of operation is not the same as yours. And, second, because my biographical situation with its relevance systems, hierarchies of plans etc., is not yours and, consequently, the explications of the horizon of objects in my case and yours could take entirely different directions [...]*⁶

From the above, it emerges that studying instruments of autoreference and reference to an addressee means uncovering forms of expression which create the *I* versus *others* polarity and show how cooperativeness is achieved in human interaction. Coding of the person in a system of three verb forms, as we know in Slovak, appears completely natural and ‘logical’ to us because it reflects the everyday model of human communication (speaker – addressee – third person as subject of communication). However, comparison with other – mainly culturally distant – languages shows that coding of people according to their communicative roles is just one of the possible ‘visions’ of a social world. This is documented in the latter part of the study.

In the first part we focus on the status of person markers in theoretical approach and in various languages; in the second part we focus on our own empirical research in the Slovak language.

2. Previous research

⁴ „A class of words whose meaning differs according to the situation“, starting with what Otto Jespersen calls (2007 [1922]: 123) *shifters*. While the speaker refers to himself or herself using *I* pronoun and the first person form of the verb, it is expected that one’s communication partner will change perspective and use the second-person. “Mirroring“ of perspective is a very interesting theme in the early ontogenetic speech of children (Kesselová 2018c: 14–35).

⁵ *Own*, *my/mine*, *our/ours* have close, familiar, trustworthy, accepted, positive associations; *strange*, *belonging to others* is associated with the unknown, the uncertain, potentially threatening, negative. In Slovak this opposition is represented by such expressions as *our* (=family, relatives), *it is my blood group*, *it is mine* ‘I like it’, *our person*, *to feel like at home* as opposed to *to feel strange*, *we are strangers*, *to become estranged*, *show someone a strange face*, *to not feel oneself*, *to not be in one’s element* etc.

⁶ Schütz & Luckmann (1973: 59–60).

2.1 Category of person and personal marker

Given that not all lexico-grammatical indicators of person can be classed as personal pronouns and grammatical verb morphemes, A. Siewierska (2004) started to use the terms *person marker* and *person form* in her *Person* monograph. From the author's extensive comparative research, it emerges that the vast majority of languages differentiate between three persons and two numbers (sg and pl). There are some languages with more than 130 personal markers (e.g. Fijian, an Austronesian language) as well as languages with only two, e.g. "*Madurese, an Austronesian language, now mainly spoken in Java, has only two, sengkog „I/me“ and tang „my“*" (Siewierska 2004: 2). Various agents enter into systems of person markers, such as use in positive and negatives statement, the social status of the speaker, social distance between the communication partners, gender, generation, reciprocity. The results are idiosyncratic and, compared to Slovak, often surprisingly rich systems of language tools. K. Hale (1966: 319) gives the example of Lardil, an Australian language, in which there are two sets of person markers which function on the principle of *alternate generation levels* (the term *harmony* is used in the text). This principle of naming persons is described (ibid.: 319):

A person is harmonic with respect to members of his own generation and with respect to members of all even-numbered generations counting away from his own (e. g., his grandparents' generation, his grandchildren's generation, etc.). He is disharmonic with respect to members of all odd-numbered generations (e. g., that of his parents, that of his children, that of his great-grand-parents, etc.).

The generational criterion is combined with two sets of pronouns – with dual and plural paradigm. A result, for instance, is that there is a specific dual form "*you two*", when the speaker addresses two people, a brother and sister or grandparent and grandchild, for instance; but a different one when the speaker addresses a parent and child or great-grandparent and their great-grandchild. This difficult system of person markers in Lardil is complemented by a corresponding system of syntactic rules. The study reveals that the principles governing the use of person markers are applied in other spheres such as "*the kinship terminology itself, the semimoiety and subsection terminology, the marriage rule, totemic association, ritual obligations, etc.*" (ibid.: 319).

Referring to selected Australian languages, A. Siewierska (2004: 3–4) demonstrates that there exist languages with 12 different sets of person markers by which, through the speech act, the speaker demonstrates their relationship towards the addressee. *Dhimal* (a Tibeto-Burman language) has "*special person forms just for the first- and second-person singular which are reciprocally used only between two distinct groups, one being the parents of a husband and a wife and the other, a man and his wife's senior relatives*". Nor is the means of creating verb forms unified. *Tiddim* (another Tibeto-Burman language) has both prefixal and suffixal forms, the first being used in narratives and the second in everyday conversation.

These chosen examples from linguistically very different cultures demonstrate that although the system of three verb persons and their corresponding pronouns may seem self-evident and normal to users of Slovak, it is in fact just one of many ways of referring to a person. Different languages code the category of person in very different ways reflecting disparities in perception and structuring of social worlds, a reality which is one of the motivations for research into the field of social and personal deixis in Slovak.

2.2 The structurality of a pronominal system

In the 1970s E. Benveniste appraised differences in the subsystem of personal pronouns. In his famous study *La nature des pronoms* (1971: 256), he challenged tradition by saying only the first and second person can belong to the grammatical category of person; the 3rd person is effectively a non-person. The 3rd person pronoun serves to replace a segment of a statement or a whole statement with a more comfortable substitute (*Pierre est malade, il a la fièvre*). However the function of the 3rd person pronoun has nothing in common with indicators of communicative roles such as the 1st and 2nd person (speaker and addressee). The key difference between first- and second-person pronouns on one side and 3rd person on the other is confirmed by Lyons (1977: 638).

The term “third person“ is negatively defined with respect to “first person“ and “second person“: it does not correlate with any positive participant role. The so-called third-person pronouns are quite different in this respect from the first-person and second-person pronouns.

The stated distinction between pronouns is manifested variously in languages: in differences in the formal structure of 1st / 2nd person pronouns in relation to the 3rd person, in disparate word order of pronouns, in the system of relational morphemes, in expression of gender, and in the various possibilities of semantic restriction of personal pronouns. Let us briefly consider this last aspect.⁷

T. Noguchi (1997: 777) states that in Japanese certain syntagmatic combinations of personal pronouns are acceptable which in translation equate to such collocations as *little he*, *sweet she*, *my he* (=boyfriend), *my she* (=girlfriend), *this he*, *this she*.

In Slovak the only one of these used is the very exception restriction of a personal pronoun using the demonstrative. A specific case of compatibility of demonstratives with a personal pronoun can occur if the context does not provide a vehicle for concretization of the 3rd person pronoun. This can be a result of unintended slackness in formulating a statement or the communicative purpose of disguising or hiding the content of a statement from a communication partner. This can be demonstrated by an example from dialog (1a,b).

- (1) a. Slovak Bol si s ním?
be-2SG-PST with he-INS-SG
'Were you with him?'
- b. Slovak A to je kto ten on?
and it be-3SG who this he-NOM
'And who is this he?'

In Slovak a 3rd person pronoun can also serve as a demonstrative. An example (2a, b) from dialog (a teacher *TCH, student *STU).

- (2) a. Slovak *TCH: Kto rozlial tú vodu?

⁷ The nature of personal pronouns creates typological differences between languages. Criteria for classification of languages according to a scale with nominality and pronominality is given in the model of N. Sugamoto (1989).

who spilled-3SG-PST that water-ACC-SG
 ‘Who spilled that water?’

b. Slovak *STU: ona.
 she-NOM-SG
 ‘She did.’ (the student points at a classmate)

Using the 3rd person to refer to a communication partner who is present in the communicative situation, however, is deemed to be a breach of good behaviour and politeness in Slovak. The demonstrative function of the personal pronoun may have a historical explanation. Third-person pronouns were originally demonstratives in Slovak (Krajčovič 1988: 120).

We should add that in Slovak personal pronouns are used in restrictive clauses with substantives. A substantive in the second position requires a personal pronoun in the first place in a restrictive group. We studied the semantic profile of substantives in collocative paradigms of personal pronouns taken from the *Slovak national corpus*. The potential of personal pronouns to function in restrictive constructions with the substantive depends on the person. The contrast between 1st and 2nd person and the 3rd person (§2.2) is clearly seen in restrictive groups. While they occur quite frequently in the 1st and 2nd person, they are exceptional in the third.⁸

The pronoun *ja* ‘I’ is predominantly associated with negative emotionality occurring in statements with the communication function of self-criticism or self-pity (*I + fool, ass, chump, idiot, wretch, rascal, twit, moron, loser, waste of time...*); less frequently it is used in conjunction with a profession or ethnicity (*I + actor, writer, musician, Slovak*). In the first case the statement’s subjectivity is highlighted (3a), in the second a chosen aspect of the speaker’s identity (3b).

(3a) Slovak Ja hlupák som jej na to skočil.
 I fool-NOM be-1-SG she-DAT-SG on it jump-PST-SG
 ‘What a fool I am for falling for it.’

(3b) Slovak Ako to vidím ja spisovateľ Daniel Hevier.
 how it see-1-SG I writer-NOM-SG Daniel Hevier
 ‘How I see it, the writer Daniel Hevier.’

Negative emotionality is also associated with substantives using the pronoun *ty* ‘you’ (*you + ass, swine, lunatic, idiot, dunce...*). These collocations are pragmatically classed as insults.

Restrictive collocations with the *my* ‘we’ pronoun are quite different. These can be classed as “unitary“ *my* (*we + two*), exclusive *my* (*we + alone, only*), inclusive *my* (*we + everyone*), ethnic *my* (*we + Slovaks, Hungarians*), oppositional *my* (*we others*), confessional *my* (*we + Christians, believers*), generational *my* (*we + older ones, youngsters, people, children, parents*) and professional *my* (*we + doctors, trainers, players, journalists*).

⁸ Results of the corpus survey are drawn from subcorpus prim-8.0-public-sane (73.52% informative, 16.50% artistic, 8.92% specialized, 1.06% other texts), 1,076,309,519 words.

The *vy* ‘you PL’ pronoun moves between the *my* ‘we’ and *ty* ‘you SG’ pronoun and is used to join similar specifications (a group *vy dvaja* ‘two’, total *vy všetci* ‘all’, oppositional *vy ostatní* ‘others’, generational *vy mladí* ‘young’, *vy starí* ‘old’ and gender-based *vy muži* ‘men’, *vy ženy* ‘women’. It is much more common, however, for the *vy* ‘you V’ pronoun to be used, as with the *ty* ‘you T’ pronoun, together with negative substantives in terms of abuse (*vy + swine, morons, idiots, lunatics* etc.).

From this it emerges that the (im)possibility of semantic restriction of pronouns is determined in Slovak both by the type of pronoun and by the type of expression with a restrictive function. While the restriction of a personal pronoun by a demonstrative is exceptional and the restriction of a possessive excluded, restriction by a substantive is possible. This occurs more commonly with 1st and 2nd person pronouns but is rare with 3rd person pronouns.

2.3 Current trends in research

In the 1960s was a turning point in research into address systems thanks to the work of Brown and Gilman (1960: 253–276), who interpret reference to an addressee within the dichotomy of *power vs. solidarity*. Power is associated with formal V pronouns (such as French *vous* or German *Sie* or Slovak *vy*) and solidarity with informal T pronouns (such as French *tu* or German *du* or Slovak *ty*). Symmetry is generally seen as a synonym of solidarity and is exemplified by relationships between people who have the same families, the same profession, studied together etc.

Power is a relationship between at least two persons, and it is nonreciprocal in the sense that both cannot have power in the same area of behavior [...]. The relations called older than, parent of, employer of, richer than, stronger than, and nobler than are all asymmetrical (ibid.: 255, 257).

P. Mühlhäusler & R. Harré (1990: 140–141) are dismissive of this interpretation however. Although they acknowledge the originality of the theory, they claim that the second-person pronoun in statements fulfils no specific function except for participating in emotional changes (surprise, consternation, hatred, love, anger, sensitivity). The question arises of whether this emotional scale is then a basis for forming *vy/ty*-statements oscillating between shows of power and solidarity. Over fifty years ago Brown & Gilman (1960: 280) predicted that social and linguistic changes would lead to a spread of what they called “*the solidary ethic with everyone*“. Confirmation of this requires wider comparative and typologically orientated research into contemporary language. J. Hajek et al. (2012: 1–15) presents project MAP (*Melbourne Address Project*) focused on intracultural aspects of address in five European languages: English, French, German, Italian and Swedish as spoken in seven countries. New project MAPET (*Melbourne Address Pronoun European Typology*) is focused on identifying not only the forms used, but their pragmatic functions, historical sources, shared features across areo-genetic space, results of language contacts in Europe, regional and individual variation and their synchronic grammatical properties. An example of intralingual and interlingual research is study of forms of address in four languages – French, German, Italian and Swedish (Schüpbach et al. 2007: 1–12). At present, research into address forms focuses upon “*specific linguistic markers which are drawn upon in discourse to position the self and other(s)*“ (Beeching et al.: 2018) and deals with formation of a person’s identity.

‘I will come home but you won’t.’

- (4b) Slovak Ja dám hore, ty dáš dole.
I will put-1-SG-FUT up, you will put-2-SG-FUT down
‘I’ll put it up, you take it down.’
- (4c) Slovak Ja ti dám a ty mi vrátiš.
I to you-SG will give-1-SG-FUT and you to me-SG will return-2SG-FUT
‘I’ll give it to you and you’ll then return it to me.’
- (4d) Slovak My to inak vnímame, oni to zas inak vnímajú
we it otherwise perceive-1-PL-PRS they it also otherwise perceive-3-PL-PRS
‘We see it one way but they see it another.’
- (4e) Slovak My prídeme zo slovenskej strany a vy z maďarskej
we will come-1-PL-FUT from Slovak side-GEN-SG and you from Hungarian
‘We will come from the Slovak and you from the Hungarian side.’
- (4f) Slovak My sme dôverovali im, oni zasa nám.
we trusted-1-PL-PST them, they also us
‘We trusted them and they also trusted us.’

3.1 Research questions

This study addresses a hitherto unexplored area: the relationship between implicit/explicit reference to the addressee on the one hand and the semantics of the verb in the second person on the other. A key research question of this study is whether explicit reference to the addressee is conditioned by the semantics of the verb in the second person.

In the first part, we focus on how explicit reference to the addressee is in comparison to reference to other persons.

In the second part we deal with whether there is some connection between the semantics of the verb and explicit reference to the addressee. What does explicit reference to one’s communication partner tell us about the intentions of the communicators?

3.2 Methods of the study

We try to guarantee reliability of results through working with an extensive and representative sample of texts. The study uses the corpus-driven approach. The *Slovak spoken corpus* is used with its 5,720,000 positions. The corpus operations we use are frequency sorting of verbs in the second person sg/pl, and a positive and negative filter for selection of the *ty/vy* pronouns with a verb and its collocative paradigms. This quantitative approach is combined with qualitative analysis of the semantic and functional profile of the verb with the highest level of explicit reference.

In terms of methodology, this study is inspired by the cognitive-linguistic approach (Langacker 2007: 171–187) and the theory of salience (Chiarcos et al. 2011: 1–30). These theories construe deictics referring to a person as maximal materialization of a person and the

prominent position of a person given the background of the communicative context. In pro-drop languages, the play of the figure and background is possible to a greater extent than in languages where the presence of a personal pronoun is obligatory (non-pro-drop). Omitting the pronoun reduces the difference between subject and context while using it increases it.

4. Data analysis and results

4.1 Verbal person form and explicit reference in dialogue

In the first part we focus on the question: to what extent is explicit reference to the addressee made in comparison to reference to other verbal persons? In other words, if the speaker uses a verbal person form, to what extent do they shift it to the centre of attention by using a personal pronoun?

We examined this question in the *Corpus of Spoken Slovak* (CSS) using both a positive and negative filter. We filtered out the presence of personal pronouns with verbs in all persons on a scale from -3 to +1. This refers to the incidence of a personal pronoun ranging from three places before the verb (*ty si mi povedal* 'you have to me said' or 'you said to me') to one place after the verb (*ako si sa tam dostal ty?* 'how did yourself there get you?' or 'how did you get there?'). This reflects how in Slovak the word order is relatively free and the order of verb and pronoun can be inverted. We determined the percentage of explicit references (ER) in the overall verb incidence in the given person (Table 1).

Table 1: Explicit references (ER) in the overall number of verb forms in the *Corpus of Spoken Slovak* (CSS)

person	number of forms in CSS	number of verbs with ER	% ER
1. sg	228 101	47 304	21
1. pl	104 930	13 443	13
2. sg	40 722	4 715	12
2. pl	43 488	4 134	10
3. sg m	83 575	7 211	9
3. pl m	57 547	3 695	6
3. sg f	44 290	2 561	6
3. pl f	10 091	72	0,7
3. sg n	53 348	189	0,1
3. pl n	2 959	2	0,07

From this data, we can draw various conclusions. Most striking is the explicit reference of the speaker to himself or herself. In a fifth of verbs in the 1st person sg, the speaker refers to himself or herself using the *ja* 'I' pronoun.

The next most common is explicit reference in those verb persons which create a minimal speech act between speaker and addressee. The pronoun is used more frequently when drawing attention to the individual speaker and addressee (21 % sg, 12 % pl); less so when referring to a collective subject or group addressee (13 % sg, 10 % pl). With explicit

reference in the 2nd person pl, we have to remember that the 10 % verbs include cases where an individual addressee is being referred to using the formal *you* (V).

Less common are references to a non-participant(s) of communication using the 3rd person masculine (*on* ‘he’ in the singular, *oni* ‘they’ in the plural) and feminine pronouns (*ona* ‘she’ in the singular).

Least common of all are references using the *ony* ‘they’ (plural pronoun for the feminine and neuter gender). The gradual decline of the *ony* pronoun in Slovak has been observed for many years. The 3rd person neuter in the singular *ono* is also uncommon and in spoken Slovak functions more as an expletive than a personal pronoun.¹⁰

Table 1 shows that the functional difference between 3rd person pronouns and 1st / 2nd person pronouns (§2.2) is reflected in the scale of explicit reference. Non-participant(s) of communication are referred to by pronouns far less than participants. This applies equally to all gender forms, both singular and plural.

4.2 Semantic classes of verb in the second person

Extensive texts enable us to examine the connection between the semantics of the verb and reference to the addressee while minimizing the influence of the theme and idiolect of the speaker. *Corpus of Spoken Slovak* (version s-hovor-5.0) contains about 40,000 second-person sg forms and 43,000 second-person pl (§Table 1). We have ordered these forms according to their frequency and semantically analysed those verbs which appear a minimum of twenty times in the corpus (more than 80 % of all forms in the corpus). When analyzing verb in the frequency dictionary, we focused on the prototypical meaning of the verbal lexeme given in lexicographical handbooks of Slovak. The only exception to this is with the verb *stíhať* ‘to try to catch someone, to chase’ because in dialogue the verb *stíhať* is colloquially used to mean ‘to have enough time to do something’.

Semantic analysis of verbs showed that more than 90 % of second-person forms are from nine semantic classes¹¹ which speakers use preferentially in dialogue. The percentage of individual semantic classes in the overall number of verbs in the second person is given in Table 2. The set of preferentially used semantic verb classes in the second person is the same in both numbers with differences only in the extent to which various semantic classes in dialogue are used. The biggest difference is with the dominant semantic class: in the singular, cognition verbs are dominant; in the plural, existence verbs.

Table 2: Percentage of semantic class (SC) in the overall number of second-person verbs in the *Corpus of Spoken Slovak* (CSS)

2 nd person SG		2 nd person PL	
SC	% SC of verbs in CSS	SC	% SC of verbs in CSS

¹⁰ Included in 0.07% of forms with explicit reference are only manually selected statements in which the *ono* pronoun refers to a person and does not serve as an expletive e.g.:

(i) Slovak To **dievča**, predstavte si, **ono** dalo výpoveď.
that girl-NOM-N imagine-IMP-PL she gave-PST-SG notice-ACC-SG
‘Just imagine: that girl handed in her notice.’

¹¹ Semantic classes of verbs are taken from the *Valency dictionary of Slovak verbs in the corpus base* (Ivanová et al. 2014).

cognition	27	existence	33
existence	22	cognition	17
possession	10	possession	10
modality	10	modality	8
perception	6	communication	6
realization	5	realization	5
motion	5	motion	5
giving/receiving	5	perception	5
communication	4	giving/receiving	3

The 2nd person in dialogue preferentially refers to the existence of the addressee (*byť* ‘be’, *nebyť* ‘not be’, *žiť* ‘live’, *narodiť sa* ‘to be born’, *prežiť* ‘survive’, *prežívať* ‘undergo’, *zažiť* ‘experience’) and to processes going on in their mind and which emphasize the existence of the communication partner as a thinking being.

Cognition verbs preferentially used in the second person indicate various aspects of the addressee’s thought processes. They refer to the addressee, to information or an ability which they:

- a) own or do not own (*vedieť* ‘know’, *nevedieť* ‘not know’, *poznať* ‘know’, *nepoznať* ‘not know’, *chápať* ‘understand’, *ovládať* ‘have mastery of’);
- b) deliberately or accidentally gain or realize (*zistiť* ‘discover’, *učiť sa* ‘learn’, *naučiť sa* ‘master’, *študovať* ‘study’, *dozvedieť sa* ‘find out’, *uvedomiť si* ‘realize’);
- c) are processing (*myslieť* ‘think’, *nemyslieť* ‘not think’, *rozmyslieť si* ‘change (one’s) mind’, *rozmyšľať* ‘reflect’, *porozmyšľať* ‘meditate’, *predstaviť si* ‘imagine’, *riešiť* ‘deal with’, *neriešiť* ‘not deal with’);
- d) retain, select or forget about (*pamätať si* ‘remember’, *nepamätať si* ‘not remember’, *spomínať si* ‘recall’, *spomenúť si* ‘reminisce’, *nespomínať si* ‘not recall’).

The second person is not typical, however, for cognition verbs which reflect degrees of conviction about the validity of certain things (*dúfať* ‘hope’, *veriť* ‘believe’, *tušiť* ‘have an inkling of’, *predpokladať* ‘suppose’). These verbs are much more compatible with the 1st person and the role of the speaking subject. Only the speaker can authentically express in such statements their level of conviction. Cognition verbs with a result, close in meaning to create verbs (e.g. *vymyslieť* ‘think up’) are also untypical in the 2nd person. This suggests that the focusing of attention on the addressee leads to a minimalization of verbs with a meaning that focuses on the result of an action.

The term *mental action* is used to describe what goes on in the human mind (Kysel’ová 2017: 26) and is considered to be one of the decisive aspects in terms of human action. Other such aspects are will, possibility, necessity and permission to act, all of which are covered by modality verbs. These are a class of verbs which cover both modal grammatical functions as well as autosemantic verbs with modal meanings (Ivanová et al. 2014: 12). Verbs in the first person are preferentially used when referring to will, which is fully known only by the speaker (Kesselová 2018a: 101). When referring to the addressee, possibility is emphasized (*môcť* ‘can’, *nemôcť* ‘cannot’, *stíhať* ‘can manage’, *nestíhať* ‘cannot manage’ in the sense ‘have/don’t have enough time to do something’), necessity (*musieť* ‘must’, *nemusieť* ‘don’t have to’, *potrebovať* ‘need’, *nepotrebovať* ‘don’t need’) and prohibition to act (*nesmieť* ‘mustn’t’). The 2nd person is typically used by the speaker with verbs stating or restricting the addressee’s possible actions.

Cognition verbs are closely associated with perception verbs referring to sources of gaining information. Verbs referring to sight are preferentially used, probably in the sense that “to see is to know“ (*vidieť* ‘see’, *pozrieť* ‘look at’, *uvidieť* ‘see’, *pozerat’* ‘watch’, *nevidieť* ‘not see’, *kukat’* ‘eye’, *všimnúť si* ‘notice’, *sledovat’* ‘watch’); less so verbs referring to hearing (*počúvať* ‘listen’, *počuť* ‘hear’) and generally perceptual verbs (*cítiť* ‘feel’, *vnímať* ‘perceive’).

Existence verbs are dominant in the 2nd person plural (*byť* ‘be’, *nebyť* ‘not be’, *žiť* ‘live’, *narodiť sa* ‘be born’, *prežiť* ‘survive’, *prežívať* ‘undergo’, *zažiť* ‘experience’). Together with possessive verbs (*mať* ‘have’, *nemať* ‘not have’, *mávať* ‘have imperf.’) they relate to two archetypal human elements: existence and possession. These are explained by E. Fromm (1976: 27) who states that the 2nd person of existence and possession verbs is a reference to two kinds of a person’s existence:

[...] *the mode of being and the mode of owning as two kinds of orientation towards oneself and the world, two disparate kinds of character structure, whereby the one which is dominant determines the overall pattern of human thought, feelings and actions.*

Possessive verbs are associated with the semantic class of giving and receiving. Verbs in this class identify a change in possessive relationship on the basis of giving or accepting things. In the 2nd person, verbs of giving are preferentially used in both numbers (*dať* ‘give’, *dávať* ‘give imperf.’, *venovať* ‘devote’, *vrátiť* ‘give back’, *zaplatiť* ‘pay’, *poslať* ‘send’, *nedať* ‘not give’, *platiť* ‘pay’), verbs of receiving make up in both cases fewer than half the incidence (*zobrať* ‘take away’, *dostať* ‘get’, *kúpiť* ‘buy’, *vziať* ‘take’, *brať* ‘take’, *nedostať* ‘not get’, *priať* ‘accept’, *dostávať* ‘get imperf.’, *nebrať* ‘not get’). In the 1st person sg, the use of verbs from the giving and receiving semantic class has a mirror perspective. Verbs of receiving prevail in terms of frequency and lexical diversity.

Although verbs in the 2nd person refer to the addressee and activity is a typical feature of living beings, 2nd verbs referring to physically observable human activities occur far less frequently. These are verbs of communication (4 % sg, 6 % pl), motion (5 %) and realization (5 %). Let us look in more details at their semantics.

Communication verbs in the second person are predominantly in these semantic groups: a) verbs with oral information transfer (*hovoríť/povedať* ‘speak/say’, *vravieť* ‘utter’, *nehovoríť/nepovedať* ‘not speak/not say’, *spomenúť* ‘recall’, *spomínať* ‘relate’, *zavolať* ‘call’),

b) verbs of reciprocal (*rozprávať sa* ‘talk together’, *porozprávať sa* ‘converse’) and potential contact (*modliť sa* ‘pray’),

c) verbs of communicative ability (*čítať* ‘read’, *prečítať* ‘read perfect.’, *písať* ‘write’, *napísať* ‘write perfect.’),

d) verbs with the illocutionary purpose of gaining information (*pýtať sa* ‘ask’, *nepýtať sa* ‘not ask’, *spýtať sa* ‘enquire’, *opýtať sa* ‘question’),

e) a verb where speaking and the semantics of cognition verbs overlap (*vysvetliť* ‘explain’ in the sense of ‘speak so that information is understandable’).

Verbs where the semantics overlap with communication intention (*d’akovať* ‘thank’, *poprosiť* ‘request’, *vítať* ‘welcome’) are not typically in the 2nd person. Communication intention reflects the purpose of the speaker thus these are typically in the 1st person.

Motion verbs are those which express movement in a certain direction (*ísť/nejsť* ‘go/not go’), directionally non-specified and repeated movement (*chodiť* ‘go’, *chodievať* ‘go’ repeated activity), verbs with meaning of reaching a destination (*prísť* ‘come’, *dôjsť* ‘arrive’), moving

away from a place (*odísť* 'leave'), getting in and out of a building (*vojsť* 'enter', *vyjsť* 'exit'), going back (*vrátiť sa* 'return') and ending movement (*zastaviť sa* 'stop').

Realization verbs include the verb with the general meaning of *robiť* 'do', verbs with the modal meaning *dovoliť* 'allow' and *nechať* 'let' in sense of 'not interfering and enabling something to be done', verbs referring to preparation, start and finish of activities (*pripravovať sa* 'prepare', *chystať sa* 'get ready', *skúsiť* 'try', *nastúpiť* 'embark', *plánovať* 'plan', *začať* 'begin', *začínať* 'start', *pustiť sa* 'commence', *prestať* 'stop', *skončiť* 'end'), verbs with analytic equivalents (*pracovať* = *robiť prácu* 'work' = 'do work'; *hrať sa* = *venovať sa hre* 'play' = 'play a game'), Verbs of social intervention are used only marginally (*pomôcť* 'help', *prepáčiť* 'excuse', *vybaviť* 'arrange').

The results of semantic analysis of verbs in the 2nd person within the *Corpus of Spoken Slovak* can be summarized accordingly. Reference to an addressee is preferentially made with verbs identifying fundamental human aspects (existence, possession), inner processes and sensory perceptions (cognitive and perceptual processes) or the possibilities and limits of the addressee's actions (modality verbs).

If verbs in the second person refer to a physically observable activity, those referring to communication, motion, realization, giving and receiving are used preferentially. Their common factor is that they name activities which do not lead to a concrete physical result nor to destruction or modification of the object. So-called 'non-intervention' verbs are typically used in the 2nd person.

If the verb in the 2nd person contains intervention in its semantic structure, this is either self-intervention (verbs of motion), partial intervention (verbs of giving/receiving),¹² or internal intervention (verbs of realization with analytic equivalents). Incidence of these verbs, however, is substantially lower (Table 2). Absence of object intervention enables attention to be shifted to the addressee. Thanks to the semantics of the verbs, the addressee as communication partner comes to the forefront in the case of the 2nd person.

This conclusion is even more evident, if we look at verbs of the semantic class taking in creation, destruction and modification. These are typical verbs of total intervention or modification of the right-intentional participant. Verbs of creation occur vary rarely in the second person (0.6% in the singular, 0.4% in the plural), verbs of modification even less so (0.06% in the singular, 0.1% in the plural) and verbs of destruction in the 2nd person occur marginally (*zabiť* 'kill' five times, *zrušiť* 'cancel', *zničiť* 'destroy', *vyliat* 'pour away' and *vymazať* 'erase' each three times). The presence of total intervention of the right-intentional participant probably shifts attention to the affected participant. At the same time the incidence of forms shifting the left-intentional participant to the centre of attention is minimized. Our conclusion about shift of attention is thus verified with respect both to verbs without intervention and verbs with total intervention.

4.3 Explicit reference to addressee

Knowing the semantic classes of verbs which occur preferentially in the 2nd person leads to another question: with which semantic class of verbs does explicit reference to the addressee occur most commonly?

We used the method of positive filtering of verb clauses in the 2nd person with the *ty/vy* 'you T/V' pronouns. The result enabled us to determine the percentual incidence of explicit

¹² Verbs of receiving and giving are verbs of partial intervention according to M. Sokolová (1995: 54).

reference for each verb in the 2nd person. For instance, the verb *myslíš* '(you) think/T' occurs in the corpus 329 times; verb with pronoun *ty* in a non-initial position occurs 42 times and in the initial position 4 times. Explicit reference to the addressee thus occurs in 14 % of cases of verb *myslíš* '(you) think/T'. We examined explicit autoreference with each verb which occurs at least 25 times in the *Corpus of Spoken Slovak*. Verbs with the highest incidence of explicit reference (ER) are listed in Table 3. (The highest incidence means a minimum of 25 % ER.)

Table 3: Verbs with the highest incidence of ER to addressee in dialogue

2 nd person SG		2 nd person PL	
verb	% ER of verb frequency	verb	% ER of verb frequency
nepoznáš <i>you don't know</i>	34,6	vnímate <i>you perceive</i>	42,5
bola si <i>you were (f)</i>	33,2	vnímali ste <i>you perceived</i>	29,2
vnímaš <i>you perceive</i>	32,2	nepoznáte <i>you don't know</i>	27,2
videl si <i>you saw</i>	32,1	študovali ste <i>you studied</i>	26,7
berieš <i>you take</i>	31,9	spomínali ste <i>you recalled</i>	25,8
hovoríš <i>you speak</i>	30,7	hovoríte <i>you speak</i>	24,6
hovoril si <i>you spoke</i>	28,1		
dávaš <i>you give</i>	27,2		
povedal si <i>you said</i>	26,2		
bol si <i>you were (m)</i>	25,1		

Several conclusions can be drawn from this data. Explicit reference depends not just on the semantics of the verb but also on the specific form. For instance, in the present tense of verb *vnímate* 'you perceive V' explicit reference occurs more frequently than with the preterite *vnímali ste* 'you perceived/V'. There are no future forms in the preferential group. This indicates that explicit reference to the addressee is much more common with verbs describing factual events (present or past) than projected ones in the future.

Differences in incidence of explicit reference occur between affirmative and negative forms of verbs. This is especially visible (in favour of negative forms) with cognition verbs: *nepoznáš* 'you don't know T' 35/20 %, *nepamätáš si* 'you don't remember T' 24/11 %, *neviáš* 'you don't know T' 13/2 %, *nepamätáte si* 'you don't remember V' 45/5 %, *nepoznáte* 'you don't know V' 27/11 %, *neviete* 'you don't know V' 19/2 %. The number after the slash is the incidence of explicit reference in the positive form of the verb. There is clearer reference to the addressee when the speaker refers to the addressee's information deficit. Highlighting the addressee's information deficit means disrupting the maximum courtesy. The subject of further research may be the motivation of the speaker, but also the cultural conditionality of this linguistic-social phenomenon.

The incidence of explicit reference does not directly correlate with the frequency of the verb. While, for instance, the verb *viete* 'you know V' occurs 3 302 times and the number of cases with explicit reference to the addressee is 1.7 %, the verb *nepamätáte sa* 'you don't remember V' occurs 20 times but explicit reference occurs in 45 % of cases. This indicates that the ratio of explicit reference to the overall incidence of the verb points more accurately to the relationship between the semantics of the verb and the addressee's degree of prominence than to the absolute number of the verb.

Verbs with the highest level of explicit reference are concentrated in the following semantic classes:

a) in plural: perception (*vnímate* ‘you perceive’, *vnímali ste* ‘you perceived’), cognition (*nepoznáte* ‘you don’t know’, *študovali ste* ‘you studied’) and communication (*spomínali ste* ‘you recalled’, *hovoríte* ‘you speak’);

b) in singular: cognition (*nepoznáš* ‘you don’t know’, *berieš* ‘you take’), existence (*bola si* ‘you were f’, *bol si* ‘you were m’), perception (*vnímaš* ‘you perceive’, *videl si* ‘you saw m’), communication (*hovoríš* ‘you speak’, *hovoril si* ‘you spoke m’, *povedal si* ‘you said m’).

If we consider the verbs *dávaš* ‘you give T’ (ER = 27 %) and *berieš* ‘you take T’ (ER = 32 %), it may seem contradictory (§4.2). We stated that verbs of giving are used preferentially.

In sentences with explicit reference, however, the verb *brať* ‘take’ is used predominantly as a verb of cognition (5) in the sense of ‘explain to oneself, understand something in a certain way, judge someone or something in a certain way’ or in questions about the source of information in which it is synonymous with *vedieť* ‘know’ (6).

(5) Slovak Ty to berieš smrteľne vážne.
 you-2-SG it-ACC-SG take-2-SG deadly seriously
 ‘You are taking it deadly seriously.’

(6) Slovak Kde ty to berieš?
 where you-2-SG it-ACC-SG take-2-SG
 ‘Where are you taking it?’

The verb *dávať* ‘give’ occurs with explicit reference as a verb from the giving class, a fact which supports the statement that such verbs are used preferentially with the 2nd person (§4.2). This is done with explicit reference to the addressee in principally three ways:

a) meaning ‘to provide someone with something intangible and not in terms of a typical change in the possessive relationship towards a specific thing (*ty dávaš silu, túžbu, okrikovanie, stres, slobodu, záľadnú otázku* ‘you are giving strength, desire, noise, stress, freedom, a difficult question etc.);

b) in questions reproving the addressee in which the verb is synonymous with the verb ‘to put or place (7);

c) as a slang verb with a wide meaning synonymous with *robiť* ‘do’, *hovoríť* ‘speak’ (8).

(7) Slovak Počuj,
 hear-2-SG-IMP to ako ty dávaš?
 it how you-2-SG give-2-SG
 ‘Listen, why are you putting it there?’

(8) Slovak A ty čo dávaš, kámoš?
 and you-2-SG what give-2-SG pal?
 ‘What are you up to, pal?’

The meaning of verb *dávať* ‘given to hand in, to provide as property for use’ is used with explicit reference to the addressee in the *Corpus of Spoken Slovak* only very occasionally (9).

(9) Slovak Ty nám dávaš jedlo.

you-2-SG we-DAT-PL give-2-SG food-ACC-SG
 ‘You give us food.’

5. Case study: explicit reference to the addressee and the verb *vnímat* ‘perceive’

Table 3 shows that the verb with the highest usage rate of the personal pronoun referring to the addressee is the verb *vnímat* ‘perceive’. There are three different grammatical forms of this lexeme in the basic vocabulary: *vy vnímate* ‘you perceive V’ (43 % ER), *ty vnímaš* ‘you perceive T’ (32 % ER) and *vy ste vnímali* ‘you perceived V’ (29 % ER). The question arises as to why this verb is preferred over other verbs that refer explicitly to the addressee. In the dictionary (Kačala et al.: 2003) this verb is defined as a perceptual verb ‘to perceive something with senses’. However, when used with the personal pronoun, it can also have other meanings. This verb refers to a person’s inner world that encompasses their cognitive processes, attitudes, emotions and ability to identify himself/herself as the subject of their own representations. We can draw an analogy between the person’s verbal and non-verbal behaviour: on the one hand, sense perception triggers emotions and enables us to gain experience and knowledge and to create attitudes; on the other hand, in communication we also use the emotional, cognitive, evaluative and identifying semantics of the verb *vnímat* ‘perceive’. This is proved by contextual meanings of this verb in which it can be understood as to ‘experience, understand, comprehend, think, imagine, remember, judge, identify with’.

We draw this conclusion from the semantic analysis of the verb in context, based on not only a subjective interpretation of the meaning but also on the explicit context this verb. The meaning of the verb is determined by the speaker or by the addressee. The reactions of the communication participants demonstrate which meaning of the verb is applied in the sentence. In a sentence (10) the evaluative semantics of the verb *vnímat* is applied by the speaker, in the answer to a question (11b) it is applied by the addressee.

(10) Slovak Keď hodnotíte toto obdobie, ako to vy vnímate?
 when evaluate-2-PL this period-ACC how it you-2-PL perceive-2-PL
 ‘When you evaluate this period, how do you perceive it?’

(11) a. Ako vy vnímate našu súčasnosť?
 how you-2-PL perceive-2-PL our-ACC-FEM present-ACC-SG
 ‘How do you perceive our present?’

b. Súčasnosť je zaujímavá, inšpiratívna [...]
 present-NOM-SG be-3-SG interesting-NOM inspiring-NOM
 ‘The present is interesting and inspirational.’

In addition to the evaluative semantics of the verb we also observe its emotional semantics (12), cognitive semantics (13) and self-identifying semantics (14). The past form of the verb refers to the addressee’s experience and memories (15). However, as a perceptual verb ‘to perceive with senses’ (16) is in explicit reference rarely used in dialogue. The 2nd person of the verb *vnímat* ‘perceive’ is mostly followed by a name of some social phenomenon that requires a cognitive operation and triggers an emotional or evaluative reaction (your job, company, past, the political situation, faith schools, freedom of speech, the life of a person in a wheelchair,

standard Slovak, the Ten Commandments, transport, social changes, gender inequality, multiculturalism, the year 1968, the Velvet Revolution, the capital, etc.).

(12) Slovak Ako ste vnímali situáciu vy báli ste sa?
 how perceive-2PL-PST situation-ACC-SG you-2-PL afraid-2PL-PST
 ‘How did you perceive the situation? Were you afraid?’

(13) Slovak Ako vy vnímate náboženský separatizmus?
 how you-2-PL perceive-2-PL religious-ACC-MASC separatism-ACC
 ‘How do you perceive religious separatism?’

(14) Slovak A ako sa vnímate vy?
 and how myself-ACC perceive-2-PL you-2-PL
 ‘And how do you perceive yourself?’

(15) Slovak Ako ste vnímali mamu vy ako dcéra?
 how perceive-2PL-PST mother-ACC you-2-PL as daughter-NOM
 ‘How did you perceive your mother as her daughter?’

(16) Slovak A ty vnímaš správy?
 And you-2-SG perceive-2-SG news-ACC-PL
 ‘And how do you perceive the news?’

The verb *vnímať* used with the personal pronoun is typically compatible with the pragmatic function, i.e. requesting information. The explicit reference to the addressee’s inner world leads to the intensification of subjectivity, which is reflected in the accumulation of elements referring to the addressee (17).

(17) Slovak Vnímaš ty osobne v sebe posun?
 perceive-2-SG you-2-SG in person in yourself-LOC shift-ACC
 ‘Do you personally perceive a shift in yourself?’

Every individual’s inner world is specific, unique and dynamic and thus contrasting with those of other communication participants. This fact is reflected in sentences that signal contrastive emphasis of the addressee: *you* versus *I* (18), *you* versus other members of society the addressee belongs in (19), your opinion versus a widespread opinion (20), your opinion in the past versus today (21).

(18) Slovak Ja som počula, že [...]. Ale ako to ty vnímaš?
 I hear-1SG-PST that [...] but how it-ACC you-2-SG perceive-2-SG
 ‘I heard that [...]. But how do you perceive it?’

(19) Slovak Ako ste vnímali vy svoju profesiu žurnalistu?
 how perceive-2PL-PST you-2-PL your-ACC profession-ACC journalist-GEN

‘How did you perceive your profession of journalist?’

(20) Slovak Hovorí sa, že [...]. Ako to ty vnímaš?
It is said that [...] how it you-2-SG perceive-2-SG
‘It is said that... How do you perceive it?’

(21) Slovak Ako to vy vnímate teraz?
how it you-2-PL perceive-2-PL now
‘How do you perceive it now?’

Looking at the above examples we can see that the explicit reference to the addressee in dialogue increases when the speaker refers to some aspect of the addressee’s inherent inner world that is invisible to communication partners, i.e. emotions, experiences, memories, knowledge, attitudes, self-identification.

6. Conclusion

In Slovak, as in other pro-drop languages, it is not necessary to refer to persons explicitly. However, explicit references are still used. The difference between 1st, 2nd, 3rd person pronouns is reflected in the scale of explicit reference. Most striking is the explicit reference of the speaker to himself followed by the 2nd person pronoun referring to the addressee and the least frequent is the 3rd person pronoun. The explicit reference to the addressee emphasizes their semantic role in dialogue. The personal pronoun is used more often when drawing attention to the individual addressee; much less so when referring to a group addressee or collective subject. At the same time, explicit references are used much more frequently when referring to communication participants (speaker and addressee) than when referring to non-participants (3rd person). We can say that the use of explicit references prove the different status of 3rd person pronouns which – as opposed to 1st and 2nd person pronouns – do not correlate with any positive participant role. The study of Slovak dialogue, too, confirms the hypothesis of the different status of 3rd person pronouns (§2.2), as suggested by E. Benveniste (1971) and J. Lyons (1977) in typologically different, non-pro-drop languages (French, English).

The first question focused our attention on verification of the connection between the semantics of the verb and the explicit reference to the addressee. The corpus-based analysis shows that explicit reference in Slovak is determined not only by the rhythm of the sentence, its expressivity, emotionality, contrastive function, functional perspective of sentence and pragmatic function but also by the semantics of the verb. In the 2nd person dominate verbs referring to the person’s existence, possession, thought processes, their materialization in communication, perception as a source of information and possibilities/limits of the addressee’s activity set by the speaker. In other words, explicit references in Slovak are used to refer to the addressee’s mental activities and limits of activities set by the speaker. Besides, verbs whose semantic structure refers to a created, modified or destructed object of the action minimize the addressee’s prominence. This result of the corpus study relates to the statement of E. Hajičová & J. Vrbová (1982: 107):

During the discourse the stock of "knowledge" the speaker assumes to share with the hearer and changes according to what is "in the centre of attention" at the given time point. Each utterance has its influence on this hierarchy of salience,¹³ however, not every mentioning of an object has the same effect.

The study of Slovak dialogue has shown that the semantic class of the verb influences the degree of the addressee's prominence. Previous findings led us to another question: In which semantic classes of verbs does the explicit reference to the addressee in Slovak occur relatively most frequently? Relativity means that we examine the ratio of all 2nd person forms in the corpus to the number of forms with the pronoun. Research has revealed four semantic domains with the highest degree of the addressee's prominence: perception, cognition, communication, existence/identification. The verbs describe actions that do not affect the other participant in any way and do not lead to a visible result but refer the addressee's existence, identification and mental activities.

This conclusion is enhanced by results of the case study of the verb *vnímat'* 'perceive'. The analysis of corpus texts has shown that the verb *vnímat'* used with the pronoun refers to the mental activity of the addressee. As such, it has the cognitive, evaluative, emotional and identifying semantics (used with the reflexive pronoun *sa*), the past form of the verb stimulates the addressee's experience and memories. Its primary meaning 'perceive with senses' is marginal in ER.

In questions of thinking, feeling, evaluating, self-perceiving and experiencing things, each person is their own highest authority. Each individual alone has exclusive and unlimited access to their own inner world. It therefore seems natural that the speaker emphasizes the addressee when referring to their inner world, inaccessible to other communication partners, and that the dominant verb *vnímat'* 'perceive' with the pronoun referring to the addressee is typically compatible with the pragmatic function requesting information.

Sources

Slovenský hovorený korpus [Corpus of Spoken Slovak] *s-hovor-5.0*. Bratislava: Jazykovedný ústav Ľ. Štúra SAV. (<http://korpus.juls.savba.sk>) (Accessed 2019-01-15.)

Slovenský národný korpus [Slovak National Corpus] *prim-8.0-public-sane.*: Bratislava: Jazykovedný ústav Ľ. Štúra SAV. (<http://korpus.juls.savba.sk>) (Accessed 2019-01-15.)

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Heinz Leo Kretzenbacher (The University of Melbourne), who has been providing bibliographies of address systems studies in different languages since 2014, and Jonathan Gresty (The University of Presov) for translating the study into English. My thanks also go to the study reviewer for all comments and recommendations.

Abbreviations

¹³ According to Chiarcos, Claus & Grabski (2011: 5), "[s]alience defines the degree of relative prominence of a unit information, at a specific point in time, in comparison to the other units of information".

ACC	accusative
DAT	dative
GEN	genitive
CSS	Corpus of Spoken Slovak
ER	explicit reference
F	feminine
FUT	future
INS	instrumental
MAP	Melbourne Address Project
MAPET	The Melbourne Address Pronoun European Typology
M	masculine
N	neuter
NOM	nominative
PL	plural
PRS	present
PST	past
pro-drop	pronoun-dropping
SC	semantic class
SG	singular
*STU	student
*TCH	teacher

References

- Beeching, Kate & Ghezzi, Chiara & Molinelli, Piera. 2018. *Positioning the Self and Others: Linguistic perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1971. *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. [Problems in general linguistics]. Paris: Gallimard.
- Bodnárová, Martina. 2016. Záměna *ja* a *on* v komunikačných súvislostiach. [Personal pronouns *ja* [I] and *on* [he] in the communication context]. *Jazykovedný časopis* 67(2). 107–124.
- Brown, Roger & Gilman, Albert. 1960. The pronouns of power and solidarity. In Sebeok, Thomas (ed.), *Style in language*, 253–276. London: Wiley and Sons.
- Deringer, Lisa & Gast, Volker & Haas, Florian & Rudolf, Olga. 2015. Impersonal uses the second person singular and generalized empathy: an exploratory corpus study of English, German and Russian. In Gardelle, Laure & Sorlin, Sandrine (eds.), *The Pragmatics of personal pronouns*, 311–334. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Findra, Ján. 2004. *Štylistika slovenčiny*. [Slovak stylistics.] Martin: Osveta.
- Fromm, Erich. 1976. *Mít nebo být?* [To have or to be?] Praha: Aurora.
- Girvin, Cammeron. 2013. Addressing changes in the Bulgarian vocative. In Noel Aziz Hanna, Patrizia & Sonnenhauser, Barbara (eds.), *Vocative! Addressing between system and performance*, 157–189. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

- Hajek, John & Kretzenbacher, Heinz Leo & Lagerberg, Robert. 2013. Towards a linguistic typology of address pronouns in Europe – past and present. In Henderson, John & Ritz, Marie-Eve & Louro, Celeste Rodríguez (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2012 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*, 1–15. (Perth, 5–7 December 2012). (<https://sites.google.com/site/als2012uwa/proceedings>) (Accessed 2018-12-02.)
- Hajičová, Eva & Vrbová, Jarka. 1982. On the role of the hierarchy of activation in the process of natural language understanding. In Horecký, Ján (ed.), *Coling 82 – Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Computational Linguistics*, 107–113. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company/Academia. (<http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/C82-1017>) (Accessed 2018-12-30.)
- Hale, Kenneth, L. 1966. Kinship reflections in syntax: some Australian languages. *Word* 22(1–3). 318–324.
- Chiarcos, Christian & Claus, Berry & Grabski, Michael. 2011. *Saliency: Multidisciplinary perspectives on its function in discourse*. (Studies and monographs 227). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Ivanová, Martina & Sokolová, Miloslava & Kyseľová, Miroslava & Perovská, Veronika. 2014. *Valenčný slovník slovenských slovies na korpusovom základe*. [A valency dictionary of Slovak verbs on corpus basis]. Prešov: Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity v Prešove.
- Jespersen, Otto. 2007. *Language: its nature, development and origin*. Abingdon: Routledge. (https://books.google.sk/books?id=57IugSwa5f4C&pg=PA16&hl=sk&source=gbs_toc_r&cad=2#v=onepage&q&f=false) (Accessed 2019-03-09.)
- Kačala, Ján & Pisárčiková, Mária & Považaj, Matej. (eds.) 2003. *Krátky slovník slovenského jazyka*. [A brief dictionary of Slovak language.] Bratislava: Veda. (http://www.juls.savba.sk/kssj_4.html) (Accessed 2018-12-10.)
- Kesselová, Jana. 2005. Komunikačno-pragmatický status osobných zámen. [Communication-pragmatic status of personal pronouns in contemporary spoken communication]. *Slovenská reč* 70(3). 129–141.
- Kesselová, Jana. 2018a. Referencia na hovoriaceho v dialogickej komunikácii v slovenčine: verbálna osoba verzus osobné zámeno. [Speaker's reference in dialogic communication in Slovak language: verbal person versus personal pronoun.] *Slavica Slovaca* (Supplementum) 53(3–4). 94–108.
- Kesselová, Jana. 2018b. Implicitná a explicitná autoreferencia v dialógu. [Implicit and explicit self-reference in the dialogue.] *Slovenská reč* 83(1). 7–22.
- Kesselová, Jana. 2018c. Self-reference in early speech of children speaking Slovak. *Journal of Language and Cultural Education* 6(2). 14–35.
- Krajčovič, Rudolf. 1988. *Vývin slovenského jazyka a dialektológia*. [Development of Slovak language and dialectology.] Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.

- Kyseľová, Miroslava. 2017. *Medzi konaním a dianím. Sémantické aspekty verba a valencia*. [Between action and occurrence: Semantic aspects of verbs and valency.] Prešov: Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity v Prešove.
- Lagerberg, Robert & Kretzenbacher, Heinz Leo & Hajek, John. 2014. Forms and patterns of address in Russia recent research and future directions. *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies* 28(1–2). 179–209.
- Langacker, Ronald Wayne. 2007. Constructing the meanings of personal pronouns. In Radden, Günter & Köpcke, Klaus-Michael & Berg, Thomas & Siemund, Peter (eds.), *Aspects of Meaning Construction*, 171–187. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing. (https://books.google.sk/books?id=LzcNFJw814cC&dq=Constructing+the+meanings+of+personal+pronouns&hl=sk&source=gbs_navlinks_s) (Accessed 2018-12-10.)
- Levinson, Steven C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mukařovský, Jan. 1948. *Kapitoly z české poetiky*. [Chapters from Czech poetics]. Praha: Svoboda.
- Mühlhäusler, Peter & Harré, Rom. 1990. *Pronouns and people: the linguistic construction of social and personal identity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Noguchi, Tohru. 1997. Two types of pronouns and variable binding. *Language* 73(4). 770–797.
- Oravec, Ján. 1961. Osobné zámená v podmete. [Personal pronouns in the grammatical subject]. *Slovenská reč* 26(4). 199–205.
- Ozer, Katalin. 2018. O razvoju pronominalnih formi oslovljavanja u nemačkom, srpskom i mađarskom jeziku [On the development of German, Serbian and Hungarian pronouns of address]. In Kašić, Zorka (ed.), *O jeziku sa raznih aspekata. Primenjena lingvistika u čast Vesni Berić-Đukić*, 79–102. Novi Sad: Društvo za primenjenu lingvistiku Srbije.
- Petrusek, Miloslav & Linhart, Jiří & Vodáková, Alena. 1996. *Velký sociologický slovník*. [Large sociological Dictionary]. Praha: Karolinum.
- Rudík, Anna. 2014. Обращения к близким людям в польском и русском языках. [Addressative phrases used to close people in Polish and Russian]. In Vágnerová, Marta & Koryčánková, Simona (eds.), *Sborník příspěvků z mezinárodní konference XXII. Olomoucké dny rusistů*, 177–180. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.
- Schlund, Katrin. 2014. Aspects of linguistic politeness in Serbian. A data-based comparison with German. *Linguistik Online* 69(7). 69–89. (https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/24b0/a1d4798b679ae704e1043c0087b8cf72a727.pdf?_ga=2.8135862.504338652.1553880911-1481734417.155388091) (Accessed 2019-01-18.)
- Schüpbach, Doris & Hajek, John & Warren, Jane & Clyne, Michael & Kretzenbacher, Heinz Leo & Norrby, Catrin. 2007. A cross-linguistic comparison of address pronoun use in four European languages: Intralingual and interlingual dimensions. In Mushin, Ilana & Laughren, Mary (eds.), *Selected papers from the 2006 annual meeting of the Australian Linguistic Society*, 1–12. St Lucia: University of Queensland.

- Schütz, Alfred & Luckmann, Thomas. 1973. *The Structures of the life-world. Studies in Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Siewierska, Anna. 2004. *Person*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (<http://www.cambridge.org/core/books/person/preface/0E8B7EE8F3CAAB33A13E3D9B138ED339>) (Accessed 2019-04-15.)
- Sirota, Elena Vladimirovna. 2017. Субъективно-оценочные обращения в современном русском языке [Subjective-evaluative forms of address in the modern Russian language]. *Мова* 27. 116–123. (<http://mova.onu.edu.ua/article/viewFile/107948/106165>) (Accessed 2019-04-15.)
- Sokolová, Miloslava. 1995. *Kapitolky zo slovenskej morfológie*. [Chapters from Slovak morphology]. Prešov: Slovacontact.
- Sosnowski, Wojciech. 2013. Forms of address and their meaning in contrast in Polish and Russian languages. *Cognitive studies / Études cognitives* 13. 225–235.
- Sugamoto, Nobuko. 1989. Pronominality: a noun-pronoun continuum. In Corrigan, Roberta & Eckman, Fred & Noonan, Michael (eds.), *Linguistic Categorization*, 267–291. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Šikra, Juraj & Furdík, Juraj. 1982. Príspevok k vymedzeniu a klasifikácii zámen z konfrontačného hľadiska (na materiáli angličtiny a slovenčiny). [Contribution to the Definition and Classification of Pronouns from a confrontational point of view: on English and Slovak material.] *Jazykovedný časopis* 33(2). 132–143.
- Vaňková, Irena. 2005. Antropocentrizmus jako perspektiva jazykového obrazu světa. In Vaňková, Irena & Nebeská, Iva & Saicová Římalová, Lucie & Šlédrová, Jasňa (eds.), *Co na srdci, to na jazyku: Kapitoly z kognitivní lingvistiky*, [Wearing heart on the sleeve: Chapters from cognitive linguistics], 24–55. Praha: Nakladatelství Karolinum.

Jana Kesselová
Institute of Slovak Studies and Media Studies
The Faculty of Arts of Prešov University, Prešov, Slovakia
jana.kesselova@unipo.sk

In SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics [online]. 2019, vol. 16, no. 3[cit. 2019-11-30]. Available on web page http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL41/pdf_doc/04.pdf. ISSN 1336-782X