

ARTICLES

Past Tense in the Rusyn Dialect of Novoselycja: Auxiliary vs. Subject Pronoun as the First- and Second-Person Subject

Elena Boudovskaia

Abstract: This article discusses the choice of the past-tense forms in the Rusyn dialect spoken in the village of Novoselycja in Zakarpats'ka oblast' of Ukraine. The past-tense forms for the 1st and 2nd person in Rusyn are formed by a participle accompanied either by an enclitic auxiliary or by a fully stressed subject pronoun (the former construction occurs more often), but not by both. The factors influencing the choice of one over the other have never been clear. I claim that in Novoselycja Rusyn the factor that influences the choice of an auxiliary or a subject pronoun is a discourse factor. The choice between auxiliaries and pronouns generally depends on the position in discourse: the pronoun codes the first mention of the 1st and 2nd person subject and the auxiliary subsequent mentions. The exceptions, auxiliaries in locally initial positions and pronouns in locally subsequent positions, show dependence on the speech genre: speakers prefer pronouns at the beginning of episodes in classical narratives, and auxiliaries in genres closer to interactional conversation.

1. Introduction

The Rusyn language is the only living East Slavic language that has an active system of clitics, both pronominal and verbal (auxiliary). In the dialect of Rusyn spoken in Novoselycja (hereafter Novoselycja Rusyn, or NR), the system of clitics is similar to the one described by Zaliznjak for the Novgorodian birchbark documents (Zaliznjak 2004: esp. 185–90) and also for the parts of early Russian chronicles reflecting the direct speech of characters (Zaliznjak 2008). In Old Novgorodian and the direct speech in Old Russian chronicles, clitics are placed in a single block after the first stressed word in a clause, or after a barrier;¹ in the block, clitics are positioned according to their ranks.

¹ Zaliznjak (2008: 47–51) explains this term as follows: a barrier (*bar'er*, or *ritmiko-sintaksičeskij bar'er*) “chops off” (*otčlenjaet*) the beginning of a clause so that clitic position rules work as if the beginning of the clause did not exist, i.e., clitics are positioned after the first stressed word that comes after the barrier (2008: 48); the barrier can

This is also the case in NR:² see, e.g., example (1), where a block of auxiliary and pronominal clitics (*ys' my s'a*)³ is situated after the first stressed word in a clause, and the order of clitics in the block cannot be changed:⁴

- (1) ta fúrt ys' my s'a snylá
 and all the time AUX_{2SG} I_{DAT} REFL_{ACC} appear in dream_{LP,F}
 'and I dreamed of you all the time'

In the past tense in NR, similarly as in Old Russian, in the 1st and 2nd persons stressed subject pronouns and present-tense clitic verbal auxiliaries are in complementary distribution. One can hear *já pišlá* or *pišlá m* 'I_F went', *tý pišów* or *pišów ys'* 'you_M went', *mý pišlý* or *pišlý s'me* 'we went', but not **já m pišlá*, **tý s' pišów*, **mý s'me pišlý*⁵ (see in detail below in section 2.1). The factors that influence the choice between the pronoun and the auxiliary in NR or in

occur only after an entire actant group (*aktantnaja grupa*, roughly equivalent to a NP; Zaliznjak 2008: 15) or after an entire inserted element, such as a form of address, a subordinate clause, a construction including a verbal adverb, etc. (see 2008: 16 about inserted elements and 2008: 49 about the possible positions of the barrier.)

² NR differs from Novgorodian/Old Russian in details (the clitic status of the conditional auxiliary, the rank of the present-tense auxiliary, and some others). There are also variations across Rusyn dialects, concerning, e.g., the rank of certain clitics in the block, the possibility of a block of clitics appearing after a conjunction, etc. See Browne 2008 on Vojvodinian Rusyn and Tolstaja 2000, 2012, 2014 on Transcarpathian Rusyn.

³ The present-tense auxiliary clitics of the 1st and 2nd persons in NR come in two versions: they start with a consonant after a final vowel of the previous word and with the vowel *y* after a consonant. Thus the present-tense auxiliaries in NR are: *m / ym* (1st sg.), *s' / ys'* (2nd sg.), *s'me / ys'me* (1st pl.), *s'te / ys'te* (2nd pl.).

⁴ I use the following abbreviations (besides the general NR: Novoselycja Rusyn): COND—conditional; LP—*l*-participle; PAU—paucal form (used with numerals 2–4); PPART—passive participle; PR—present tense. Since in NR adjectives and pronouns have feminine, masculine, and neuter forms only in the singular, in glosses for these parts of speech I use, e.g., *tótú* 'that_{ACC.F'}' rather than 'that_{ACC.SG.F'}'.

⁵ The 3rd-person forms of the past tense are formed without auxiliaries.

other varieties of Rusyn have not been described.^{6,7} I claim that the distribution can be explained in terms of discourse. As a rule, a pronoun is chosen to code the first appearance of the referent as a subject after a number of clauses with other subjects, while the referent mentioned in the previous clause is expressed in the current clause by an auxiliary. However, under specific discourse conditions a speaker may choose to violate the basic rule.

1.1. Source of Data and Fieldwork

Rusyn is an idiom with a number of regional varieties. It is viewed in Slovakia, Poland, and Serbia as a minority Slavic language and in Ukraine as a dialect of Ukrainian (for more detailed treatment, see, e.g., Pugh 2009: vii–20). The materials on which this article is based reflect the variety spoken in one location in Ukraine, the village of Novoselycja, Zakarpattja region, Mižhir'ja district, Ukraine, where I made recordings in 1987 and 2001–13.

The data for this article come from a growing corpus of spoken Rusyn dialectal texts (currently about 200 thousand word tokens from Novoselycja alone) that I am putting together by transcribing and tagging my field recordings. Out of this corpus, three texts containing altogether about 20 thousand

⁶ Pan'kevč 1938: 313–14 states (translation mine—E. B.): “The past tense can appear in either of two forms: (i) in the descriptive form, with partic. praet. II, without the personal pronoun but with the auxiliary *iem*, which blends with the participle. Often the *i* is lost before *e*: *chod|ilem*, [...] (ii) in the simple form, i.e., only the parci. praet. II, but with a personal pronoun before it: *ja ch|odyl* in the Western dialects, *ja chod|yū* in the Eastern ones. When the first form, the descriptive one, is used, the 3rd person sg. and pl. do not get an auxiliary, but only a personal pronoun or a general subject [expressed by a noun? E. B.]: *rob|yū iem*, *rob|yū iēs'*, *vīn rob|yū*, *rob|ylys'me*, *rob|ylys'te*, *ony rob|yly* [note no stress marks in forms after 1st person sg.—E. B.]’”. Pan'kevč makes no attempt to explain the difference. Regarding the Rusyn variety spoken in Slovakia, Pugh (2009: 140) writes that “there is no real functional difference in Prešov Rusyn between, say, *ja čital* and *jem čital*,” and then states that Subcarpathian Rusyn (the Rusyn language in Zakarpats'ka oblast' of Ukraine) forms the past tense in exactly the same way, except that the auxiliary in plural has an initial *je*. Other authors, both Rusyn and non-Rusyn, do not attempt to explain the difference in usage between the two forms either, though they all state the possibility of two forms in the varieties of Rusyn they describe. See Harajda 1941: 68–69; Lyzanec' [Lizanec] 2008: 180–81; Nikolaev, Tolstaja, and Žuravlev 2001: 52–53; Teutsch 2001: 164–67; Kercha 2004: 137, 139; Jabur and Pliškova 2004: 176–77; Fontans'kij 2004: 253–54; Benedek 2004: 271; Ramač 2004: 299; and Tolstaja 2012, 2014.

⁷ For a similar system in Old Russian of the oldest period, Zaliznjak describes the distribution of auxiliary clitics vs. stressed pronouns in the 1st and 2nd persons, stating that the auxiliary is a default choice and pronouns occur in a number of syntactic positions (at the beginning of a clause, after a preposition, etc.) and in the situation of contrast or emphasis (Zaliznjak 2008: 129–33). The NR distribution looks similar.

word tokens and recorded in 2011–12 from four informants, three females and one male, aged between 69 and 87, were examined for examples and the rest were only episodically used. In the texts used in the study, informants were asked the general question, “What was life like in olden times?” I listened to their answers, trying not to interfere, asking questions only if I did not understand something or wanted more detail.

1.2. Transcription

The transcription symbols used in the article are listed in Tables 1–2. Their corresponding IPA symbols are given in square brackets. The verticle bar (|) is used in to denote a pause, which is often a boundary between clauses.

Table 1. Vowels

<i>i</i> [i]	<i>ü</i> [ü]	<i>u</i> [u]
<i>y</i> [ɨ]	<i>ŷ</i> ^o [ɵ]	<i>ŷ</i> [ɯ]
<i>ê</i> [e]		<i>ô</i> [ɔ]
<i>e</i> [e]		<i>o</i> [o]
<i>a</i> [a]		

I do not mark palatalization on labials, velars, or on *č* before *i*. Stress is marked by the sign (´) over the vowel.

Consonant assimilation across a word boundary is indicated by an underscore. For example, *píč býla* ‘the oven was’ is transcribed as *pídž_ býla*.

2. Theoretical Background

The mechanisms underlying the differential coding of one and the same referent have been extensively studied. The large literature on the topic of anaphoric reference follows several approaches (see discussion in Huang 2000). The topic-continuity model (Givón 1983, etc.) explains the choice between referential expressions by their distance from the first mention of the referent in the text and the number of intervening subjects: the further from the first mention and the more intervening subjects there are, the more coding material will be needed for referring to this subject. The prominence of a referent, however, can compensate for the distance. The other model, the hierarchy model (Fox 1987a, Tomlin 1987, etc.), explains the choice by discourse organization: across

Table 2. Consonants

	Labial	Dental	Alveolar	Palatal	Velar
Stops	<i>p</i> [p] <i>p.</i> [p'] <i>m</i> [m]	<i>t</i> [t] <i>d</i> [d] <i>n</i> [n]		<i>t'</i> [c] <i>d'</i> [j] <i>n'</i> [ɲ]	<i>k</i> [k] <i>k.</i> [k'] <i>g</i> [g] <i>g.</i> [g']? <i>(ŋ)</i> [ŋ]
Fricatives	<i>f</i> [f] <i>f.</i> [f']	<i>s</i> [s] <i>s'</i> [s']	š [ʃ] š. [ʃ'] ž [ʒ] ž. [ʒ']		<i>x</i> [x] <i>h</i> [ɣ]
Affricates		<i>c</i> [ts] <i>c'</i> [ts']	č [tʃ] č. [tʃ']		
Sonorants			<i>r</i> [r] <i>r.</i> [r']	<i>l</i> [ɫ] ⁸ <i>l'</i> [ɫ'] <i>j</i> [j]	

¹⁸ The letter [ɫ] in IPA is used for a velarized alveolar lateral approximant, which is the closest representation of the sound in the dialect of Novoselycja.

the boundaries of discourse units, such as episodes, a more overt form will be used than within a single discourse unit. Studies of specific languages often combine these two approaches. There is also an approach that explains the usage of certain forms by the activation status of the referent in the listener's mind, and thus by the cognitive effort the listener needs to apply to recover the referent based on the form used by the speaker (Gundel et al. 1993, Chafe 1994, etc.). Full forms should be used if the referent is not activated in the listener's mind, and reduced forms if it has been recently activated.

Subject reference has often been studied more often with reference to 3rd-person referents than 1st and 2nd persons. 1st- and 2nd-person reference has a number of differences from 3rd person reference. 1st- and 2nd-person referents are speech-act participants. From a cognitive standpoint, it is a question whether the mental representations of the speaker and the listener are activated or not, because the speech act may not be focused on them.⁹ Also, there seems to be a less formal option for expressing 1st- and 2nd-person referents. Whereas for a 3rd-person referent a full NP is a possibility, for the 1st and 2nd person, a full NP can be an option only in a limited number of contexts. However, there is often more than one option for the coding of 1st- and 2nd-person referents: an accented form versus a weakly accented form (as in English), a full form versus zero (as in Spanish), a stressed form which is different phonetically from a clitic form (as in French), etc. That is also the case with NR, which has two possibilities for referring to the 1st- or 2nd-person subject: a stressed pronoun or a clitic auxiliary. It allows one to study the differential usage of a more phonetically salient form, a stressed pronoun, and a less salient form, a clitic, and the factors influencing this usage.

This paper studies the distribution of the two forms of 1st- and 2nd-person reference in the past tense in NR. For modeling the cognitive status of the 1st- and 2nd-person referents, I use Olga Yokoyama's Transactional Discourse Model (Yokoyama 1986). According to it, during an exchange the speaker and the listener have in mind certain mental representations of reality. Each has their own picture, and their pictures intersect. The speaker introduces into this "area of common concern" (denoted as $C_a \cap C_b$, the area of the intersection of the concern of the speaker, C_a , and the concern of the listener, C_b) the speaker introduces new units from the area of their common

⁹ E.g., Chafe (1994: 79) states that since the 1st- and 2nd-person referents, as participants in discourse, are usually given, i.e., kept in active consciousness by both the speaker and the listener, they are most often "verbalized with weakly accented pronouns like *I* and *you*." Later he also notes: "It is interesting to observe that first-person referents, which might be thought active throughout a conversation and therefore always given, are sometimes judged by a speaker to have receded into the listener's semiactive state and are thus treated as accessible rather than given. Such cases are recognizable from the occurrence of accented *I* under circumstances where contrastiveness is ruled out" (1994: 87).

concerns. That area also contains certain things from before the beginning of the exchange, such as {DEIXIS}, which contains referential knowledge of the four items {I, you, here, now} (1986: 32). In terms of other models, these elements are activated by being present in the nonlinguistic environment of the conversation. Chafe (1994: 86) states that elements activated in this manner “may be in the semiactive rather than the inactive state and thus be accessible rather than new.” However, at the beginning of a conversation such elements are new and active.

Under certain circumstances, during further conversation certain elements of {DEIXIS} can be “demoted,” i.e., removed from the area of common concern. Yokoyama states: “The originally established {I, you} can be cancelled even in interpersonal discourse by any utterance, as soon as the utterance has made it clear that the verbal communication that has just taken place is unrelated to the personas of the interlocutors; thus, the utterance ‘A TWA plane was hijacked this morning’ is quite likely to cancel the mutual prelinguistic awareness of the interlocutors and remove at least {I, you, here} in the case of most speakers, while a more personal utterance ‘I have a headache’ does not have such a depersonalizing effect” (1986: 33).¹⁰ However, Yokoyama does not state how and under what circumstances the {I, you, here} can be demoted.

Apparently, the {I, you, here, now} elements can be demoted from the focus of common attention when something else—more attention-grabbing—is introduced into this focus, as in the example with a hijacked plane. Such an attention-grabber can be provided by a narrative. One starts following the characters in it and momentarily gets distracted from the world at hand. This can also be described as an introduction of the referential knowledge of new elements (characters), together with their time and place, into the focus of common attention, or more precisely into its subset, {DEIXIS}, which now includes {character A, narrated time, narrated place}. The demotion of the elements {I, you, here, now} is a consequence of this.

The narrative usually is concerned with one subject at a time, although frequently switching from one subject to another. It is not quite clear how many elements the {DEIXIS} can contain during a narrative. If the {DEIXIS} contains only activated elements, it will probably contain one protagonist at a time and switch them often, unlike the {DEIXIS} during a dialogue that contains both conversation participants.¹¹ When the narrative turns to Character B from Character A, the attention of the speaker and the listener switches to

¹⁰ The demotion of {I, you, here} does not happen automatically and totally with the introduction of new elements into {DEIXIS}; it is rather a gradual and partial process, more like fading than removal. See Yokoyama 1986: 37.

¹¹ Also, “I” as a character in narration may be different from “I” in the {DEIXIS} during a dialogue, because the “I” as a character (Goffman’s *self-as-protagonist*) invokes the time and place of the narrated events, not the time and place of communication,

Character B and not to themselves. The return from narration to the realm of conversation reintroduces the original components {I, you, here, now} into {DEIXIS}. So, if a story about soap-opera characters is interrupted by one of the interlocutors' *I have a headache*, both interlocutors and the world surrounding them are reintroduced in the area of common concern. On the other hand, demoting a referent from the DEIXIS is possibly gradual and not total.

However, even in narration the attention of the speaker and the listener is not always and only focused on the protagonists as new components of {DEIXIS}. Yokoyama's other example cited above, the one about a plane hijacked on the morning of the conversation, is apparently a part of narration but nevertheless is not totally devoid of "I" and "you" elements, since the sentence still contains an indication of the relation between the narrated events and the time of the conversation, "this morning." This sentence is a classical Labovian orientation at the beginning of a narrative; its function is to anchor the events about to be related in space and time (Labov and Waletzky 1997: 27). After the orientation, when a narrative starts in earnest, the elements "I" and "you" may be demoted from the area of concern shared by the speaker and listener, as both conversation partners become concerned with the narrated events and the referential knowledge of the protagonist(s). However, even during a narrative returning to the time and place of the conversation is not only possible but sometimes necessary. A well-formed narrative, as Labov and Waletzky state, is not merely a sequence of narrative clauses connected with the "a-then-b" relation. Such narratives exist, but they do not sound right because their point is not clear, and they are mostly produced by young children or by adults with underdeveloped communication skills. To be a real narrative, a sequence of narrative clauses needs to include such nonnarrative elements as an evaluation of the narrated events by the speaker. An evaluation can be located at one place in the narrative, but more often it occurs diffusely, in more than one place. An evaluation can be expressed by a number of means, but its point is that the narrator introduces his/her judgment (and/or tries to show her/himself in a better light), which, depending on the specifics, might bring the narrator as a participant in the conversation back into the focus of shared attention. Moreover, after the events have been narrated, the narrative often contains a final part, which Labov and Waletzky call the coda. The coda also provides a connection between the narrated events and the world where the narration takes place. Thus, the nonnarrative parts in a narration, such as orientation, evaluation(s), and coda, can bring the world of the conversation back into the speaker and listener's focus of attention. Meanwhile in the narrative "I" and "you" can be demoted and replaced in {DEIXIS} by the new characters of the narration. Research on specific languages is needed to deter-

which are connected with the "I" as a narrator (Goffman's *addressing self*). It is not quite clear how much the activation of one activates the other.

mine to what extent they may be absent or present in {DEIXIS} in the narrative genre and other genres of discourse.

Since transitions between the world of conversation and the world of narration happen many times even during one narrative, it is plausible that the 1st- and 2nd-person referents during the narrative can either linger in {DEIXIS} for some time or be slowly and gradually demoted.¹² In the following, I will examine the 1st and 2nd person of the past tense in NR, comparing their status and form to figure out what factors influence the distribution of pronouns versus auxiliaries.

The paper is organized as follows. First I describe the general rule for choosing one of the two variants, the clitic auxiliary or the stressed pronoun, in the past tense in the 1st person. Next I discuss exceptions to the rule: pronouns in the position where an auxiliary would be expected and auxiliaries in the position where a pronoun would be expected. Then the 2nd person will be treated similarly. After that I briefly describe the formation of the past tense in the 3rd person, where no auxiliary clitic exists, so the choice is between an overt or silent subject pronoun. Finally a similar issue for the present tense is mentioned but not treated in detail. The conclusion sums up the main points of the argument.

3. Past-Tense Forms in NR

3.1. Formation of Past Tense in the Rusyn Dialect of Novoselycja

As mentioned above, in the 1st- and 2nd-person singular and plural in NR there are two possibilities for the formation of the past tense.¹³ One possibility is to use the *l*-participle of the main verb (agreeing with the subject in gender and number) and a subject pronoun indicating person, but no auxiliary:¹⁴

- (2) a **já** pišlá
 and I_{NOM} go_{LPF}
 ‘and I went’

¹² Using the terminology of Chafe 1994, the 1st- and 2nd-person referents can retain their status either as given and active—when a new reference to those referents will utilize a less explicit form—or move to a different, less-than-given status, i.e., accessible and semiactive—when reference to them will use a more explicit form.

¹³ The pluperfect is formed the same way, with the addition of the *l*-participle of the verb ‘to be’ agreeing in gender and number with the subject; see, e.g., example (11) clause 2, example (12) clause 6, etc.

¹⁴ Unless specified otherwise, pronouns and auxiliaries are in boldface where relevant for the argument.

- (3) **mý** ho l'ičýly
 we_{NOM} he_{ACC} treat_{LP.PL}
 'we treated it [the dog]'.

The other option is to use the *l*-participle of the main verb agreeing with the subject in gender and number and the auxiliary enclitic indicating person, but no pronoun:

- (4) vozýw¹⁵ **ym** kormá
 transport_{LP.M} AUX_{1SG} fodder_{ACC.PL}
 'I transported fodder'
- (5) w zymí **s'me** s'a pibrály
 in winter_{LOC.SG} AUX_{1PL} REFL_{ACC} take_{LP.PL}
 'in the winter we got married'

In the 3rd person no clitic auxiliary exists. The subject can be expressed by a noun, a pronoun, or a zero:

- (6) 1. ôhén' hôríw
 fire_{NOM.SG} burn_{LP.M}
 'The fire burned,'
2. a tuj sperédu |
 and here in the front
 'and there in the front,'
3. tôtô kypílo
 that_{NOM.N} boil_{LP.N}
 'that [i.e., food in a pot] was boiling'
- (7) 1. ta oná pak xodýla na žnývo
 and she_{NOM} later go_{LP.F} on reaping_{ACC}
 'And later she went to reap the crops,'

¹⁵ I call such forms as *vozýw* *l*-participles because that is what they are historically, even though in the masculine gender currently there is no final *l*, because *l* yields *w* in syllable-final position in NR (*s'c'iw* 'table', *xodýw* 'he walked', *pyščáwka* 'a kind of flute', etc.)

- (7) 2. uže pak jak |
 already later, as...
 'already later, after that,'
3. ta Ø | lyšála Ø na žônú |
 and Ø leave_{LP,F} Ø on woman_{ACC}
 'and [she] left [her children] with a woman'.

3.2. 1st Person

My hypothesis that the choice between a subject pronoun or an auxiliary depends on discourse factors is based on the following considerations.

In the 1st person, the pronoun in NR is used if the subject, together with the action or state, is being introduced for the first time, either in the entire text or in a long stretch of text; the auxiliary clitic is used otherwise.

- (8) 1. | a totó wže | w pjadêš'at šós't'im |
 and that already in 56th_{LOC,M}
 'and that [was] already in [19]56;'
2. uže pjadêš'at sémÿj rik jak ja tuj |
 already 57th_{NOM,M} year_{NOM} as I_{NOM} here
 'it's already the fifty-seventh year that I am here;'
3. ta mÿ hy bý... |
 and we_{NOM} as if
 'and we_{PRON} as if...'¹⁶
4. w zymí s'me s'a pibrály |
 in winter_{LOC} AUX_{1PL} REFL_{ACC} take_{LP,PL}
 'in the winter we_{AUX} got married;'
5. a vesnów ys'me posadyly | sês'ú hrúšu |
 and in-spring AUX_{1PL} plant_{LP,PL} this_{ACC,F} pear-tree_{ACC}
 'and in the spring we_{AUX} planted this pear tree.'¹⁷

¹⁶ This *hy bý* 'as if' might be best translated as English "like": 'and we, like... in winter we got married...'

¹⁷ A seeming contradiction to the rule in this example (i.e., a pronoun and an auxiliary together) is the result of the combination of a fragment ('and we as if...') and a sentence ('in winter we got married'), which can be heard on the recording. The speaker lengthens *ta* 'and', searching for words, then after *hy bý* 'as if' makes a pause, abandoning the previous utterance, and then starts a new one.

In the example (8), the speaker tells the history of a pear tree growing on a slope nearby: she first starts with a fragment “in 1956...”, then she produces a short episode about herself, where she uses a 1st-person singular pronoun (clause 2). After that, in clause 3, she starts a new episode telling about her and her husband’s shared actions (using the 1st-person plural pronoun), but hesitates and uses a filler instead of finishing the clause: ‘and we as if...’. However, though the clause is not finished, in the fragment the pronoun introducing a new subject has been uttered, and in the next two clauses the speaker uses an auxiliary.

- (9) 1. ...u lán'c'i búl'i sadýly wšýtko ta |
 in brigade_{LOC} potatoes_{ACC} plant_{LP.PL} everything_{ACC} and
 ‘[me and my sister together] were in the brigade planting potatoes
 and everything;’
2. a já pišlá u čotýrynác'et' rókiw
 and I_{NOM} go_{LP.F} in fourteen_{ACC} years_{GEN}
 ‘and I_{PRON} went when I was fourteen;’
3. užé m koróvŷ pišlá w kolxóz dôjýty |
 already AUX_{1SG} cows_{ACC} go_{LP.F} in collective-farm_{ACC} milk_{INF}
 ‘I_{AUX} already went to the collective farm to milk the cows;’
4. dôjýla m pjêť rókiw koróvŷ |
 milk_{LP.F} AUX_{1SG} five_{ACC} years_{GEN} cows_{ACC}
 do dêwjatnác'it' rókiw
 until 19_{ACC} years_{GEN}
 ‘I_{AUX} milked the cows for five years, until [I was] nineteen;’
5. | a w dêwjatnác'it' ym s'a viddála |
 and in 19_{ACC} AUX_{1SG} REFL_{ACC} give-away_{LP.F}
 ‘and at nineteen I_{AUX} got married.’
6. taj tuj e witkrýly pekárn'u zrobýly |
 and here here open_{LP.PL} bakery_{ACC} make_{LP.PL}
 ‘and here, right here they opened a bakery, made it;’
7. i ja u n'u náras pišlá pérša robýty
 and I_{NOM} in she_{ACC} at once go_{LP.F} first_{NOM.F} work_{INF}
 u pekárn'u |
 in bakery_{ACC}
 ‘and I was the first to go there to work, in the bakery’

- (9) 8. i tá*k* *ym* robýla
 and so AUX_{1SG} work_{LPF}
 ‘and this way I worked’
9. zak ne zakrýly
 until not close_{LP,PL}
 ‘until they closed it,’
10. zak ne pišlá sês’á perestró*j*ka |
 until not go_{LP,F} this_{NOM,F} perestroika_{NOM}
 ‘until this perestroika started.’

Example (9) is taken from the life story of the speaker. In clause 1 she talks about her and her sister working in the field at a collective farm, then she switches to telling her own life story and at first refers to herself with a 1st-person singular pronoun (clause 2). In the next three clauses while talking about herself, she uses an auxiliary. In clause 6, she digresses to tell about a bakery opened in the village, and when in clause 7 she returns to telling the story of her life, she again refers to herself first by a pronoun and then in clause 8 by an auxiliary.

This is what I will call the basic rule for NR: the first mention of a 1st-person referent is with a pronoun, and the subsequent mentions in a continuous chain of clauses with the same referent are with auxiliaries. In more precise terminology (taken from Schegloff 1996: 450–58) I will call the first mention “locally initial position” and subsequent mentions “locally subsequent positions”; for NR, a pronoun is, in Schegloff’s terms, a “locally initial form,” and an auxiliary a “locally subsequent form.” In these terms, the basic rule can be formulated as:

- (10) In the 1st person of the past tense in NR, pronouns are used in locally initial positions and auxiliaries in locally subsequent positions.¹⁸

On the basis of example (9), one could think a pronoun is used if and only if a 1st-person subject is reintroduced after clauses with a different subject. This is very often the case, but there are examples where a 1st-person pronoun is used after clauses with the same 1st-person subject, such as in example (11):

¹⁸ This is in accord with Givón’s (1983) principle, reformulated by Huang (2000: 157): “Givón’s topic coding-quantity principle: The less predictable/accessible/continuous a topic is, the more coding material is used to represent it in language.” This principle holds for many languages; see the discussion in Huang 2000.

- (11) 1. | **já** xodýw mnóho pónočy |
 I_{NOM} go_{LP.M} a lot at night
 ‘I went a lot at night’
2. užé | jak **ym** pidn’áw s’a na nóhÿ býw
 already as AUX_{1SG} raise_{LP.M} REFL_{ACC} on-feet_{ACC} be_{LP.M}
 ‘already as I became self-supporting,’
3. pidr.ís |
 grow-up_{LP.M}
 ‘grew up,’
4. poženýw **ym** s’a
 marry_{LP.M} AUX_{1SG} REFL_{ACC}
 ‘got married,’
5. pryjšów tuj na sé
 come_{LP.M} here on this_{ACC.N}
 ‘came here to this,’
6. bo **já** ne túj s’a ródyw a | hôr.íw maj |
 because I_{NOM} not here REFL_{ACC} be-born_{LP.M} but uphill more
 ‘because I wasn’t born here but up there,’
7. a túj pryjšów **ym** u prýjmÿ |
 and here come_{LP.M} AUX_{1SG} in-husband-in-wife’s-house_{ACC.PL}
 ‘and here, I came here as a husband.’

Here, in (11), the speaker starts a narrative about his encounter with a mysterious apparition one night many years ago. The narrative begins with a Labovian orientation, specifying the settings for the action. The beginning of the story contains not one but two orientation episodes, clauses 1–5 and 6–7. In the first orientation episode, the speaker explains when exactly he started riding around at night a lot, and then he interrupts himself and starts telling the history of his getting married and not taking his wife to his own house, as was common, but going to live in her house instead. (Actually, while telling the story, he forgot the original story he had started with.) At the beginning of both episodes, he refers to himself with a pronoun (clauses 1 and 6),¹⁹ even though there were no other intervening subjects between the two pronouns.

¹⁹ The speaker also uses a zero reference (neither a pronoun nor an auxiliary) in clauses 3 and 5. This is rare, mostly occurring in cases of coordinated clauses after an auxiliary. This speaker does this more than others, possibly because he used to live in other parts of Ukraine (Donbass) and picked up a “more cultural” way of speaking, which he tries to use to impress me, a foreign listener.

Thus although a 1st-person pronoun tends to be used after clauses with a different subject, it can also be used after clauses with the same 1st-person subject, i.e., in locally subsequent position. In these cases, the pronoun usage depends on how the speaker perceives the story. The speaker may identify a certain point of the story as the start of a new episode or as a continuation of the current one. In the first case, at this point s/he will use a pronoun; in the second case an auxiliary.

It is known that at the start of an episode many languages tend to use a more marked referential expression. Fox (1987a) states that in English literary discourse at a start of an episode a more salient form, an NP, is often used where a less salient form, a pronoun, would be expected. Similar results are described by Tomlin (1987). This corresponds with the NR data, where in an uninterrupted sequence of 1st-person references a phonetically more salient form, a stressed pronoun, may be chosen at the beginning of an episode, while a less salient form, a clitic auxiliary, tends to be used in the middle of it. The problem is what to consider an episode. Intuitively it is easy to say what an episode is, but it is not clear how to give a formal definition. An episode can be defined conceptually as a "semantic unit... governed by a macroproposition or a paragraph-level theme" (Tomlin 1987: 460). In a controlled experiment where subjects describe a video or a slide show, as in Tomlin's experiment, the episode boundaries can be defined by the change of a slide. In naturally produced speech, however, an episode is harder to recognize, and the arbitrariness of the definition of an episode can be a drawback, since one is tempted to use circular argumentation. However, there are some guidelines for recognizing an episode in discourse. Tomlin, following van Dijk and Kintsch (1983), states that in natural discourse major changes in time, place, or characters can correspond to episode boundaries. I claim, however, that it is often the speaker's choice to frame a certain chain of events as a new episode or as a continuation of an old one. This is similar to Schegloff's (1996: 452) findings about the 3rd-person reference in English: "By use of a locally initial reference form a speaker can try to bring off 'a new departure' in talk which is otherwise apparently referentially continuous with just prior talk." Schegloff also stresses that it is the speaker's choice in that s/he decides to treat the new reference occasion "as a new spate of talk, in which the referent will figure in a different way. She embodies this, and incipiently constitutes it, by use of the locally initial reference form" (ibid.). Finally, Schegloff addresses the problem of circularity, of defining an episode based on reference and then reference based on episode. He states this practice is necessarily reflexive, that it "adumbrates multiple stages in reference composition and reference analysis for any given reference for the participants, in which, for example, the second stage of the analysis can confirm the first ('looks like a locally subsequent position; it has a locally subsequent form; it *is* a locally subsequent reference') or change it ('looks like a locally subsequent position; oops! it has a locally initial form

in it; it's a locally initial reference and we're into a new sequence/topic'). This sort of reflexive relationship between position and what is *in* the position has appeared elsewhere in studies of conversation... and resists reduction to more familiar, linear depiction" (1996: 453).

In example (11) we have a case of exactly this. In clause 6 right before the 1st-person pronoun the speaker uses a subordinating conjunction *bo* 'because, since', starting a flashback, a digression, an orientation within an orientation.²⁰ he is speaking about the time of his marriage that happened before the time when he started to ride a lot at night, and that switch can be counted as a major change in time. It is harder to perceive this digression as a continuation and not as a start of a new episode.²¹ Nevertheless, my consultants have noted that the use of an auxiliary here (i.e., *bo ródyw ym s'a ne túj*) would not make the sequence infelicitous. The pronoun is a conscious choice; it shows the speaker's intention in framing his story, in highlighting certain parts of it as constituting distinctive episodes and thus worthy of specific attention.

The material contains several more examples where the 1st-person pronoun starts a new episode after another 1st-person pronoun:

²⁰ The conjunction *bo* by itself does not require a pronoun: cf. (i), where the clause with *bo* has an auxiliary:

- (i) *ták ys'me s'a wčóra narobýly*
 so AUX_{1PL} REFL_{ACC} yesterday work_{LP.PL}
 'we got so tired working yesterday,'
ščo ja s'a i ne pereôd'íla nýč
 that I_{NOM} REFL_{ACC} and not redress_{LP.F} nothing
 'that I did not even change my clothes,'
he taká
 look such_{NOM.F}
 'look how I am dressed,'
bo dúže ... narobýly s'me s'a
 because very work_{LP.PL} AUX_{1PL} REFL_{ACC}
 'because we got tired working so hard.'

²¹ Ariel (1990: 27) states that research in several other languages, including Chinese (Li and Thompson 1979) and English (Fox 1987b), has shown that High Accessibility Markers can indicate that the previous episode "has not been closed down," while a Low Accessibility Marker shows "the proposition containing the antecedent is closed." That is exactly what we find here for NR: a Low Accessibility Marker, which would be a pronoun, is used to indicate the end of one meaningful chunk of narration and the beginning of a new one.

- (12) 1. a bába taká veselá |
and old woman_{NOM} such_{NOM.F} happy_{NOM.F} |
'and the old woman [was] so happy,'
2. ta sto rók'iw máje |
and hundred_{ACC} years_{GEN} have_{3SG} |
'and she is one hundred years old,'
3. taká sôbí veselá bába
such_{NOM.F} REFL_{DAT} happy_{NOM.F} old woman
'such a happy old woman,'
4. ws'ó prykázovala
everything_{ACC.N} tell_{LP.F}
'she was talking all the time,'
5. no já totó i ne rozum'íla
but I_{NOM} that_{ACC.N} and not understand_{LP.F}
'but I did not even understand that,'
6. bo ja ja uže i ôhlúxla býla hêt |
because I_{NOM} I_{NOM} already and get deaf_{LP.F} be_{LP.F} totally |
'because I... I already had gotten totally deaf,'
7. šo z' d'it'mý m užé i ne mohlá
that with children_{INST} AUX_{1SG} already and not can_{LP.F}
hovoryty po telefónu |
speak_{INF} by telephone_{DAT} |
'so that I couldn't even talk to my children on the phone.'

Here an almost ninety-year-old speaker says how she saw a celebration of the 100th birthday of an old woman on TV. The first pronoun *ja* refers to the speaker who is mentioned in the narrative after a certain other subject (the 100-year-old woman on TV), so it is in locally initial position. The second pronoun *ja*, which is at first sight in a locally subsequent position, starts a new episode that tells about what happened to the speaker at a different time (here, how the speaker almost went deaf some time previously). This episode is a digression, an orientation in the middle of the story, introduced by the conjunction *bo* 'since', and additionally set apart from the story line by the usage of the pluperfect tense and by a disfluency (repeating the pronoun twice).

- (13) 1. to kolo ôvéc' maj bíl'se
that next to sheep_{GEN.PL} most more
'that most often [happens] next to the sheep,'

- (13) 2. kolý víwc'í he u košáru | ženút |
 when sheep_{ACC.PL} there in pen_{ACC} make-go_{PR.3PL}
 'when people get sheep into a pen,'
3. ta viwčar.í tam | vad' dóma |
 and shepherds_{NOM} there or home
 'so the shepherds [played the alpenhorn], there or at home'
4. u nas tam de ja ródyla s'a hôr.í
 by us_{GEN} there where I_{NOM} be-born_{LP.F} REFL_{ACC} uphill
 'at our place, where I was born, up there,'
5. ja s'a tam ródyla
 I_{NOM} REFL_{ACC} there be-born_{LP.F}
 'I was born there,'
6. výšše jak bába tótá gyl'óva
 higher as old woman_{NOM} that_{NOM.F} Gyl'ova_{NOM}
 šče výšše dês' tam |
 still higher somewhere there
 'higher than that Gyl'ova woman, still higher, somewhere there,'
7. piw k.ilómetra i nyjé uže |
 half kilometer_{GEN} and not-be_{PR.3SG} already
 'there is less than half a kilometer [from there]'
8. ta tam | tam i d'ído bý'w hudák |
 and there there and grandfather_{NOM} be_{LP.M} musician_{NOM}
 'so it was there, there my grandfather also was a musician,'
9. i ws'ó znaw totó robýty |
 and all know_{LP.M} that_{ACC.N} make_{INF}
 'and he knew how to make all those [instruments].'

In this example, the speaker tells where and when people used to play *trembitas* (long alpenhorns) but digresses to tell about the place she was born, where her grandfather, a musician, could make musical instruments and used to teach people to play *trembitas*. The speaker mentions the place where she was born and then starts explaining where exactly that place is, which also constitutes a distinct episode in the story.

The pronoun can also be used after an auxiliary denoting the same referent, with the same function: the start of an episode. The following example is from reported speech. The speaker retells her family member's account of getting food poisoning.

- (14) 1. áa | a kolý výt's'í išlá
and... and when from here go_{LP.F}
'and when she left from here,'
2. bo Stepán podzvonyw obÿ jšlá
because Stepan_{NOM} call_{LP.M} so that_{COND.3SG} go_{LP.F}
'because Stepan called [and said] she should go,'
3. bo | vín' pryjde s čěx.iw |
because he_{NOM} come_{FUT.3SG} from Czechs_{GEN}
'because he was coming home from the Czech Republic,'
4. ta káže pryjšlá m | nó |
and say_{PR.3SG} come_{LP.F} AUX_{1SG} well
'and, she says, I came, and...'
5. ta ščí m káže |
and also AUX_{1SG} say_{PR.3SG}
'and also, I have, she says,'
6. ta wžé zhôlôd'n'íla
and already get hungry_{LP.F}
'and I had already gotten hungry,'
7. bo ráno nê íla jak išlá |
because morning not eat_{LP.F} as go_{LP.F}
'because in the morning she had not eaten when she left,'
8. ta pryjšlá ta pam.idóru m kaé rôz'rízala
and come_{LP.F} and tomato_{ACC} AUX_{1SG} say_{PR.3SG} cut_{LP.F}
'and she came [home] and I cut up a tomato, she said,'
9. to zaprávyła m pam.idóru | tai | ohiréc' |
and dress_{LP.F} AUX_{1SG} tomato_{ACC} and cucumber_{ACC}
'and I put some dressing on the tomato and a cucumber,'
10. e tám kaé |
oh there say_{PR.3SG}
'on, she says,'
11. bóže já c'ílu bóžu n'íč ne spála
God_{VOC} I_{NOM} entire_{ACC.F} God's_{ACC.F} night_{ACC} not sleep_{LP.F}
'OMG, I did not sleep the entire night,'

- (14) 12. *ták n'a káže žólúdok bôl'íw |*
so I_{ACC} say_{PR.3SG} stomach_{NOM} ache_{LP.M}
 'I had such a stomach ache, she says,'
13. *já dúmala ká ščo |*
I_{NOM} think_{LP.F} say_{PR.3SG} that
 'I thought, she says, that'
14. *já s'a kôn'ču |*
I_{NOM} REFL_{ACC} finish_{FUT.3SG}
 'I would die.'

The speaker reports another person's speech as direct speech, only inserting the quoting verb *káže* 's/he says', which can be reduced to *kaé* or even *ká*, multiple times (clauses 4, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13), but not changing the 1st-person reference. The family member's reported direct speech starts in clause 4, which contains a 1st-person auxiliary. Then the auxiliary is repeated three more times, while the speaker, impersonating her family member, explains what and how she had eaten. When the most emotional part about the food poisoning and its consequences begins in clause 11, the 1st-person referent remains the same. But instead of continuing with auxiliaries, the speaker uses pronouns three times (including a future-tense; clause 14). In clause 13, after a nonsubject 1st-person pronoun *n'a* 'me' in the previous clause, theoretically an auxiliary could be used (see below), but the speaker chooses a pronoun. In this example again the pronoun and not the auxiliary is used in locally subsequent position in the most dramatic part of the narrative, apparently to divide the narrative into smaller subepisodes, slow it down, and thus add suspense.

There are also other types of exceptions to the basic rule in (10). Among these are auxiliaries occurring after a different subject has been mentioned (in a locally initial position).

First, it is not only 1st-person subject pronouns, but also the 1st-person non-subject pronouns that cause the usage of an auxiliary in the subsequent clause. Second, an intervening clause with a present-tense form of a verb with the same 1st-person subject (which is shown by the agreement in person and number in the present tense) can be followed by a clause with an auxiliary rather than a pronoun. Example (15) demonstrates both these possibilities:

- (15) 1. *to býlo dějanóstoho róku*
that_{NOM.N} be_{LP.N} ninetieth_{GEN.M} year_{GEN}
 'that was in 1990,'

- (15) 2. no dejanósto péršoho uže my pak | dály |
 well ninety-first_{GEN.M} already I_{DAT} then give_{LP.PL}
 ‘and in 1991 they already gave me [the disability status],’
3. bo dówhô m býla
 because for a long time AUX_{1SG} be_{LP.F}
 ‘because for a long time I was...’
4. šos’ ne mohlá m |
 somehow not be able_{LP.F} AUX_{1SG}
 ‘for some reason I was not able’
5. ne mohlá m s’a pi(d)nymáty |
 not be able_{LP.F} AUX_{1SG} REFL_{ACC} rise_{INF}
 ‘I was not able to stand up,’
6. užé my zrobýly býly operáciju
 already I_{DAT} make_{LP.PL} be_{LP.PL} surgery_{ACC}
 ‘I had already had surgery,’
7. užé m býla móže i dva týžn’i |
 already AUX_{1SG} be_{LP.F} maybe and two week_{PAU}
 ‘already about two weeks passed [since the surgery],’
8. no čým s’a pidnymáju
 but as soon as REFL_{ACC} rise_{PR.1SG}
 ‘but as soon as I stood up,’
9. ta zoml’ivála m | ščôs’ |
 and faint_{LP.F} AUX_{1SG} somehow
 ‘I would faint for some reason.’

Example (15) is from the account of an accident that will be discussed in more detail below. In clause 2 there is a nonsubject (dative) 1st-person singular pronoun *my*, and the next clauses contain an auxiliary; similarly there is the same dative pronoun *my* in clause 6 and then an auxiliary in the next clause. There is also a 1st-person present-tense form in clause 8 (*s’a pidnymáju* ‘I pick myself up’), followed by the 1st-person auxiliary in the next clause.

However, there are also cases when an auxiliary occurs after clauses with different subjects that also do not contain nonsubject 1st-person pronouns. Here are examples:

- (16) 1. ... to skládovaly s’me u mýský tak.í |
 that_{ACC.N} store_{LP.PL} AUX_{1PL} in bowls_{ACC} such_{ACC.PL}
 ‘...we would put it in these bowls.’

- (16) 2. *tô(w)dý jak užé pič nahôr.íla |*
 then as already oven_{NOM} get hot_{LP.F}
 ‘Then, when the oven was already hot,’
3. *výbraly s’me hrán’ | u drúhu*
 take out_{LP.PL} AUX_{1PL} hot coals_{ACC} in another_{ACC.F}
 ‘we would take the coals in another one,’
4. *tam de vodá býla taká bóčka*
 there where water_{NOM} be_{LP.F} such_{NOM.F} barrel_{NOM}
zamuróvana
 build-in_{PPART.NOM.F}
 ‘there where water was there was a kind of built-in barrel,’
5. *obý vodá s’a hr.íla |*
 so that_{COND.3SG} water_{NOM} REFL_{ACC} warm_{LP.F}
 ‘so that the water would heat,’
6. *pit tótú bóčku s’me |*
 under that_{ACC.F} barrel_{ACC} AUX_{1PL}
u takú malú pič | výbrály hrán’ |
 in such_{ACC.F} small_{ACC.F} oven_{ACC} take out_{LP.PL} coals_{ACC}
 ‘we put the coals in this small oven under that barrel.’

This is an excerpt from a long description of how the speaker and her coworkers used to bake bread in the village bakery. In clause 1, the speaker refers to the bakers with an auxiliary; then there is a clause with the subject *pič* ‘oven’, and in the next clause the 1st-plural auxiliary is used. In the next two clauses, 4 and 5, the subjects are ‘barrel’ and ‘water’, but after that the 1st-person plural subject is again coded with an auxiliary.

This example shows that at times interfering clauses with other subjects can be transparent for subject reference. Such transparent clauses represent certain digressions after which the speaker returns to the actions of the main character(s). However, clauses representing similar types of digressions (introduction of new entities and their descriptions, etc.) can be also followed by clauses with 1st-person pronouns, as in examples (17) and (18) below.

- (17) 1. *a w dêwjatnác’c’it’ ym s’a viddála |*
 and in nineteen AUX_{1SG} REFL_{ACC} give away_{LP.F}
 ‘and at nineteen I got married.’

- (17) 2. taj tuj e witkrýly pekárn'u zrobýly |
and here here open_{LP.PL} bakery_{ACC} make_{LP.PL} |
'and here they opened a bakery,'
3. i ja u n'u náras pišlá pěrša
and I_{NOM} in she_{ACC} at once go_{LP.F} first_{NOM.F}
robýty u pekárn'u
work_{INF} in bakery_{ACC}
'and I immediately went there, [I was] one of the first to work in that bakery.'
- (18) 1. koly já pryjšlá s'udý za nevístku |
when I_{NOM} came_{LP.F} here for daughter-in-law_{ACC} |
'When I came here as a daughter-in-law,'
2. ta s'óho sádu ne býlo |
and this_{GEN.M} garden_{GEN} not be_{LP.N} |
'this garden did not exist,'
3. taj sóho u béréz'i ne býlo tuj |
and this_{GEN.M} in slope_{LOC} not be_{LP.N} here |
'and this one, on the slope, was not here,'
4. sámoje kôrcíw'á býlo sês' béréh |
only_{NOM.N} bushes_{NOM} be_{LP.N} this_{NOM.M} slope_{NOM} |
'this slope had only bushes,'
5. ják vid nás vidhorodžéno |
as from we_{GEN} fence_{PPART.NOM.N} |
'it was fenced off from our land,'
6. to nó je wže h.i bý naša d'il'ánka
that well be_{PR.3SG} already as if our_{NOM.F} land_{NOM} |
sês' béréh |
this_{NOM.M} slope_{NOM} |
'that over there, it is like our land, that slope,'
7. a totó sámoje kôrcíw'á býlo |
and that_{NOM} only_{NOM.N} bushes_{NOM} be_{LP.N} |
'and that, that was only bushes,'
8. ta ja pak is čólôwíkom
and I_{NOM} then with husband_{INST} |
'and my husband and I,'

- (18) 9. jak **mý** s'a poženýly dvóje |
 as we_{NOM} refl_{ACC} get married_{LP.PL} two_{NOM}
 'as the two of us got married,'
10. totó kôříwl'a ws'ó vřrúbovaly vř... vertovalý
 that_{ACC.N} bushes_{ACC} all_{ACC} cut_{LP.PL} uproot_{LP.PL}
 jak káty vřkópovaly kô.in'a |
 how say_{INF} dig out_{LP.PL} roots_{ACC}
 'we chopped out all those bushes, took out the roots, how to say
 it, we dug up the roots.'

It turns out that the choice of pronoun vs. auxiliary after a digression (i.e., in locally initial position) is related to the type of text. In classic narratives, especially in artistic stories used to impress the listener, the chances of encountering a pronoun after a digression are higher. In nonclassic narratives, such as habitual narratives, descriptions, arguments, and other types of texts that are closer to interaction than to narrative, the auxiliary is more common.

To demonstrate this, I analyze pronoun versus auxiliary usage in several texts. They include classical narrative parts, such as artistic stories, and more interactional narratives produced for the occasion, on the spot, in response to a listener's question or springing from the speaker's own thoughts. Example (19) below starts as a classical Labovian narrative, a danger-of-death story. Unlike the stories Labov studied, this one was not elicited but was volunteered by the speaker in the course of telling me about her family. The speaker listed her siblings, then started with the story about her father's death during the war, next told the story of her late sister's death, followed by a brief account of her living siblings. Eventually, she started telling me about her own life. After talking about her youth (see (9) above), she continued:

- (19) 1. a jřće uže tóho rřku dēwanosto(h)o rřku |
 and also already that_{GEN.M} year_{GEN} ninetieth_{GEN.M} year_{GEN}
 'and also that year, in 1990,'
2. zarvály s'a na mn'a m.iřký u pekárny
 fall_{LP.PL} aux_{1PL} on me_{ACC} sacks_{NOM} in bakery_{LOC}
 s'imdes'atk.ylřwi |
 seventy-kilo_{NOM.PL}
 '70-kilo sacks fell on me in the bakery,'
3. bo dřt'i i ne býlo m.iřk.řw malýx
 because until then and not be_{LP.N} sacks_{GEN} small_{GEN.PL}
 'because till that time there were no small sacks,'

- (19) 4. to têtér' uže je sorokpjat'k.ilóvi | piis'át k.ilóvi
 that now already be_{PR.3SG} 45-kilo_{NOM.PL} 50-kilo_{NOM.PL}
 jak.í
 all kinds_{NOM.PL}
 'but now there are [also] 45-kilo and 50-kilo sacks,'
5. a tówdý ws'í býly tak.í polotn'án'i
 and then all_{NOM.PL} be_{LP.PL} such_{NOM.PL} cloth_{NOM.PL}
 velyk.i m.íxý s'imdês'át k.i(y)lów[i]
 large_{NOM.PL} sacks_{NOM} 70-kilo_{NOM.PL}
 'and at that time all the sacks were such large ones, made of cloth,
 70-kilo ones,'
6. s'imdês'át k.il vahý mály muký |
 seventy kilos_{GEN} weight_{GEN} have_{LP.PL} flour_{GEN}
 'they contained 70 kilos of flour by weight,'
7. ta tak býly naskládovan'i u sklád'i |
 and so be_{LP.PL} store_{PPART.NOM.PL} in storage_{LOC}
 'and they were stacked like that in the storage,'
8. a ja níčnú zm.ínu uže k.in'čála
 and I_{NOM} night_{ACC.F} shift_{ACC} already finish_{LP.F}
 'and I was already finishing the night shift,'
9. usé s'me mály zakvásku zrobýty
 always AUX_{1PL} have to_{LP.PL} leaven_{ACC} make_{INF}
 wdénn'i z'm.ín'i |
 day_{DAT.F} shift_{DAT}
 'we always had to make leaven for the day shift.'
10. ja pišlá t'ahnúty tot m.ix |
 I_{NOM} go_{LP.F} pull_{INF} that_{ACC.M} sack_{ACC}
 'I went to pull out this sack,'
11. a ony s'a vitslojýly
 and they REFL_{ACC} peel off_{LP.PL}
 'and they came loose'
12. môže jyx i dês'át vit s't'iný s'ak
 maybe they_{GEN} and ten_{NOM} from wall_{GEN} like this

us'í s'ar... [unclear]...

all_{NOM.PL} [unclear]

'maybe there were even ten of them, from the wall, like this
[unclear]'

- (19) 13. **ja** uvíd'ila
I_{NOM} see_{LP.F}
'I saw'
14. ščo wný s'a na méne zarývajúť
that they_{NOM} REFL_{ACC} on me_{ACC} fall_{PR,3PL}
'that they are going to fall on me,'
15. ta **ja** t'íkála |
and I_{NOM} flee_{LP.F}
'and I fled,'
16. a na drúhômú bôc'i | býly pus'cí m.íxý
and on other_{LOC.M} side_{LOC} be_{LP.PL} empty_{NOM.PL} sacks_{NOM}
pôróz'n'i |
empty_{NOM.PL}
'and on the other side there was nothing in them, empty ones,'
17. **ja** s'a u totý m.íxý zapútala
I_{NOM} REFL_{ACC} in that_{ACC.PL} sacks_{ACC} trip_{LP.F}
'I tripped on the sacks,'
18. tam **ym** upála
there AUX_{1SG} fall_{LP.F}
'I fell there,'
19. i wný mené tam dohnály tótý i |
and they me_{ACC} there catch up with_{LP.PL} that_{NOM.PL} and
prybýly
put down_{LP.PL}
'and they caught me there, those sacks, and pinned me down.'
20. u méne rozrýw býw |
by me_{GEN} rupture_{NOM} be_{LP.M}
'I had a rupture,'
21. kéd' **bym** [vam] pokazála wšýtko u méne
when be_{COND.1SG} you_{DAT.PL} show_{LP.F} all_{ACC.N} by me_{GEN}

- o tudý́ totó
there that_{ACC.N}
'if I could show you everything I had, there like this,'
- (19) 22. no |
well
'well,'
23. u méne kŷšký́ túj býly na kól'ínax |
by me_{GEN} guts_{NOM} here be_{LP.PL} on knees_{LOC}
'I had my guts right here on my knees,'
24. i ja tohdý́
and I_{NOM} then
'and then I...'
25. pak dály my drúhu hrúpu |
later give_{LP.PL} I_{DAT} second_{ACC.F} group_{ACC}
dêwjanósto pěršocho róku |
ninety-first_{GEN.M} year_{GEN}
'then they gave me the 2nd grade [of disability status], in 1991,'
26. ja vit tohdý́ ne róbl'u u pekárn[y] |
I_{NOM} from then not work_{PR.1SG} in bakery_{LOC}
'since that time I haven't been working in the bakery.'
27. w m.ížh.ír.u m býla na operác'ii
in Mizhhir'ja_{LOC} AUX_{1PL} be_{LP.F} on surgery_{LOC}
'I had a surgery in Mizhhir'ja,'
28. čotýry s polovýnow hódynŷ m býla na
four_{ACC} with half_{INST} hour_{PAU} AUX_{1SG} be_{LP.F} on
operác'ii |
surgery_{LOC}
'I was in surgery for four and a half hours,'
29. tó s'a na mn'í ws'ó pry ... pírvalo býlo |
that_{NOM} AUX_{1PL} on me_{LOC} all_{NOM.N} tear_{LP.N} be_{LP.N}
'everything in me was torn up,'
30. ta wýbačte
and forgive_{IMP.2PL}
'and, sorry,'

- (19) 31. krów pišlá my býla i jenným bókom i
 blood_{NOM} go_{LP.F} I_{DAT} be_{LP.F} and one_{INST.M} side_{INST} and
 druhým tuj na m.is'i (mýs'i) |
 other_{INST.M} here on sacks_{ACC} (?)
 'I was bleeding from both sides here on the sacks (?)'
32. xót'ila m umérty taj |
 will_{LP.F} AUX_{1SG} die_{INF} and
 'I thought I would die, and that would be it,'²²
33. ajbo ne umérta |
 but not die_{LP.F}
 'but I did not die.'
34. ta užé |
 and already
 'and already,'
35. to býlo dějanóstoho róku
 that_{NOM} be_{LP.N} ninetieth_{GEN.M} year_{GEN}
 'that was in 1990,'
36. no dejanósto péršoho uže my pak | dály |
 well ninety-first_{GEN.M} already I_{DAT} then give_{LP.PL}
 'and in 1991 they gave me [the disability status],'
37. bo dôwhô m býla
 because for a long time AUX_{1SG} be_{LP.F}
 'because for a long time I was...'
38. šos' ne mohlá m |
 somehow not be able_{LP.F} AUX_{1SG}
 'for some reason I was not able'
39. ne mohlá m s'a pi(d)nymáty |
 not be able_{LP.F} AUX_{1SG} REFL_{ACC} rise_{INF}
 'I was not able to stand up,'
40. užé my zrobýly b(/)ýly operáciju
 already I_{DAT} make_{LP.PL} be_{LP.PL} surgery_{ACC}
 'I had had an operation,'

²² Or: 'I wanted to die so that it all would end.'

- (19) 41. užé **m** býla móže i dva týžn'í |
 already AUX_{1SG} be_{LP.F} maybe and two week_{PAU}
 'already about two weeks passed [since the operation]'
42. no čým s'a pidnymáju
 but as soon as REFL_{ACC} rise_{PR.1SG}
 'but as soon as I stood up,'
43. ta zoml'ivála **m** | ščôs' |
 and faint_{LP.F} AUX_{1SG} somehow
 'I would faint for some reason,'
44. ščôs' | ne znáju čóho |
 somehow not know_{PR.1SG} why
 'for some reason, I don't know why,'
45. ne mohlá **m** dówho vidžýty za wtó |
 not be able_{LP.F} AUX_{1SG} long get better_{INF} for that_{ACC.N}
 'I could not recover from that for a long time.'
46. a é óde u n'a gúl'a e pobýta |
 and here here by I_{GEN} bump_{NOM} be_{PR.3SG} beat_{PPART.NOM.F}
 'and right here I have a swelling, a bump,'
47. ta xót'ily tuj r.ízaty
 and want_{LP.PL} here cut_{INF}
 'and they wanted to operate on me here,'
48. a **ja** ne dála |
 and I_{NOM} not let_{LP.F}
 'but I didn't let them,'
49. bôjála **m** s'a
 be afraid_{LP.F} AUX_{1SG} REFL_{ACC}
 'I was afraid.'
50. é |
 [leave me in peace]
 'Let me be.'

The beginning of example (19) up to clause 19 is a simple but very powerful oral art, so powerful that it gives the impression that it has been told before and polished to impress. As mentioned above, it is a classical Labovian narrative, a sequence of events in the past described in the past tense. It has most of the parts that a Labovian narrative is supposed to have: an abstract (clause 2), an orientation (clauses 1 and 3–9), a complication, a composite unit consist-

ing of several orientation-complication sets (clauses 10–18), and a resolution (clause 19). In this part the 1st-person protagonist is introduced and referred to with a pronoun (clause 8, end of orientation), after which the 1st-person plural subject (we, the bakers, including the protagonist) is referred to with an auxiliary. Clause 10 is the beginning of complicating action, the start of a new episode, so in it the 1st-person singular protagonist is referred to by a pronoun. Then comes a dynamic and dramatic account of the protagonist's actions in trying to escape the falling sacks of flour, described almost as living evil beings ('they caught me and pinned me down'). The account is structured as one or more actions of the protagonist followed by the actions of the other party, the flour sacks ('I went... and they came loose; I saw that they..., I fled..., I tripped..., I fell... and they caught up with me and pinned me down.')²³ The speaker describes herself as initiating actions, and the sacks as reacting to her. Therefore, her actions are shown as starting several subepisodes.²⁴ The clauses describing the actions of the speaker contain the 1st-person pronoun four times (in clauses 10, 13,²⁵ 15, 17). Of these, clause 10 represents the beginning of a new episode; clauses 15 and 17 might have had an auxiliary according to the judgment of other native speakers. However, both have a pronoun. The reason for excessive pronoun use here, as in examples (11) and (12) above, is that each of these pronouns starts a small episode in the story. This usage is an artistic device characterizing the most dramatic part of the narrative. Dividing the story into many episodes builds suspense.

Thereafter, in clauses 20 and further, the story shifts from a narrative to a series of stacked short descriptions (clauses 20–23, 46) and digressions from the timeline (27–28, 29–31, 32–33, 37–45, 47–49). Here, the speaker refers to herself mostly with an auxiliary, except for clause 48. Of course, for many clauses, a previous clause contains an auxiliary or a nonsubject 1st-person pronoun, so an auxiliary is expected. However, it is noteworthy that the speaker does not take advantage of the opportunity to use a pronoun when a new episode

²³ It is noteworthy that all the actions of the sacks are also described by clauses containing overt 3rd-person pronouns (clauses 11, 14, 19). The rules for 3rd-person overt vs. zero subject are in a way similar to the rules for the 1st-person overt vs. zero subjects: in the 3rd person, the first mention is usually a noun, the second mention, a personal pronoun, the third mention, a zero (see below, section 3.4). The fact that here the speaker uses an overt 3rd-person pronoun and not a zero indicates that the sacks' actions, similarly to the protagonist's actions, are presented as distinct episodes.

²⁴ An alternative explanation of the pronoun usage here is that there is a doubly different contrast between the protagonist and the sacks, and between the actions of the two entities. Contrast in many languages requires the usage of a more overt expression. However, contrast does not explain the pronoun in clause 17.

²⁵ The end of clause 12 cannot be heard clearly on the recording. Therefore I cannot tell if the following clause, 13, theoretically could also have had an auxiliary.

starts. Apparently, pronoun usage is a less common strategy in a nonnarrative oral discourse.²⁶

Another example of a speech act containing both an artistic, classical narrative and a more interactional type of speaking is (20), recorded from a different speaker in 1987:

- (20) 1. |...|
2. brály **sme** bú'í |
 take_{LP,PL} AUX_{1PL} potatoes_{ACC}
 'We were digging potatoes,'
3. ta užé **sme** povýbyrály ws'údý
 and already AUX_{1PL} harvest_{LP,PL} everywhere
 'and we had already dug them everywhere,'
4. a bý'lo u nás yšče u póly bul' málo |
 and be_{LP,N} by we_{GEN} also in field_{LOC} potatoes_{GEN} a little
 'and we still had some potatoes in the field,'
5. a bý'la u n'á d'ítýna malá |
 and be_{LP,F} by me_{GEN} baby_{NOM} little_{NOM,F}
 'and I had a little baby,'
6. a dóma tréba kváký mý'katy |
 and at home necessary turnips_{ACC} pull out_{INF}
 'and at home we had some turnips to pull out,'
7. bo kváký bý'ly |
 because turnips_{NOM} be_{LP,PL}
 'because we had turnips,'
8. ják totó po vášômu kážut | no |
 how that_{ACC,N} by your_{DAT,M} say_{PR,3PL} see
 'what do they call them in your language, huh?'
9. po nášômu kváký |
 by our_{DAT,M} turnips_{NOM}
 'in our language it's *kvaky*.'

²⁶ This is true for artistic oral stories vs. less spontaneous oral genres in other languages as well. Clancy (1980: 176, fn. 10), notes that "Hinds and Hinds (1979) found that in traditional Japanese folktales 'ellipsis is blocked across episode boundaries.' In unplanned oral narratives, this is only a tendency rather than a rule; perhaps a greater attempt is made to mark episode boundaries explicitly in written narratives."

- (20) 10. ta **já** pišlá mýkаты kváký |
 and I_{NOM} go_{LP.F} pull out_{INF} turnips_{ACC}
 ‘So I went to pull turnips,’
11. wz’ála **m** d’itynu s sôbów |
 take_{LP.F} AUX_{1SG} baby_{ACC} with REFL_{INST}
 ‘I took the baby with me,’
12. ta položýla **m** na zém’u |
 and put_{LP.F} AUX_{1SG} on ground_{ACC}
 ‘and put [the baby] on the ground,’
13. postelýla m.íx ta položýla **m** d’itynu tám |
 spread_{LP.F} sack_{ACC} and put_{LP.F} AUX_{1SG} baby_{ACC} there
 ‘I spread a sack and put the baby on it,’
14. a pac’átko malóje býlo u nas ta |
 and pig_{NOM} small_{NOM.N} be_{LP.N} by we_{GEN} and
 ‘and we had a young pig,’
15. koxály **mý** totó pac’á
 raise_{LP.PL} we_{NOM} that_{ACC.N} pig_{ACC}
 ‘we fed this pig,’
16. ta ws’ó je... vŷo^opuščály **sme**
 and always let out_{LP.PL} AUX_{1PL}
 ‘and we always let it out,’
17. oták xodýlo pô dvôrú |
 like this walk_{LP.N} by yard_{DAT}
 ‘it was walking in the yard like this.’
18. pišlá **ja**
 go_{LP.F} I_{NOM}
 ‘I went,’
19. ta buraký totý kváký mýkaju ta
 and beets_{ACC} that_{ACC.PL} turnips_{ACC} pull_{PR.1SG} and
 mýkaju |
 pull_{PR.1SG}
 ‘and I am pulling and pulling these beets, I mean, turnips,’
20. ájbo túj yšče (?) na dóžč zaládžuje
 but here also on rain_{ACC} make_{PR.3SG}
 ‘and here it looks like it’s going to rain,’

- (20) 21. takýj dóšč xóče pádaty |
 such_{NOM.M} rain_{NOM} want_{PR.3SG} fall_{INF}
 ‘rain will fall,’
22. a já skóro dýwl’u
 and I_{NOM} fast see_{PR.1SG}
 ‘and I quickly look,’
23. wbým poxvatála kváký ta pometála
 so that_{COND.1SG} grab_{LP.F} turnips_{ACC} and throw_{LP.F}
 na jámu tam püt str.íxu |
 on pit_{ACC} there under roof_{ACC}
 ‘to grab all the turnips and throw them into the pit under the roof there,’
24. a d’itýna sôbí spýt taj spýt |
 and baby_{NOM} REFL_{DAT} sleep_{PR.3SG} and sleep_{PR.1SG}
 ‘and the baby is sleeping calmly,’
25. a pac’á tudý xódyt |
 and pig_{NOM} there go_{PR.3SG}
 ‘and the pig is walking there.’
26. ráz začaw dóždž užé pádaty velýkýj |
 suddenly start_{LP.M} rain_{NOM} already fall_{INF} large_{NOM.M}
 ‘Suddenly, a huge rain started,’
27. já püšlá d’itýnu bráty |
 I_{NOM} go_{LP.F} baby_{ACC} take_{INF}
 ‘I went to take the baby,’
28. a pac’á d’itýnu o tudý hét ôbbolót’anylo |
 and pig_{NOM} baby_{ACC} here here all make dirty_{LP.N}
 poobrýválo
 tear off_{LP.N}
 ‘and the pig had smeared dirt on the baby, pulled off [its head kerchief],’
27. us’ó bolót’ane
 all_{NOM.N} dirty_{NOM.N}
 ‘everything is dirty,’
28. ták platók issúnulo |
 this way kerchief_{ACC} push_{LP.F}
 ‘so the pig pulled the kerchief off,’

- (20) 29. tújký pówno
 here a lot
 ‘here is a lot...’
30. d’itýna spýt
 baby_{NOM} sleep_{PR.3SG}
 ‘the baby is asleep,’
31. a túj pówno vodý na očax |
 and here a lot of water_{GEN} on eyes_{LOC} |
 ‘and there is a lot of water on its eyes.’
34. iôj já jak s’a napúdyla |
 oh I_{NOM} how REFL_{ACC} get scared_{LP.F} |
 ‘Oh how I got scared!’
35. d’itýnu xvátyla |
 baby_{ACC} grab_{LP.F} |
 ‘I grabbed the baby,’
36. ta šťás’c’a
 and luck_{NOM}
 ‘and it is lucky’
37. ščo ne vitkusýlo pac.á n’íz_ d’itýn’i |
 that not bite off_{LP.N} pig_{NOM} nose_{ACC} baby_{DAT} |
 ‘that the pig had not biten the baby’s nose off.’
38. totó býlo móje šťás’c’a |
 that_{NOM.N} be_{LP.N} my_{NOM.N} good luck_{NOM} |
 ‘that was my good luck!’
39. tak.í býly horazdý |
 such_{NOM.PL} be_{LP.PL} good life_{NOM} |
 ‘such was our good life.’
40. tat’ kudý m išlá |
 but wherever AUX_{1SG} go_{LP.F} |
 ‘and wherever I went...’
41. | ta iščy j tót sýn ščo óde kolo
 and also and that_{NOM.M} son_{NOM} that here near
 úzhôrôdu ta |
 Uzhhorod_{GEN} and
 ‘and also that son who is here near Uzhhorod, ’

- (20) 42. *péršu d'ítýnu mály*
 first_{ACC.F} baby_{ACC} have_{LP.PL}
 'they had their first baby,'
43. *ta u kôlxôz'i m búl'i sadýla ta |*
 and in collective farm_{LOC} AUX_{1SG} potatoes_{ACC} plant_{LP.F} and
 'and at the collective farm I planted potatoes, and'
44. *is sôbôw ym d'ítýnu nosýla tak jak*
 with REFL_{INST} AUX_{1SG} baby_{ACC} carry_{LP.F} so as
svôju | it kôlhôs'k'i rôbôt'i |
 one's own_{ACC.F} to collective farm's_{DAT.F} work_{DAT}
 'I took the baby to the collective farm to work, so as I used to take
 my own,'
45. *támkÿ sme vývezly*
 there AUX_{1PL} take out_{LP.PL}
 'we would take it there,'
46. *malén'ka u nas kolýsočka býla |*
 small_{NOM.F} by us_{GEN} cradle_{NOM} be_{LP.F}
 'we had a little stroller,'
47. *ta na póly stojála*
 and on field_{LOC} stand_{LP.F}
 'so it was standing on the field,'
48. *a já | d'ítýnu výnesu u kolýsočku pôložu*
 and I_{NOM} baby_{ACC} take out_{PR.1SG} in cradle_{ACC} put_{PR.1SG}
 'and I would take the baby out, put it in the stroller,'
49. *ta tám izo mnów c'ilýj | dó pô pôlun'n'u*
 and there with me_{INST} whole_{ACC.M} until after noon_{DAT}
 'and it is with me for the whole morning, till afternoon,'
50. *dok ne výjduť iš_ škólý |*
 until not come_{PR.3PL} from school_{GEN}
 'until [its parents] come from school,'
51. *a tohdý výjduť ta zabéruť vat' |*
 and then come_{PR.3PL} and take_{PR.3PL} or
 'and then they would come and take it, or'
52. *vad' d'ído beré ta nesé dôm.i*
 or old man_{NOM} take_{PR.3SG} and take_{PR.3SG} home
 'or my husband would take it and bring it home,'

- (20) 53. ta užé v'ýjduť
and already come_{PR.3PL}
'and they would come,'
54. ta tohdý i wžé im lýšyt |
and then and already them_{DAT} leave_{PR.3PL}
'and then he would leave it with them,'
55. ta dóma p'ouď'íluje
and at home take care of cattle_{PR.3SG}
'and at home he would tend the cattle.'
56. ta ták mý s'a múčyly c'íloje
so this way we_{NOM} REFL_{ACC} torture_{LP.PL} whole_{ACC.N}
žyt't'á móš kazáty e |
life_{ACC} can say_{INF} come on
'so we were suffering this way our whole lives, one can say. Come on,'
57. mên'í léxko nýgda ne býlo |...|
me_{DAT} easy never not be_{LP.N}
'I never had it easy.'

In the passage from which this excerpt is taken, the speaker started talking about how she used to take young children to the field, and then she had me turn off the recorder and asked if the story she was about to tell was appropriate for recording. I confirmed that it was and turned the recorder back on. The speaker immediately starts a story about the pig and the baby, which again sounds as if it has been rehearsed and repeated several times. It is also a classical narrative. It is interesting that at the very beginning of the orientation, before the first narrative clause, the 1st-person plural referent (the speaker and her family) is referred to with an auxiliary, not a pronoun. In the first narrative clause, 10, the speaker refers to herself with a pronoun, and she also does so in the clauses beginning new episodes: 18, 22 (although it is not in the past tense), 27, and 34. In clause 15, the speaker and her family are also referred to with a pronoun, for the same reason. After referring to herself with a pronoun, in an uninterrupted sequence (clauses 11–13) the speaker codes subsequent mentions of herself, as expected, with auxiliaries. There are also clauses 18 and 27 where the speaker refers to herself with a pronoun after clauses with other subjects. However, the intervening clauses (14–17 and 24–26) can be understood as digressions, and therefore an auxiliary would be also possible. The speaker apparently chooses pronouns to start new episodes in her story. The story ends in clause 39 with a coda evaluating the hard life

the speaker used to have. Then, the speaker adds several more episodes to support her idea that it was not at all easy to combine childcare with work in the field. In these episodes, which do not constitute a classical narrative but are habitual narratives describing typical actions with imperfective verbs in the past tense or with verbs in the present or future tenses, the speaker refers to herself (and to herself together with her husband) with auxiliaries, though once, in clause 48, at the beginning of an episode, she uses a pronoun. At the end, when she concludes the idea that her (and her husband's) life was not easy, in clause 56, she uses a pronoun again. In this example, as in the previous one, in locally initial position, pronouns are more likely to occur in classical narrative, in an artistic story, as stylistic devices to mark beginnings of new episodes, and auxiliaries are more likely to occur in the parts representing other types of narrative, though pronouns at the beginning of an episode are not excluded.

The next example is not a classical narrative, but a habitual one—a story about bread baking:

- (21) 1. E. B.: roskaž.ite jak žýly kolys²⁷
 'tell me how you used to live in the olden times,'
2. jak | xl'íb peklý dawnó šče na dróvax |
 'how you/they used to bake bread, long ago, using firewood'
3. S: no tak davnó | xl'íp peklý na |
 well so long ago bread_{ACC} bake_{LP.PL} on...
 'Well, long ago, they/we baked bread on...'
4. drývá kolóly tak'í metrôwí
 firewood_{ACC} chop_{LP.PL} such_{ACC.PL} 1 meter long_{ACC.PL}
 dówh.i | ta |
 long_{ACC.PL} and
 'we/they chopped firewood, such long pieces, one meter long,
 and'
5. napál'ovala s'a píč |
 get hot_{LP.F} REFL_{ACC} oven_{NOM}
 'an oven would be heated,'
6. no xl'íp s'a m.isýw rukámy |
 well bread_{NOM} REFL_{ACC} knead_{LP.M} hands_{INST}
 'well, the bread would be kneaded by hand,'

²⁷ I do not give a morpheme-by-morpheme analysis of my own utterances.

- (21) 7. tak he s'ak kurtá býla kófta
 so look like this short_{NOM.F} be_{LP.F} jacket_{NOM}
 bez rukawíw |
 without sleeves_{GEN}
 'look, there would be a jacket without sleeves, like this,'
8. i tak rúkŷ ws'í býly u t'ístovy
 and like this arms_{NOM} all_{NOM.PL} be_{LP.F} in dough_{LOC}
 'and your arms would be covered in dough up to here.'
9. E. B.: a čým pryčyn'ály? |
 'and what would you use as leaven?'
10. S: dr.íž'd'ž'amy |
 yeast_{INST}
 'With yeast.'
11. robýly s'me zakvásku takú |
 make_{LP.PL} AUX_{1PL} leaven_{ACC} such_{ACC.F}
 'we would make a kind of a leaven,'
12. tám ysme robýly tak
 then AUX_{1PL} make_{LP.PL} so
 'then we would do the following:'
13. l'ály s'm.i_ p.at' v'ídr.iw wodŷ |
 pour_{LP.PL} AUX_{1PL} five_{ACC} buckets_{GEN} water_{GEN}
 iy tam k.ílo dr.íž'd'ž'iw |
 and there kilo_{ACC} yeast_{GEN}
 'we would pour in five bucketfuls of water, and there was also a kilo of yeast,'
14. i tak pryčyn'ály s'me kvas na trý hódynŷ |
 and so make_{LP.PL} AUX_{1PL} leaven_{ACC} for three_{ACC} hour_{PL}
 'and so we would work the leaven for three hours,'
15. tôwdŷ u trý hódynŷ dôbavl'ály s'm.i_ s'il'
 then in three_{ACC} hour_{PAU} add_{LP.PL} AUX_{1PL} salt_{ACC}
 'then in three hours we would add salt,'
16. | i cúkru málo dawnó davály u xl'íp |
 and sugar_{GEN} a little long ago add_{LP.PL} in bread_{ACC}
 'and long ago they would also add some sugar in bread,'

- (21) 17. *i tohdý s'me pidm.išovaly |*
 and then AUX_{1PL} mix_{LP.PL}
 'and then we would add flour.'
18. *jak užé výkÿslo |*
 as already leaven_{LP.N}
 'when it has already leavened,'
19. *tôwdý s'me formovály |*
 then AUX_{1PL} form_{LP.PL}
 'then we would form loaves,'
20. *pô k.ílu | po k.ílo dv'ís't'i t'ísta s'me klály*
 by kilo_{DAT} by kilo two hundred dough_{GEN} AUX_{1PL} put_{LP.PL}
na vahú |
 on scale_{ACC}
 'we would put on the scale a kilo or a kilo and two hundred grams of dough,'
21. *i káždÿj s'me xl'íp vážyly t'ísto*
 and every_{ACC.M} AUX_{1PL} bread_{ACC} weigh_{LP.PL} dough_{ACC}
 'and we would weigh every loaf, the dough for it,'
22. *i tódÿ s'me kacá... val'ály tak |*
 and then AUX_{1PL} roll... roll_{LP.PL} like that
 'and then we would roll... roll it like this,'
23. *to skládovaly s'me u mýskÿ tak.í |*
 that_{ACC} store_{LP.PL} AUX_{1PL} in bowls_{ACC} such_{ACC.PL}
 'then we would store them in these bowls,'
24. *tô(w)dÿ jak užé pič nahôr.íla |*
 then as already oven_{NOM} get hot_{LP.F}
 'then, when the oven was hot,'
25. *výbraly s'me hrán' | u drúhu*
 take out_{LP.PL} AUX_{1PL} hot coals_{ACC} in other_{ACC.F}
 'we would take the hot coals in a different...'
26. *tam de vodá býla taká bóčka*
 there where water_{NOM} be_{LP.F} such_{NOM.F} barrel_{NOM}
zamuróvana
 put in wall_{PPART.NOM.F}
 'there where was water, there was such a barrel set into the wall,'

- (21) 27. obý vodá s'a hr.íla |
 so that_{COND.3SG} water_{NOM} REFL_{ACC} warm_{LP.F}
 'so that the water would heat,'
28. pit tótú bóčku s'me |
 under that_{ACC.F} barrel_{ACC} AUX_{1PL}
 u takú malú pič | vŷbyrály hrán' |
 in such_{ACC.F} small_{ACC.F} oven_{ACC} take out_{LP.PL} coals_{ACC}
 'under that barrel, we put the coals in a small oven.'
29. a tám ys'me ul'íaly u tázyk vodý |
 and there AUX_{1PL} pour_{LP.PL} in bowl_{ACC} water_{GEN}
 'and there we would pour water in a bowl,'
30. ta pi(ü)wm.išká rozdy(e)rály takóho polot(т)²⁸n'ánoho |
 and half a sack_{GEN} tear_{LP.PL} such_{GEN.M} cloth_{GEN.M}
 'and we would tear up half of a cloth sack,'
31. ta wjazály na takú dówhu | trymêtróvu
 and tie_{LP.PL} on such_{ACC.F} long_{ACC.F} three-meter-long_{ACC.F}
 týcku |
 stick_{ACC}
 'and tie it on a three-meter pole,'
32. i tak ysme mocýly u totó
 and so AUX_{1PL} wet_{LP.PL} in that_{ACC.N}
 'and so we would wet it in that,'
33. j tak | vŷm.itály s'me úhl'a pyl'
 and so sweep away_{LP.PL} AUX_{1PL} coals_{ACC} dust_{ACC}
 tótú s péčy |
 that_{ACC.F} from oven_{GEN}
 'and so we would sweep (those) coals, that dust, from the oven,'
34. no tówdý s'me
 and then AUX_{1PL}
 'and then we would...'

²⁸ Here the speaker pronounces the cluster *tn* not as one sound, a prestopped nasal [tⁿ] where the dental closure does not get released but the air starts flowing through the nasal cavity, but as a sequence of two dental consonants, *t* and *n*, separated by a very short vowel of unclear quality. This pronunciation occurs in NR also in some other speakers' speech, usually at morpheme boundaries.

- (21) 35. wżé tak'í dówh'í lôpátŷ býly
 already such_{NOM.PL} long_{NOM.PL} shovels_{NOM} be_{LP.PL}
 derêwl'án'í |
 wooden_{NOM.PL}
 'there were these long wooden shovels,'
36. šo s'ak vŷbŷvály na lopátu
 that like this put out of the form_{LP.PL} on shovel_{ACC}
 'that we would put it out of the form on the shovel like this,'
37. j tudŷ taków dówhów klály s'me tak |
 and there such_{INST.F} long_{INST.F} put_{LP.PL} AUX_{1PL} like this
 u r(i)adŷ tak.í |
 in rows_{ACC} such_{ACC.PL}
 'and there [in the oven], we would put it on such a long [shovel],
 in such rows.'

This story was told by the speaker at the very beginning of a two-hour interview. The story is in answer to my standard opening interview question: "How did people long ago live, work, bake bread using firewood?" The speaker at first does not know what exactly she wants to say. She starts talking about baking bread, but she is still not sure about how much I know about the process and how detailed her account should be. She starts at a slower pace, explaining the bread-baking process responding to the cues in my question. First she gives more detail about heating the oven with firewood, which I have mentioned in my question, and then proceeds to describing bread kneading. At that time, she avoids mentioning the people participating in the process, and she answers using impersonal 3rd-person plural constructions ([they] baked bread, [they] chopped firewood), and then, passive constructions (the oven was heated, the bread was kneaded). However, after my question, "How did you/they make it [the bread] rise?" the speaker sees I know something about baking and makes a decision about how she is going to proceed with her narrative. Her intonation becomes more conversational, and her pace slightly faster. She also switches to the active construction with the 1st-person plural subject 'we', that is, herself and other bakers in the village bakery. From there on she refers to the bakers 18 times, and all these times she uses only auxiliaries, though there were several places where she could have started a new episode. She perceives her account as part of an interaction, as an answer to my question. This is the core environment for an auxiliary.

The character of reference in NR, therefore, appears to depend, at least partially, on the oral genre. The oral texts on which this paper is based, as mentioned before, represent mostly the varieties of one genre: narrative. They contain long monologues of speakers answering my questions. I was trying

to say a bare minimum just to keep the conversation rolling, so as not to interfere. A different genre, interactional conversation, occurred very rarely in these texts. However, on other occasions I had permission to record a conversation between two or more native speakers. These recordings showed that conversations fall into at least three categories from the point of view of interaction. Sometimes participants would go on with telling their own stories regardless of other participants' interruptions; sometimes they would listen to cues in each other's words, starting their own stories on similar topics and comparing and contrasting their own experiences with those of their collocutors (e.g., boasting or complaining); and sometimes they would hear each other and exchange information to immediately coordinate actions. This last type is closest to what Chafe (1994: 196) calls "immediate mode,"²⁹ "when people verbalize experiences that are directly related to their immediate environments." An example of that in NR is when a person comes through the door and, even without saying hello, says to one of the four people inside:

- (22) 1. mámo
mom_{VOC}
'Mom,'
2. prynésla m s'íno s pit k.izlá
bring_{LP,F} AUX_{1SG} hay_{ACC} from under haystack_{GEN}
'I have brought hay from under the haystack,'
3. ščo upálo
that fall_{LP,N}
'that had fallen,'
4. ta óde m | rostr'ásla
and here/now AUX_{1SG} spread_{LP,F}
'and I have spread it here.'

This type of conversation is interactional. It is an account of one's actions, specifically recent ones, made to coordinate with future actions. It is listener oriented (at the very beginning of this excerpt there is a vocative form attracting the specific listener's attention). It refers to actions that are close in time and space (in this example the speaker uses *óde* which can mean both 'here' and 'just now'). From the point of view of the 1st-person reference, it contains auxiliaries, not pronouns, even at the beginning of the interaction (in locally initial position). That can be because the 1st-person referent is activated by the nonlinguistic environment (or in Yokoyama's terms, the area of common

²⁹ As opposed to "displaced mode," the mode of remembering and imagining (Chafe 1994: 196), i.e., the mode of narrative.

concern of both the speaker and listener) contains the DEIXIS subset with the referential knowledge of {I, you, here, now}, not only before but also during the exchange. In conversation the collocutors are at the center of attention. Because of that, the locally subsequent form, an auxiliary, is used even in locally initial position. It is this type of interaction that is on one end of a continuum on the other end of which are artistic stories, i.e., narratives with verbs in the past tense and perfective aspect that are told to produce an effect on the listener—but not to elicit actions on her/his part—while describing the actions of a first-person character who is remote in time and space, the self-as-protagonist. Even during one speaking event, the speaker moves between these two ends of the scale, depending on how s/he perceives her/his goals and means. The choice of the 1st-person reference, of pronouns or auxiliaries among other factors, signals the current position of the speaker on this continuum. While the main rule in (10) generally applies in all modes, it can be bent or violated depending on the mode: in storytelling modes pronouns can be used more often to signal beginnings of episodes, while in interactional modes auxiliaries can be used more often to signal that the speaker's mental representation remains in the area of common concern of the collocutors even while the speaker is talking about other things.

3.3. 2nd Person

There are very few instances of the 2nd-person subject in the past tense in the material. The contexts where they occur do not mirror the contexts for the 1st person. For the 2nd person in the past tense classical narratives are rare: the speaker usually is not telling the listener things that happened to the latter. The most commonly occurring contexts for the 2nd person in the past tense are (i) questions and (ii) uses of the generic 2nd person denoting 'you, or any person in your situation' or the 'you' that in English can be substituted by 'one' in hypothetical narrative.

3.3.1. Questions

In questions the speaker tries to solicit information from the listener. Questions of course are asked in conversation when the representations of both the speaker and the listener are within the area of their common concern.

In questions the same basic rule applies as for the 1st-person reference: pronouns occur in locally initial positions and auxiliaries in locally subsequent positions. However, some questions in the material contain auxiliaries in locally initial positions. The material shows that when the speaker abandons what s/he was talking about and starts to question the listener hoping to get an answer, i.e., when a narrative turns into a conversation, the questions

tend to contain a pronoun in a locally initial position. Those that only request a confirmation of understanding, after which the speaker continues to talk about the previous topic, tend to contain an auxiliary.

- (23) 1. S.: | taj málo mu hy pitrúčovaly tak id hôri
 and a little he_{DAT} as if push_{LP,PL} so up
 ‘and they, so to speak, pushed it up a little to him’
2. obý tot hôrí mix_ t’ahnúty |
 so that_{COND.3SG} that_{NOM.M} up there can_{LP,M} pull_{INF}
 ‘so that the one on the top could pull it;’
3. taka pylá |
 such_{NOM.F} saw_{NOM}
 ‘such a saw;’
4. ne vúd’ily s’te jak drývá rížut
 not see_{LP,PL} AUX_{2PL} how firewood_{ACC} cut_{LP,PL}
 s’ak tóbí mên’í |
 like this you_{DAT.SG} I_{DAT}
 ‘have you_{AUX.2PL} seen how people cut firewood? like this, towards
 you, towards me?’
5. E. B.: takú vídila
 ‘I’ve seen such [a saw].’
6. S.: | no totó sámó taká lyšé maj
 well that_{NOM.N} exactly such_{NOM.F} only more
 velýka
 large_{NOM.F}
 ‘well, exactly such [a saw], only a bit bigger’
7. ta ínšaki u néji tuj zúbý býly |
 and such_{NOM.PL} by she_{GEN} here teeth_{NOM} be_{LP,PL}
 ‘and it had slightly different teeth here;’
8. tótá rízala došký |
 that_{NOM.F} cut_{LP,F} boards_{ACC}
 ‘that one was used to cut boards.’

Here, the speaker (S) is telling me (E. B.) about the traditional way of cutting a log into boards with a vertical saw. Her explanation continues through clause 3, and then she decides to check my understanding and asks if I have ever seen regular saws used for cutting firewood (clause 4). I confirm (using

the wrong form of the past tense, without either a pronoun or an auxiliary), and then the speaker continues her explanation. Her fleeting mention of me, the listener, has been only a temporary digression. She did not intend to start asking the listener further questions or to begin a new episode of conversation centered on the listener. Therefore she mentions the listener using an auxiliary.

- (24) 1. na n'í sn'ix padé
 on they_{ACC} snow_{NOM} fall_{PR.3SG}
 'snow falls on them [the lambs];'
2. i ščo jim totó nýč |
 and what they_{DAT} that_{NOM} nothing
 'and what is that to them? nothing;'
3. bo wný u vówn'i |
 because they_{NOM} in wool_{LOC}
 'because they are covered with wool.'
4. a vŷ s kým s'udŷ pri(ü)šlý ? |
 and you_{NOM.PL} with who_{INST} here come_{LP.PL}
 'and who did you_{PRON.2PL} come here with?'

In (24), in clauses 1–3, the speaker finishes telling me about the sheep in winter and switches her attention to me, since she is naturally curious how come I arrived from America to her house in Novoselycja without a guide to ask her about sheep. She is apparently interested in my story. From a habitual description in the present tense she switches to a direct question to me. She changes the settings, that is, she starts a new episode with me as the center and therefore uses a pronoun.

Another instance of the speaker getting distracted from the narration and starting to question the listener is (25) below. The speaker starts a new episode centered around the listener. In conformity with the basic rule, she first addresses the listener with a pronoun, thereafter using an auxiliary. This example is especially interesting because it happens twice, in the speech of two different speakers:

- (25) 1. W: býla j gerendá
 be_{LP.PL} and main beam_{NOM}
 'there was also the main beam;'
2. ta vŷ užé čúly totó ?
 but you_{NOM.PL} already hear_{LP.PL} that_{ACC.N}
 'but you_{PRON.2PL} have already heard about it.'

- (25) 3. E. B.: čúla m
 'I have.'
4. W: a dé s'te býly ?
 and where AUX_{2PL} be_{LP.PL}
 'and where have you_{AUX} been,'
5. u kó(h)o s'te s'udý býly ?
 by who_{GEN} AUX_{2PL} here be_{LP.PL}
 'at whose place have you_{AUX} been here?'
6. E. B.: u d[...]*x*ý býla m
 'At D's place.'
7. W: aha u d[...]*x*ý tam | kumý móje[ji] |
 aha by D_{GEN} there godchild's-mother_{GEN} my_{GEN.F}
 'aha, at D's place there, my godchild's mother's,'
8. to s[...]*a* mója xrésnyc'a |
 that S_{NOM} my_{NOM.F} goddaughter_{NOM}
 'S. is my godchild,'
9. ščo tôrhúje tam
 that trade_{PR.3SG} there
 'the one who works at the shop there.'
10. E. B.: mhm
 'Mhm.'
11. H: a v'ý užé túj dawnó ?
 and you_{NOM.PL} already here since-long-ago
 'and have you_{PRON} been here long?'
12. E. B.: trý ajbo čotýry dny |
 'Three or four days.'
13. W: a šcy dé s'te býly u kóho ?
 and also where AUX_{2PL} be_{LP.PL} by who_{GEN}
 'and where else have you_{AUX} been? at whose place?'

This is a conversation with three participants, the wife (W), her husband (H), and me (E. B.). The wife and the husband together have been telling me about the main beam and the construction of the ceiling in old houses. Clause 1 is uttered by the wife and belongs to that description of the ceiling. Then in clause 2 the wife turns her attention to me. She asks me a personal question using the 2nd-person pronoun. After I answer it in clause 3, she asks more

questions (in 4 and 5), this time using the auxiliary, since the episode continues. I answer in clause 6. She gives a commentary on other people I have visited since they are her baptismal relatives.³⁰ Then her husband asks me a question in clause 11. He uses a pronoun (though he could have used an auxiliary), showing he is not continuing his wife's streak of questions but positions his question as a new episode in conversation. After I answer him, the wife continues asking me more questions, inquiring who else I have visited. Since for her it is a continuation of previous question-asking episode, she uses an auxiliary. Thus, (25) is, on the one hand, an example of the basic rule (pronouns in locally initial position, auxiliaries in locally subsequent position), and on the other hand, an example of the speaker choosing to shape her/his utterances: as a start of a new episode or a continuation of the previous one, using 2nd-person reference. What is new here is that even in a very interactional part of a conversation, the speaker can choose a pronoun to indicate the beginning of a new episode.

3.3.2. Generic Usage

The few instances when the 2nd person is used generically occurred mostly in hypothetical narratives. Hypothetical narrative is, in my opinion, an indicator of nonnarrative mood and the speaker's awareness of the world of here-and-now.³¹ Hypothetical narration contains an overt invitation from the speaker to the listener to construct a hypothetical world. This invitation implies that both the speaker and the listener are present in the {DEIXIS}. A beginning of such an invitation is usually marked in NR, often with a lexical item such as *naprýklad* 'for example', *kêd'* 'when/if', etc. Since both the speaker and listener are in {DEIXIS}, the speaker often chooses the 2nd-person auxiliary, singular or plural, to refer to the listener even in locally initial position. The next two examples, (26) and (27), contain hypothetical narration with one protagonist, the 2nd person, which is expressed with an auxiliary:

³⁰ In NR the terms *kumá* (fem.) / *kum* (masc.) can mean 'mother/father of one's god-child' or 'one's child's godmother/godfather'. The relations between children's biological and baptismal parents are considered to be very important, almost a version of kinship. Thus marriages between *kumá* and *kum* are forbidden as sinful and incestual, the same as marriages between close blood relatives. This is a long-standing church tradition preserved in Orthodox Christianity; cf. the story of Princess Olga's baptism in the Primary Chronicle under the year 955.

³¹ This has been noted also for English by Labov (1972), who states that hypothetical clauses in narrative mostly occur in evaluations and not in narrative sequences.

- (26) 1. | u čěl'usty no ne músaj klásty |
 in front part of oven_{ACC} well not necessary put_{INF}
 'one should not put it [the loaf] in the front part of the oven [to bake],'
2. to xýbá k'ísta s'te mnóho zamisýly
 that only if dough_{ACC} AUX_{2PL} a lot knead_{LP.PL}
 'only if you_{AUX.2PL} made too much dough,'
3. ta nemály s'te de poklásty
 and not have_{LP.PL} AUX_{2PL} where put_{INF}
 'and you_{AUX.2PL} did not have anywhere to put it,'
4. ta poklály s'te ho u čěl'usty tam |
 and put_{LP.PL} AUX_{2PL} it_{ACC} in front part of oven_{ACC} there
 'and you_{AUX.2SG} put it in the front part of the oven,'
5. ô tuj obý s'a spekló het kolo hrány |
 here here so that_{COND.3SG} REFL_{ACC} bake_{LP.N} here near coals_{GEN}
 'right here, so that it can bake here right next to the live coals...'
- (27) 1. | dawnó xl'íba ne móž býlo kupýty hy tēpēr' |
 long ago bread_{GEN} not possible be_{LP.N} buy_{INF} as now
 'long ago, one could not buy bread as now,'
2. aj | kēd' ys' sy namolótýw |
 but when AUX_{2PL} self_{DAT} thrash_{LP.M}
 'only when you_{AUX.2SG} threshed [the grain] yourself'
3. iz'molów | u mlyní |
 grind_{LP.M} in mill_{LOC}
 'and ground [it] at the mill...'

Example (27) contains a reference to subsistence farming long ago, when bread could only be made from one's own grain, not bought—a very common motif in speakers' memoirs. The speaker invites me to imagine how in order to get bread you first had to thresh and then grind the grain. The point of invitation is the conjunction *kēd'* 'when/if'. This example is particularly interesting because the gender of the generic 2nd person showing on the participle of the verb is masculine (*namolótýw* 'threshed_{LP.M}', *iz'molów* 'ground_{LP.M}') according to the gender of the person who would do the thrashing and grinding, though the active listener, me, is a woman. The "you" from the hypothetical world has been fused by the speaker with the "you" from the world of here-and-now, the first one contributing the gender, the second one an auxiliary indicating that

a 2nd-person referent is activated.³² The reason the speaker does this is to try to prove a point to the listener and is therefore also in the world of here-and-now. Again, an auxiliary in locally initial position appears in interactional settings.

There are also instances when hypothetical narratives contain a pronoun in locally subsequent position. This happens in a situation when the generic addressee and another active agent occur in rapid succession and are possibly contrasted:

- (28) 1. | vad' **já** naprýklad no wžé wstála vít's'i |
 or I_{NOM} for example well already stand up_{LP.F} from here
 'or, for example, I_{PRON} had already stood up [to go] from here,'
2. taj **vý** wstály |
 and you_{NOM} stood up_{LP.F}
 'and you_{PRON} stood up,'
3. taj **vý** pišlý |
 and you_{NOM} go_{LP.PL}
 'and you_{PRON} left,'
4. no taj **já** pišlá | u póle dês' |
 well and I_{NOM} go_{LP.F} in field_{ACC} somewhere
 'well, and I_{PRON} went out in the field somewhere,'
5. i **vý** za mnów hl'ádate
 and you_{NOM} after I_{INST} watch_{PR.2PL}
 'and look after me,'
6. bo **vý** mae...
 because you_{NOM} have...
 'because you_{PRON} have...'
7. užé totó vas ís'c'
 already that_{NOM} you_{ACC} eat_{PR.3SG}
 'that already makes you suffer,'
8. ščo **ja** pi(ü)šlá | vid vas |
 that I_{NOM} go_{LP.F} from you_{GEN}
 'because I_{PRON} left you.'

³² It is the listener who is activated and not the person grinding the grain in the hypothetical world, since the grinding person has not appeared previously.

This is an excerpt from the speaker's musing on *dvodúšnykŷ* 'people with two souls', evil people with supernatural powers. The speaker was not too clear here; I think she was trying to explain how and why such a person would follow other people with one of her/his two souls while keeping her/his other soul in the body. It is a hypothetical narrative, but it is shaped as a story in the past tense and perfective aspect. The invitation to construct the hypothetical world is given in clause 1 by the use of *naprŷklad* 'for example'. Then the speaker positions herself, the 1st-person protagonist, as a common person, and the 2nd-person protagonist as a 'person with two souls'. The two are juxtaposed and contrasted. In clause 1, the speaker uses a 1st-person pronoun to starting the episode. In clause 2 she uses a pronoun for the 2nd-person reference (a plural pronoun, for politeness) at the beginning of the next miniepisode, and in clause 3 again the 2nd-person pronoun. One can see here a sequence of short episodes in rapid succession or a contrast between two protagonists doing similar things. The dramatic character of the narrative and the speaker's possible perception of each action as a new episode together result in the choice of pronoun in locally subsequent position.

Thus the generic 2nd person has its peculiarities. It occurs mostly in a hypothetical narrative, which is a hypothetical world created jointly by the speaker and the listener and is hence closer to interaction than to classical narrative. For the generic 2nd person, there were no examples found of the basic rule, no doubt because of the scarcity of the material. However, there were instances of auxiliaries in locally initial position, which conforms to the interactional character of hypothetical narrative, and instances of pronouns in locally subsequent position, which shows that even in more interactional genres the rule about a pronoun being preferred at the beginning of an episode can apply.

3.4. 3rd Person

Systematic research on the 3rd person of the past tense in NR is a task for the future, but a preliminary examination of the material suggests that rules similar to the basic rule apply to the 3rd-person past, at least in some situations. In the 3rd person in the past tense there is never an auxiliary, so the past tense consists of only the *l*-participle of the main verb. However, there is a choice between an overt subject (a noun, an NP, or a pronoun) and a zero subject. The choice is conditioned, at least in some cases, by the same factors as the choice between the pronoun and the auxiliary in the 1st and 2nd persons: the first mention of a third person in the past tense in narrative is marked by a noun, the second mention by a 3rd-person subject pronoun; after that, if there is a chain of actions performed by the same person, there is no pronoun, or sometimes the pronoun appears but with inversion, e.g., *pišlá oná* 'she went' instead of *oná pišlá*. One example comes from the narrative below, which is

a very typical context for the usage of the 3rd person, a nonparticipant in a conversation.³³

- (29) 1. **býw** sôbí odýn **hrýc'** |
 be_{LP.M} self_{DAT} one_{NOM} Hryc'_{NOM}
 'There once was a Hryc,'
2. tá **zadúmaw** **vín** sôbí oženýty s'a |
 and decide_{LP.M} he_{NOM} self_{DAT} marry_{INF} REFL_{ACC}
 'and he decided_{INVERSION} to get married.'
3. no **wz'áw** sôbí
 well take_{LP.M} self_{DAT}
 'well, [he] married'
4. kotrá máj fájna | d'íwčyna |
 which_{NOM.F} most beautiful_{NOM.F} girl_{NOM}
 'a girl who was most beautiful.'
5. i **vín** totó | **oženýw** s'a
 and he_{NOM} that marry_{LP.M} REFL_{ACC}
 'and he, well... [He] got married,'
6. **pryvív** jêjí |
 take_{LP.M} she_{ACC}
 'brought her home,'
7. a **oná** **býla** dúže ledáča
 and she_{NOM} be_{LP.F} very lazy_{NOM.F}
 'and she_{PRON} was very lazy,'
8. ne **xót'ila** robýty nyčóho |
 not want_{LP.F} do_{INF} nothing
 '[she] did not want to do anything,'
9. lyšé wsé s'a w dzér'kalo **dyvýla** | ta **spála** |
 only always REFL_{ACC} in mirror_{ACC} look_{LP.F} and sleep_{LP.F}
 '[she] only looked at herself in the mirror all the time, and slept.'
10. no **vín** **pryvív** jêjí dô dómu
 well he_{NOM} take_{LP.M} she_{ACC} to home_{GEN}
 'so, he_{PRON} took her home,'

³³ In this example, both *l*-participles of verbs and overt subjects are in boldface, for the sake of clarity.

- (29) 11. i **býlo** u nýx žýto | u pól'u žáty |
 and be_{LP,N} by they_{GEN} rye_{NOM} in field_{LOC} reap_{INF}
 'and there was_{INVERSION} rye in the field to reap.'
12. káže **vin** ji(i) |
 say_{PR,3SG} he_{NOM} she_{DAT}
 'he says_{INVERSION} to her.'
13. idý žýto žný |
 go_{IMP,2SG} rye_{ACC} reap_{IMP,2SG}
 'go reap the rye.'
14. dobře |
 good
 'well.'
15. **oná** s'a **zibrála**
 she_{NOM} REFL_{ACC} get ready_{LP,F}
 'she_{PRON} got ready.'
16. **pišlá** žáty žýto |
 go_{LP,F} reap_{INF} rye_{ACC}
 'went to reap the rye.'
17. **výjšla** u póle |
 come_{LP,F} to field_{ACC}
 '[she] went out to the field.'
18. **nažála** sôbí támký dvá snópý cy trý |
 reap_{LP,F} self_{DAT} there two_{ACC} sheaf_{PAU} or three_{ACC}
 '[she] reaped herself two or three sheaves.'
19. **isklála** sôbí tak u kúpu
 put_{LP,F} self_{DAT} so in heap_{ACC}
 'put them in a heap.'
20. **zrobýla** sôbí takýj xólod
 make_{LP,F} self_{DAT} such_{ACC,M} shade_{ACC}
 'made herself some shade'
21. obý na n'ú sónce ne hrílo
 so that_{COND,3SG} on she_{ACC} sun_{NOM} not shine_{PR,3SG}
 'so that the sun would not shine on her.'

- (29) 22. i **lehlá** sôbí ta spýt |
 and lie down_{LP.F} self_{DAT} and sleep_{PR.3SG}
 '[she] lies down and sleeps.'
23. i **spála** **prospála** | c.ílÿj dên' |
 and sleep_{LP.F} sleep through_{LP.F} entire_{ACC.M} day_{ACC}
 'And [she] slept through the day.'
24. na **věčir** **ustála**
 on evening_{ACC} get up_{LP.F}
 'in the evening [she] got up.'
25. **podývyla** s'a u dzěr'kalo
 look_{LP.F} REFL_{ACC} in mirror_{ACC}
 'looked at herself in the mirror.'
26. cy **fájna**
 whether beautiful_{NOM.F}
 'whether [she] looked good.'
27. pryxódyd_ dô dómu |
 come_{PR.3SG} to home_{GEN}
 '[and she] comes home.'

This is an excerpt from a folk tale that the speaker performs artistically. It is a classical past-tense narration with only a few orientation and evaluation clauses. In clause 1 Hryc is first introduced and mentioned by name (with a numeral which works here as an indefinite article). After that in clause 2 he is referred to as *vín* 'he', and in clause 3 the past-tense verb referring to him appears without an overt subject. His bride is mentioned first in clause 4 with an NP (*maj fájna d'ívčyna* 'the most beautiful girl'). Then, the speaker starts a new episode referring to Hryc by a pronoun, though right afterward she hesitates about how exactly to say what she wants to say. In clause 6, she continues talking about Hryc and uses the past-tense verb with a zero subject. After that the topic shifts back to Hryc's wife. The speaker indicates the start of a new episode with the conjunction *a*, and referring to Hryc's wife she uses a pronoun. This episode provides orientation, with imperfective verbs describing the setting for the story to come. After the first mention of Hryc's wife (with a pronoun) in clause 7, she is the continuous subject and is referred to with a zero pronoun (clauses 8 and 9). After that a new episode starts where Hryc is the actor again in the narrative clause 10, and he is referred to by a subject pronoun *vín* 'he'. After an orientation clause about the rye and the reporting of Hryc and his wife's conversation in clauses 12–14 (where Hryc at the beginning of a new episode is again referred to by a pronoun, with a present tense

verb *káže* 'says', and with a presentational sequence, with the pronoun at the end in 12), a new episode about the wife starts. At the beginning of this episode the wife is mentioned as *oná* 'she' in clause 15, and then comes a sequence of 10 verbs in the past tense describing her actions (*pišlá* 'went', *výjšla* 'went out', *nažála* 'reaped', *isklála* 'put together', *zrobýla* 'made', *lehlá* 'lay down', *spála* 'slept', *prospála* 'slept through', *ustála* 'got up', *podývoyla* 'looked'), one predicative adjective (*fájna* 'beautiful') and one (historical) present-tense verb (*pryxoýdyd_* 'comes') all referring to her and all without an overt subject. This succession is interrupted by one subordinate clause that contains orientation (clause 21) and where the wife is referred to with a nonsubject pronoun, but otherwise all these clauses with the same subject follow one another. Thus in this excerpt from a typical narration, the very first mention of each 3rd-person character in the plot is indicated by a noun or an NP, and a return to the 3rd-person character after an interruption is indicated by a pronoun (sometimes in a presentational sequence). The zero subject indicates the same person performing new actions in an uninterrupted sequence, and the chain of zero-subject verbs can contain as many as ten verbs.

When the new 3rd-person referent is introduced, it does not always need to be expressed by a subject pronoun; it can be expressed by a nonsubject personal pronoun, similarly to what we saw in the 1st person:

- (30) 1. *kosýty músaj s'ino sušýty nosýty*
mow_{INF} necessary hay_{ACC} dry_{INF} carry_{INF}
 'one needs to mow the hay, dry it, carry it,'
2. *ta ne mohlá m*
and not can_{LP,F} AUX_{1SG}
 'and I couldn't'
3. *l taj pak l*
and then
 'and then'
4. *a u n'óho žoná umérla*
and by he_{GEN} wife_{NOM} die_{LP,F}
 'and his wife died,'
5. *ta bý^ow dva róký bež_ žoný l*
and be_{LP,M} two_{ACC} year_{PAU} without wife_{GEN}
 'and he was without a wife for two years,'
6. *a ja try róký býla beš_ čôlôwíka*
and I_{NOM} three_{ACC} year_{PAU} be_{LP,F} without husband_{GEN}
 'and I was for three years without a husband.'

Here, the narrator first continues speaking about herself (using an auxiliary) in clauses 1–3 and then starts an episode about her future husband. Clause 3 is a fragment, an instance of disfluency on an episode border. Then the speaker introduces the man she would marry by a 3rd-person pronoun *u n'óho*, which is not a subject, being in genitive with a preposition *u*, while the formal subject of this clause is *žoná* '[his] wife'. In the next clause the future husband is the subject, but since he has already been mentioned by a pronoun in the previous clause, a zero is used.

4. Present Tense

The main focus of this article is the past tense, but it is interesting to note that in the present tense the situation regarding the presence or absence of subject personal pronouns is at least partially similar (for more detail, additional research will be necessary). Unlike in English, where the verb in the present tense does not indicate the person and the number, except the 3rd-person singular, and an overt subject is used, in NR the verb in the present tense indicates the person and number. Therefore, the usage of pronouns for all persons in the present tense in NR is redundant. However, in the present tense there is a choice between an overt subject and a zero. The subject expressed by the 1st- or 2nd-person pronoun (in the case of the 3rd person by a noun) is preferred when the referent appears for the first time; if the referent has already been mentioned, the verb without a pronoun is preferred. In the example below, present-tense verbs are in boldface, subject pronouns or nouns are italicized.³⁴

- (31) 1. | a **já** ras skotáryla nevelýka
 and *I_{NOM}* once herd cattle_{LP,F} little_{NOM,F}
 ‘and *I_{PRON}* once herded cattle, *I_{PRON}* was little,’
2. **ja** býla ščé d’ítvakóm |
 I_{NOM} be_{LP,F} still child_{INST}
 ‘*I_{PRON}* was still a child,’
3. ta tóže na s’akóje s’játo | **mý** skotáryly |
 and also on such_{ACC,N} holiday_{ACC} we_{NOM} herd cattle_{LP,PL}
 ‘and it was also on a holiday that we_{PRON} herded cattle,’
4. taj **výdyme** |
 and see_{PR,1PL}
 ‘and we see:’

³⁴ In this example, present-tense verbs, as well as nominal and pronominal subjects, are in boldface.

- (31) 5. **jdé** **žoná** | zavýta u vyláx |
 go_{PR.3SG} woman_{NOM} wrap_{PPART.NOM.F} in cloth_{ACC}
 ‘there goes a woman wrapped in cloth,’
6. **ták** **ščo** **jí** **ne** **výtko**
 so that she_{GEN} not can be seen
 ‘so you can’t see her,’
7. **hét** **vyláx** **do** | **do** **tóho** |
 totally cloth_{NOM} up to up to that_{GEN.N}
 ‘the cloth reaches totally up to... up to here...’
8. **idé** **ta** **usé** |
 go_{PR.3SG} and always
 ‘she’s going, and all the time...’
9. **usé** **sxýlyt’** _ **s’a**
 all the time bend_{PR.3SG} REFL_{ACC}
 ‘constantly bending over,’
10. **ta** **dé** **koróva** **stála**
 and where cow_{NOM} stand_{LP.F}
 ‘and wherever a cow has stood,’
11. **ta** **s’** _ **s’lída** **beré** | **hlýny** |
 and from trace_{GEN} take_{PR.3SG} clay_{GEN}
 ‘and from the trace she takes clay,’
12. **ta** **dúmaju** **sôbí** **hospody**
 and think_{PR.1SG} self_{DAT} Lord_{VOC}
 ‘and I think to myself, O my God!’
13. **a** **mý** **t’ičeme**
 and we_{NOM} flee_{PR.1PL}
 ‘and we_{PRON} run away,’
14. **bo** **mý** **s’a** **boimé** | **d’ity**
 because we_{NOM} REFL_{ACC} be scared_{PR.1PL} children_{NOM}
 ‘because we_{PRON} children are scared.’

This is a story that the speaker told to me to support her claim that witches do exist. This story is about a woman whom the speaker spotted one day long ago, in her childhood. The woman apparently was practicing witchcraft, taking clay from cows’ footprints. It is one of the things people do when they want to steal someone else’s cow’s milk and transfer it to their own cow. The fact that the woman was wearing only a sack and that it happened on a hol-

iday also suggests witchcraft. The scary memory has been apparently vivid to such an extent that while telling the story to me, some sixty years later, the speaker, in her 70s, switched to the present historical tense after telling the beginning of the narrative, the orientation, in the past tense (clauses 1–3).³⁵ In clause 4, the action begins, and a zero 1st-person plural subject is used (possibly, after the overt 1st-person plural subject *mŷ* in the previous clause). Then, the strange woman is introduced in clause 5. She is first referred to by a noun (*žoná*).³⁶ In clause 6 she is referred to by a (nonsubject) pronoun, and in clauses 8, 9, and 11, by a zero. Here, as in the 1st and 2nd persons of the past tense, and, at least in certain instances, in the 3rd person of the past tense, the first mention of a new 3rd-person subject is a noun, the second a pronoun, and subsequent ones are zeros. The intervening clauses with other subjects (7, 10) are regarded as digressions that do not require the repetition of a noun/pronoun denoting the previous referent, because a witch is the main character of the episode and a more important referent than either the cloth or the cow. Then in clause 12 a zero 1st-person subject is introduced. It might be expressed by zero because it is positioned by the speaker so as not start a new narrative episode, but it appears in an evaluation, in the world of here-and-now. Then two 1st-person plural pronouns are used to introduce the new subject, the children. In 12, it is the start of a new episode, and possibly in 13 a start of the new micro-episode, an explanation.

5. Conclusion

The question posed at the beginning—what factors influence the choice between pronouns and auxiliaries in the 1st and 2nd persons of the past tense in NR—turns out to have answers at several levels. First, there is the basic rule that pronouns are used in locally initial positions and auxiliaries in locally subsequent positions. It is formulated in terms of the topic-continuity model at the clause level. Then the pronoun can be chosen to mark the beginning of an episode. This is formulated in terms of the hierarchy model, at the level of discourse units larger than clauses. At this level it is the choice of the speaker what change of settings s/he will consider important enough to begin a new episode. Then the next generalization works in discourse genres. In an interactional conversation (Schegloff's immediate mode), speakers tend to use auxiliaries (since both the 1st- and 2nd-person referents are activated and stay in {DEIXIS}), while in classical narration speakers tend to use more pronouns as an artistic device to divide the action into more miniepisodes and to create

³⁵ It is worth noting that in the past-tense orientation, clause 1, the beginning of the story, contains a 1st-person pronoun, and clause 2 an explanation that changes the perspective, i.e., begins a miniepisode, again contains a 1st-person pronoun.

³⁶ The subject and the verb are inverted here in a presentational sequence.

suspense. The closer the genre is to classical narrative, the more pronouns are used, and the closer the genre is to conversation (e.g., hypothetical narration), the more auxiliaries are used. Starting from the episode level, and especially at the genre level, the connection between the rules of the level and the speaker's choices appears to the researcher as stochastic, not deterministic. Apparently, the higher the level, the more important is the personal choice, creativity, and freedom of the speaker.

References

- Ariel, Mira. (1990) *Accessing NP antecedents*. London: Routledge.
- Benedek, Gergej. (2004) "Madjar'sko". Paul Robert Magocsi, ed. *Rusin'skyj jazyk*. Opole: Instytut Filologii Polskiej Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, 263–75.
- Browne, Wayles. (2008) "Porjadok enklitikox u jaziku vojvodjanskix Rusnacox". *Švetlosc* 44(3): 351–61.
- Chafe, Wallace L. (1994) *Discourse, consciousness, and time: The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clancy, Patricia M. (1980) "Referential choice in English and Japanese narrative discourse". Wallace L. Chafe, ed. *The pear stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 127–202.
- Fontans'kij, H. (2004) "Lemkovyna." Paul Robert Magocsi, ed. *Rusin'skyj jazyk*. Opole: Instytut Filologii Polskiej Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, 221–62.
- Fox, Barbara A. (1987a) "Anaphora in popular written English narratives". Russell S. Tomlin, ed. *Coherence and grounding in discourse: Outcome of a symposium, Eugene, Oregon, June 1984*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 157–74.
- . (1987b) *Discourse structure and anaphora*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Givón, Talmy. (1983) *Topic continuity in discourse: A quantitative cross-language study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gundel, Jeanette K., Nancy Hedberg, and Ron Zacharski. (1993) "Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse". *Language* 69(2): 274–307.
- Harajda, Ivan. (1941) *Hramatyka rus'koho jazyka*. Ungvar (Užhorod): Vydanja podkarpatskoho občestva nauk.
- Hinds, John and Waco Hinds. (1979) "Participant identification in Japanese narrative discourse". George Bedell, Eichi Kobayashi, and Masatake Muraki, eds. *Explorations in linguistics: Papers in honor of Kazuko Inoue*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 201–12.
- Huang, Yan. (2000) "Discourse anaphora: Four theoretical models." *Journal of pragmatics* 32: 151–76.

- Jabur, Vasyľ and A. Pliškova. (2004) "Prjašivska Rus". Paul Robert Magocsi, ed. *Rusin'skyj jazyk*. Opole: Instytut Filologii Polskiej Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, 147–209.
- Kerča, Ihor'. (2004) "Pudkarpats'ka Rus". Paul Robert Magocsi, ed. *Rusin'skyj jazyk*. Opole: Instytut Filologii Polskiej Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, 115–46.
- Labov, William. (1972) *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, William and Joshua Waletzky. (1967) "Narrative analysis". J. Helm, ed. *Essays on the verbal and visual arts*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 12–44. [Reprinted in *Journal of narrative and life history* 7: 3–38, 1997.]
- Li, Charles N. and Sandra A. Thompson. (1979) "Third-person pronouns and zero anaphora in Chinese discourse". Talmy Givón, ed. *Syntax and semantics 12: Discourse and syntax*. New York: Academic Press, 311–35.
- Lyzanec', P. M. (2008) *Ukrajins'ki pivdennokarpats'ki hovirki Zatyssja Vynohradiv's'koho rajonu Zakarpats'koji oblasti*. Užhorod: Karpaty.
- Magocsi, Paul Robert, ed. (2004) *Rusin'skyj jazyk*. Opole: Instytut Filologii Polskiej Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Nikolaev, S. L., M. N. Tolstaja, and A. F. Žuravlev. (2001) *Slovar' karpatoukrainskogo torun'skogo govora: S grammatičeskim očerkom i obrazcami tekstov*. Moscow: Institut slavjanovedenija RAN.
- Pan'kevyč, Ivan. (1938) *Ukraïns'ki hovory Pidkarpats'koï Rusy i sumežnyx oblastej*. Prague: Nakl. Sboru pro výzkum Slovenska a Podkarpatské Rusi; v komisi "Orbis".
- Pliškova, A. and K. Koporova. (2011) *Rusyn'skýj jazýk pro začatočnykiv*. Prjašiv [Prešov]: Sloven'ska asociacija rusyn'skýx organizacij, Rusyn i Narodný novynký.
- Pugh, Stefan. (2009) *The Rusyn language: A grammar of the literary standard of Slovakia with reference to Lemko and Subcarpathian Rusyn*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Ramač, Julijan. (2004) "Vojvodyna". Paul Robert Magocsi, ed. *Rusin'skyj jazyk*. Opole: Instytut Filologii Polskiej Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, 277–304.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1996) "Some practices for referring to persons in talk-in-interaction: A partial sketch of a systematics". Barbara A. Fox, ed. *Studies in anaphora*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 437–86.
- Teutsch, Alexander. (2001) *Das Rusinische der Ostslowakei im Kontext seiner Nachbarsprachen*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Tolstaja, M. N. (2000) "Forma pljuskvamperfekta v ukrainskix zakarpatskix govorax: Mesto vspomogatel'nogo glagola v predloženíi". *Balto-slavjanske issledovanija*. 14: 134–43.
- . (2012) "Karpatskie ènklitiki v južnoslavjanskoj perspektive". A. A. Plotnikova and G. P. Klepikova, eds. *Karpato-balkanskij dialektnyj landšaft: Jazyk i kul'tura. Pamiati Galiny Petrovny Klepikovej*. Moscow: Rossijskaja akademija nauk, Institut slavjanovedenija, 190–210.

- Tolstaja, M. N. 2014. "Sintaksis vozvratnogo *sę v govore gucul'skogo sela Golovy načala XX veka". P. Ju. Hrycenko, ed. *Dialekty v synxroniji ta diaxroniji: Zahal'noslov'janskyj kontekst*. Kyiv: KMM, 483–89.
- Tomlin, Russell S. (1987) "Linguistic reflections of cognitive events." Russell S. Tomlin, ed. *Coherence and grounding in discourse: Outcome of a symposium, Eugene, Oregon, June 1984*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 455–80.
- van Dijk, Teun A. and Walter Kintsch. (1983) *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- Yokoyama, Olga Tsuneko. (1986) *Discourse and word order*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Zaliznjak, A. A. (2004) *Drevnenovgorodskij dialekt*. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.
- . (2008) *Drevnerusskie ènklitiki*. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskix kul'tur.

Georgetown University
Department of Slavic Languages
Box 571050
Washington, DC 20057-1050 USA
eeb54@georgetown.edu

Received: January 2016
Revised: May 2016