

PRONOMINAL VS ZERO SUBJECTS IN CZECH AND RUSSIAN

0. If we were to compare the frequency of pronominal and zero subjects in Czech and Russian resp., we could conclude that the pronominal subjects are unmarked in Russian, while the zero subjects are unmarked in Czech. Zero subjects in Russian and pronominal subjects in Czech are marked, i.e. give more information. Nilsson (1979a) has reached the same conclusion concerning Russian and Polish. The question is whether we can discover any single principle governing the use of the marked items or whether marking signals several disparate phenomena.

I leave aside the question of whether the absence of subjects in sentences with finite verbs in third person plural where the "actor" is anonymous (*Hlásili to v rozhlase, / Сообщали это по радио*) and in sentences with verbs in second person singular (or even plural in Czech) taken generally, non-individually (*Слезаму делу не поможешь, / Slzami to-mu nepomůžeš*), do belong to the same category of sentences where the subject is obligatorily unexpressed as in impersonal sentences (*Темнеет, / Stmívá se*). Brčáková (1968), who made this clear-cut separation of the above-mentioned sentence types from other sentences consisting of two main sentence members - the predicate and the (explicit or potential) subject - partially modified her own standpoint in Brčáková (1974).

The theory of Functional Sentence Perspective (FSP), which is referred to in this paper, is that which has been worked out mainly by the Brno school, esp. by J. Firbas. For the bibliography of Firbas' papers see Firbas - Golkova (1976). Nearly all example sentences are from the excerpts done by the authors of the quoted papers, except for some of the translations where two languages are compared. The constructed examples are "marked" §.

1.0. Since Potebnja it has been common in Russian linguistics to consider expressions like *я чужако* with an unstressed pronoun as unanalysable into subject and predicate. The pronoun

has been seen as a mere morphological formant (Potebnja 1958, I, 100), whatever has been meant by that. However, not everybody has been of this opinion. For example, Šachmatov (1925, 48-53) insists on the subject nature of the clitic pronominal subject. Also Adamec (1959, 23) has no doubts about the independent character of such pronominal pronouns. (This is also the position of Brčáková (1968) and (1974), who differentiates between the systemic nature of the pattern "Predicate" (cf. the examples in 0.) and the "reduced" utterance type "∅ - Predicate" of (which, in my opinion, is a realization of) the sentence pattern Subject - Predicate.)

1.1. It is worth mentioning that there is no difference between the frequency of zero subjects with Russian preterite, where the pronoun alone would have been the indicator of grammatical person, in comparison with present and future tense, where the grammatical person is indicated even by the ending of the verb (cf. Brčáková 1974, 123-124), who gave up Adamec's (1959, 30-31) and her own (Brčáková 1968, 211) original position based on the criterion of morphological building for the functional needs of an utterance).

Also the fact that it is the Russian finite verb that can stand alone in past tense with a zero subject even in other sentences than confirmations or negations of previous utterance (1-3), while in Czech the grammatical person must always be expressed, either by the personal pronoun or the auxiliary verb *být* (1b), in all cases except for the yes - no utterances consisting only of the 1-participle (2b, 3b), this fact leads to the surprising conclusion that it is the Czech and not the Russian finite verb that makes the strongest demands on the presence of a morpheme signalling grammatical person.

- (1) *В Грузии я ждал тебя, - говорил Беридзе. Обманул, не приехал. Приехал к московским камням, влюбился в какую-то блондинку и даже не позвал на свадьбу.* (All verbs in 2nd sg)
- (1b) *Já na tebe v Gruzii čekal, řekl Beridze. Oklamal jsi mne, nepřijel. Přišel jsi k moskevským kamenům, zamiloval jsi se do jakési blondýnky a ani jsi mne nepozval na svadbu.*

- (2) *А вы видели Волгу? - Видел. В Сталинграде.*
 (2b) *A vy jste Volhu viděl? - Viděl. V Stalingradu.*
 (3) *Я даже думала сегодня о вас...Правда, правда, думала.*
 (3b) *Já na vás dokonce dnes myslela...Opravdu, opravdu, myslela.*

All this seems to refute the traditional concept of Russian verbs as forming more closely-knit units with personal pronouns than Czech verbs.

1.2. The very fact that Russian pronominal subjects are unmarked and more frequent than Czech or Polish ones, should not be equated with the impossibility of analysing Russian sentences with pronominal subjects into two separate and distinct units - subjects and predicates. The Russian pronominal subjects are "more closely united with the verbs" than Czech or Polish pronominal subjects in approximately the same sense as Czech objects, which can be deleted only very exceptionally, are in comparison with Russian or Polish objects:

- (4) *А ведь он тебе, кажется, нравился немножко? - Никогда...Ненавижу.*
Ale vždyť se ti, zdá se mi, trochu líbil? - Nikdy...Nenávidím ho.
 (5) *Marysia kupiła książkę i przeczytała.*
Maryša koupila knihu a přečetla ji.

1.3. On the other hand, it is well-motivated to consider even zero subjects, which are implied by verbal congruence, as being present in the grammatical pattern of the sentences they belong to. Such subjects differ radically from a verb's optional participants, which has been shown in Panevová (1978a) and (1978b): "If A uses a sentence S and B asks him a wh-question concerning the participant P, A's answer might be 'I don't know' (without disturbing the dialogue) if and only if the participant P is not semantically obligatory in S." (Panevová 1978a, 229). Thus, while (6) is a deviant dialogue (which indicates that the goal of the verbum movendi is an obligatory participant of the verb), (7) is acceptable (and indicates that the given participant is not obligatory with the verb):

- (6) *My friend returned. - Where to? - *I don't know.*
 (7) *Helen knits a sweater. - From what? - I don't know.*

The deletion of a subject is obviously something else than the non-existence of subjects to impersonal verbs as in *Темнеет* or *У меня колет в боку*. We can make Panevová's test more general: if either the answer can be 'I don't know', or the appropriate wh-question itself is not meaningful, then the questioned participant is not an obligatory participant. (I.e., in the case of the "subjects" of impersonal verbs, these neither are obligatory, "deep" participants, nor do they exist optionally on the surface. This equals the non-existence of such subjects.)

(8) *Темнеет.* - **Что?* - *Не знаю.*

У меня колет в боку. - **Что?* - *Не знаю.*

2.0. Brčáková (1968) and (1974) has confirmed the known fact that pronominal subjects are necessary in both Czech and Russian as rhemes (10) and as contrastive themes (11, 12):

(10) *Эти стихи сочинил я.* / *Ty verše jsem napsal já.*

(11) *Вы здесь пока знакомьтесь, а я сбегая в огород.*

Vy se tuďy zatím seznamte a já zaběhnu do zahrady.

(12) *Не бойся.* - *А я и не боюсь.* / *Neboj se.* - *Já se nebojím.*

This is, of course, true even for Polish rhematic subjects and contrastive themes. From this point of view, there is no difference between "purely contrastive" themes (13), and those with adversative meaning (14) as Nilsson (1979a) assumes. Adversative constructions are just a subcategory of contrastive constructions - cf. Brčáková (1968, 210):

(13) *On nie poszedł do Giewałdowej, ale Giewałdowa do niego.*

(14) *Danka przyszła punktualnie, ale ja już czekałem.*

All this is implied already in Adamec (1959), who collected a large number of examples and divided them into many concrete subdivisions, though his main division is clearly based on a tautology. Beside the rhematic and contrastive pronominal subjects, Adamec differentiates between subjects that are neither rhematic nor "centrum východiska" (since he does not explain what he means by this term, we have to make a guess: probably "primarnaja osnova" of Adamec (1966, 21) is meant, i.e. leftmost thematic element in the linear structure) and

subjects of sentences without any theme, i.e. of sentences consisting of rhemes only, where the theme is obvious from the context and/or situation. Adamec says about the latter subjects that they are always unexpressed in both Czech and Russian. However, all this means that "when the pronominal subject is not expressed, it is not expressed". The fallacy of this becomes explicit (Adamec 1959, 25), when Adamec analyses his claim in greater detail: "Jestliže však i časové určení i děj jsou ve větě nové ... pak vyvstává určitá nutnost vytýčit východisko a tím se stává zájmeno!

Já // zítra nepřijdu.

východisko jádro

Jestliže se věta vůbec nerozpadá na východisko a jádro, je-li celá jádrem, je zájmeno samozřejmě zbytečné!

- Už ses rozhodl? - Ano.

Půjdu s tebou.

...

Jádro: východisko není, resp. je obsaženo v kontextu."
(The original graphical form has been kept in the quotation.)

2.1. Starting from the working hypothesis about the "mirror-imaged" markedness in Russian vs. Czech (and Polish and Slovak), one can ask what is signalled by the plus-marking of West Slavic pronominal rhemes and contrastive themes. The answer is, naturally, that the presence of West Slavic pronominal subjects, which are obligatory as rhemes and contrastive themes, signals a higher degree of Communicative Dynamism (CD) than a zero subject. A zero subject is more thematic, carries a lower degree of CD than a contrastive thematic subject, not to mention rhematic pronominal subjects.

The same marking exists in Czech, Slovak, and Polish, i.e. in languages with enclitic forms of personal pronouns. The knowledge that the enclitic pronouns are very thematic, carry very low degree of CD, while the full forms are used for contrastive themes and even rhemes (when bearing sentence stress), is nothing new - cf. e.g., Mistrík (1975). The surface shape of the enclitic forms *ho, mu* in Czech, *go, mu* in Polish etc.,

can be considered case ending plus an enclitic zero stem, i.e. $\emptyset + ho$, $\emptyset + mu$ etc. Thus a zero subject would be $\emptyset + \emptyset$. As it is the primary function of pronouns to express themes, elements carrying very low degrees of CD (cf. e.g. Firbas (1959, 43), Nilsson (1979b etc.)), it is the enclitic pronouns and the zero subjects that are the proper means of expressing low degrees of CD in languages where these exist, while the full forms are used to signal an increase of the CD degree: either a contrastive theme or a rheme.

However, the last paragraph met with some opposition when the preliminary version of this paper was read at the Scandinavian Congress of Slavists 1980. Therefore it must be added that, though the structuring of zero subjects in West Slavic languages seems to me to be a sensible idea, it is in no way crucial for the purpose of this paper. What is worth insisting on is the different status of the zero subjects (if you wish: of the subjects deleted in the surface structure) in comparison with the non-existing subjects of impersonal verbs (cf. 1.3).

2.2. As rhematic personal pronouns must always be expressed like all other rhemes (provided that they are not substituted by some non-linguistic means - e.g. gestures), zero subjects are excluded as Czech rhemes, since they have no surface realizations. Not even all thematic subjects with increased degrees of CD can be expressed by the Czech unmarked zero.

(15) \S *Čte noviny a pije kávu.*

(16) \S *Čte noviny a on pije kávu.*

Only (16) with the pronoun in the second clause, can signal the change of themes, i.e. an increase of CD. (15), with the zero subject in the second clause, must be interpreted as dealing about the same person, i.e. the unmarked zero can in this case signal only the referential identity of themes. This is hardly surprising - it is not so unusual that the unmarked member of a privative opposition is used in certain contexts with the meaning "Non-feature", e.g. "Is it a dog or a bitch?". (As for the reason why I consider the pronominal subject in (16) less thematic, that is carrying a higher degree of CD than the zero subject of (15), cf. 2.1. and the FSP analysis in Firbas (1959, 51-53).)

However, we can generally say that zero subjects do often express the same FSP needs as the marked pronominal subjects. Consequently, while pronominal subjects are unambiguous in certain types of contexts, zero subjects are there ambiguous, they can be used for signalling the "normal", low degree of CD, as well as for signalling a thematic element with an increased degree of CD, viz. a change of themes (a new theme) or a contrastive theme:

(17) § *Karel potkal na ulici Petra. Řekl mi, že ...*

(18) § *Karel potkal na ulici Petra. On/Ten mi řekl, že ...*

The zero subject in (17) can be interpreted in two ways (though the primary interpretation certainly is the coreference of the two subjects), while the expressed pronominal subject in (18) is unambiguous.

2.3. As our assumption has been the markedness of Czech pronominal subjects and of Russian zero subjects, we may check if we get the corresponding ambiguity with Russian pronominal subjects versus one interpretation of zero subjects:

(19) § *Петр встретил на улице Ивана. Он сказал ему, что ...*

(20) § *Петр встретил на улице Ивана. Сказал ему, что ...*

(19) does allow both interpretations of the pronominal subject as predicted. (20) is unambiguous. The zero subject marking is different from Czech marking of "full" personal pronouns, which is /+ Increase of CD/. The Russian marking is /+ Decrease of CD/.

Of course, since the zero is marked /+ Decrease of CD/ in Russian, one may feel some inadequacy of the zero subject in (20) because it is not sufficiently "given" in this context, but (21) and (22) confirm the difference between pronominal and zero subjects in Russian:

(21) § *Иван встретил на улице Наташу. Она сказала ему, что ...*

(22) § *Иван встретил на улице Наташу. *Сказала ему, что ...*

"Nataša" will be a new theme in the second sentence. Therefore the unmarked pronoun is possible, but the zero subject /+ Decrease of CD/ is excluded. As the Czech marking is a sort of mirror image of the Russian one, we obtain a different result in Czech:

(21b) § *Ivan potkal na ulici Natašu. Ona/Ta mu řekla, ře ...*

(22b) § *Ivan potkal na ulici Natašu. Řekla mu, ře ...*

Both (21b) and (22b) are acceptable. The difference is, that it is the pronominal subject, which is marked /+ Increase of CD/, while the zero is unmarked.

2.4. It must be underlined that the markings /+ Increase of CD/ in West Slavic languages and /+ Decrease of CD/ in Russian, cannot be equated with a marking of referential non-identity between two subjects and a marking of referential identity respectively. Nilsson (1979a, 68) quotes the claim that the zero subject of the subclause in (23) stands for referential identity with the subject of the main clause, while the pronominal subject of the subclause in (24) signals that the two subjects are not coreferential:

(23) *Wie, ře řyje.*

(24) *Wie, ře on řyje.*

However, I have no doubts that, at least in Czech and Slovak, the zero subject can be used even to refer to another person and vice versa, the pronominal subject can also be coreferential with the subject of the main clause when used in order to indicate the contrastive nature of (= a higher degree of CD carried by) the subject. I presume the same must be true even for Nilsson's Polish examples. (To be more exact, (24) is ambiguous even in speech if *on* gets contrastive stress. It may be unambiguous without it.)

2.5. As Pađučeva (1978, 68-69) has shown, the unmarked pronominal subjects in Russian enter another opposition corresponding to the Czech marking /+ Increase of CD/. The marked member of the opposition is the anaphoric *ona, ma, mo*. Pađučeva shows that the demonstrative anaphoric pronoun neither means "the former" nor "the latter". Both claims can be found in Russian dictionaries. Brčáková (1974, 124) believes that *on* refers to a subject antecedent and *ona* to a non-subject antecedent. (25) and (25b) show that this is not true.

(25) *Посоветуй Ивану взять секретаря, чтобы тот навел порядок в его бумагах.*

Тот refers to *секретарь* and *он* in its place would refer to *Иван*. But both antecedents are non-subjects. The distinction must be a different one to account even for sentences like (25).

(25b) § *Это мог сказать Ивану только Петр.*

- 1) *Он не мог узнать об этом от никого другого.*
- 2) * *Тот не мог узнать об этом от никого другого.*
- 3) *Он узнал об этом вчера.*
- 4) *Тот узнал об этом вчера.*

In (25b1), *он* (because of the context) refers unambiguously to *Иван*, which has been a non-subject. *Тот* cannot be used in the same context (25b2). Both *он* and *тот* can be used when referring to the previous subject *Петр* (25b3, 25b4).

There is merely a certain statistical tendency for subjects whose antecedents are non-subjects to become new themes, i.e. themes with an increase of CD. Therefore they can be expressed by *тот*:

(26) *Лаврецкий подвез старика к его домику; тот вылез, достал свой чемодан.*

(26b) *Дворянин у которого нет ничего (...) почетнее отца моего. Отец мой снимает перед ним шляпу, а тот и смотрит на него.*

According to Paďuřeva, *тот* is used to signal that its antecedent is not "smyslovaja osnova". This term has no place in the theory accepted in the present paper, but the claim can be reformulated as "though it is thematic, *тот* carries an increased degree of CD". In (27) we cannot decide which NP in the second clause is more thematic. "*К кастрату*" in the first sentence is already thematic, but it is not as thematic as thematic subjects can be, and subject rhemes are also strong candidates for themes proper in the following sentence. Therefore (27) is ambiguous:

(27) *К кастрату раз пришел скрипач, он был бедняк, а тот богач.*

3.0. Brčáková (1968) tried to uncover factors that are relevant for the use of zero subjects and full pronominal subjects. According to her, the choice results from several competing levels (ibid. 209): the level of Functional Sentence Perspective (FSP), the level of sentence syntax, "the level of the dialogue

structure and its embedding in the situation", the semantic level of the text. However, it seems that all these levels can, in fact, be reduced, or reformulated as requirements of FSP. Brčáková's terminology and examples has very little to do with, say, syntax or semantics. What her approach is about, is how a number of factors contribute to requirements of FSP, which I hope to show in this part.

3.1. As Brčáková (1968, 211-212), (1974, 125) and Adamec (1959, 30-33) show, there is a statistical correlation between the grammatical nature of the zero and pronominal subjects and their antecedents. The zero subjects are more frequent with antecedents that are subjects (28), than with antecedents that fulfill sentence functions other than subject (29, 30).

(28) *Ну, я очень рад, что правильно тебя понял.*

(29) *Напишу еще Косте Исаеву, пусть проследит, чтобы скорее ответили.*

(30) *Жалко мне его. Потерял столько лет, а пришел к тому, с чего я начинал.*

This is quite natural, since thematic subject antecedents are more easily felt to be "natural" themes of the following sentences. As the speaker has a certain freedom to build the FSP structure according to his/her subjective intentions (cf. 4.3. and 5.), non-subject antecedents do not exclude the marking /+ Decrease of CD/, i.e. zero subjects, but make them less probable.

If a subordinate clause is preceded by a main clause with the same subject, the zero subject in the subclause is more probable than the zero subject in the main clause is, when the subclause precedes the main clause.

(31) § *Его жена не вернется, если узнает обо всем.*

(32) *Все эти дни я мечтал о часе, когда его увижу.*

(33) § *Если его жена узнает обо всем, она не вернется.*

(34) *Когда Вера вспоминает эту историю, она наистро теряет чувство юмора.*

However, the opposite alternatives are not impossible:

(35) § *Его жена не вернется, если она узнает обо всем.*

(36) § ?? *Если его жена узнает обо всем, (то) не вернется.*

It is apparently easier to present the subject of the subclause as an "old theme" if its antecedent is the subject of the main

clause that precedes the subclause, than it is to present the subject of the main clause as an old theme if the antecedent is the subject of the subclause. This claim is supported by the literal translations to Czech, where another situation is obtained, depending on the difference between the different sorts of marking in Russian and Czech (/+ Decrease of CD/ vs. /+ Increase of CD/) and what is marked (zero subjects in Russian, pronominal subjects in Czech):

(31b) § *Jeho žena se nevrátí, jestliže se o všem dozví.*

(33b) § *Jestliže se jeho žena o všem dozví, ona/ta se nevrátí.*

(35b) § ?? *Jeho žena se nevrátí, jestliže se ona o všem dozví.*

(36b) § *Jestliže se jeho žena o všem dozví, nevrátí se.*

Another unquestionable FSP phenomenon is the difference between the higher frequency of Russian zero subjects when the antecedent is a pronoun, and the lower frequency when the antecedent is a full NP. It is obvious that a thematic pronominal antecedent carrying a lower degree of CD, makes it more natural to consider the following coreferential subject as an old theme. With a thematic antecedent carrying a higher degree of CD (a full NP), this interpretation of the following subject is more difficult.

3.2. As for the so-called level of the dialogue structure, it is obvious that this is also a question of FSP. In a dialogue situation, zero subjects can be used because they are easily recoverable from the situation:

(37) *Не понимаю тебя, - сказала Екатерина Дмитриевна.*

(38) *Он спрашивал: - Получил мое сочинение?*

This is also usual in answers, where the zero is recoverable from the context:

(39) *Что Алина? - спросил Макаров.*

- Лягит, что-то шепчет.

(40) *Где же он нас обогнал?*

- Прибыл на самолете.

The low degree of CD can depend on both context and situation:

(41) *Отчего вы такой скучный? - мягко спросила она Андрея.*

- Хочу есть, - сказал Андрей.

Zero subjects are also usual in answers to yes-no questions, as well as in other confirmations or negations of previous utterances:

(42) *А мы булку слону купим? - Купим.*

(43) *Вы ошибаетесь, Валерьян Сергеевич. - Нет, не ошибаюсь.*

(44) *Я даже думала о вас ... Правда, правда, думала.*

The context-dependence of dialogue can be observed also in repetitions of predicates, which are put in confrontation with the speaker's own attitude, or which are repeated deliberately:

(45) *Она просто шутит.*

- Что же, шутит. Смеется надо мной.

(46) *О чем ты думаешь, Надя?*

- О чем думаю? О матери вспомнила.

(47) *Вы куда сейчас бежите?*

- Куда бегу? На вокзал, делегацию встречать.

3.3. The "semantic level of the text" is said to influence the choice of subjects in the following way: If several predications are chained together into one context unit, zero subjects are used:

(48) *По-настоящему я стал охотиться примерно с тридцать четвертого.*

Купил ружье себе, завел собаку.

Pronominal subjects are used to indicate separate predications that do not form a micro-text unit. This is usual in sentences where a new narrative line is started. Such new narrative lines can be marked by expressions "ну вот", "а потом" etc.:

(49) *Послушайте девушки какую я чудную себе купила шляпу. Вот недавно иду я по Невскому ...*

Also when the narration has been interrupted by the listener, the pronominal subject is usually repeated by the speaker:

(50) *Он уезжает снова на Север ... - Не говори. - Так уезжает он на Север ...*

What is common to these occurrences of pronominal subjects? Again, it is the increase of CD carried by the subject. This increase may be caused by the semantics of the sentence, as in (49), where the speaker wants to affirm that the same theme is talked about even in the new "microtext". It can be used by the speaker who wants to underline that he is taking over

and that he is going to talk about the same theme (50). Even in (51), where "Ну вот, я хочу спать." would not be possible, since there is a continuation of the same narration, the speaker uses the unmarked pronoun in Russian to achieve an "artificial" escalation of his message via the presentation of the last sentence as if it were a new microtext.

(51) *Я не люблю танцев. Даже больше, я их ненавижу. Я терпеть не могу, когда надо мной шуршат подошвами ежевечерние танцоры. Я спать хочу.*

3.4. In the summary, Brčáková (1968, 217) mentions an additional level determining the choice of zero or pronominal subjects: the level of the speaker's emotional attitude to the communicated reality. In Brčáková (1974, 124ff) this is considered one of the main factors determining the choice. However, "emotionality", or "expressiveness" are often mere linguistic labels that do not explain very much. According to Brčáková, the presence or the absence of a pronominal subject, is a signal of "emotionality" only on the basis of and in opposition to a neutral structure (ibid. 127). Thus (52) is said to signal an emotional actualization because the neutral structure of "multiple predicates" is that with unrepeated pronominal subjects:

(52) *Я прошу, я плачу, я ее умоляю, я стою на коленях, она как камень.*

But this hardly holds for all of Brčáková's own examples. There is no reason to assume that ordinary answers to yes-no questions bear any emotionality:

(53) *Ты достал лекарство? - Да, достал.*

Therefore it should have been the pronominal subject that ought to have signaled "emotional actualization" on the basis of the "neutral structure" of (53). But Brčáková claims that (53) is emotionally motivated.

(54) *Наташа, ты опять всю ночь танцевала? - Ну и танцевала!*

Similarly, (54) can certainly be considered emotionally coloured, both because of its semantics and the exclamation mark. But since short replies in dialogues usually lack pronominal subjects, the "neutral basis" should have been \emptyset + Verb. Brčáková's claim does not hold in this case either. We can hardly say that the neutral basis is made by full answers to

yes-no questions. Such answers cannot be heard outside of school classrooms. If anything is stylistically marked, it is the full answer "Да, я достал лекарство." etc.

All this casts doubts on Brčáková's conception of emotional actualization concerning zero and pronominal subjects.

3.5. As for the supposedly subjectless sentences that were mentioned in 0., they (with the exception of the impersonal sentences) are perhaps also sentences with zero subjects. (And by zero subjects, subjects that consist of zero morpheme(s) are meant - not non-existing subjects.) The zero subjects are used in such sentences because of the actors' low communicative value. Such subjects are more or less deictic. Therefore, for example, the English, so to speak "anonymous" *they* does not require any antecedent - cf. (55) and (56):

(55) * *Eve was kidnapped but he didn't hurt her.*

(56) *Eve was kidnapped but they didn't hurt her.*

In a way, the sentences with vague zero subjects are comparable with (57):

(57) *Кто-то вошел.*

Dahl (1969, 9) had difficulties in explaining in which way the indefinite pronoun is "given" (since it is placed initially as the thematic subject of "Петр вошел."). I claim (Bílý 1980, chapter 2) that the indefinite subject of (57) is not "given" in any way. It is just of lesser communicative importance. Being so vague, it carries a lower degree of CD than the verb, which communicates about the very fact of appearance.

The general, non-individual utterances as those mentioned in 0., have subjects with a definitely marginal communicative importance. For example, the zero subject in 2nd person singular which appears in proverbs, is a sort of subject meaning "anybody who it concerns" (the speaker included). In Bílý (1978a) I based my analysis of the usage of possessive and possessive reflexive pronouns in Czech and Russian on the semantic vagueness of the personal possessives of the third person and of the possessive reflexives in the first and the second grammatical person. These were compared with the unambig-

uous personal possessive pronouns of the first two persons and the less ambiguous possessive reflexives the third person. I equated the semantic vagueness with a lower degree of CD. I suppose that the vagueness of the zero subjects in question, can also be equated with a very low degree of CD. Therefore it is not surprising that these sentences are much more usual in Russian, where the zero subjects are explicitly marked /+ Decrease of CD/, than in Czech where the zero subjects are unmarked. (Another strategy to get rid of a communicatively unimportant agent is used in Czech, viz. the reflexive passive construction.)

3.6. Also the "constricted, nominative" examples of Adamec (1959, 33-34) seem to be related to the sentences discussed in 3.5. Such sentences may have more or less indeterminate zero subjects that are not referentially identifiable. Such zero subjects just indicate the low communicative importance, the low degree of the subjects' CD:

- (58) *Вы не смейтесь, я серьезно говорю. В моих глазах лиричность души, если только это действительно серьезно, хорошее качество в человеке.*
 - *Понеслась, - с досадой сказала Женя. - Девушка тирé философ.*

As several people are present, it is not clear whether Zenja talks to the former speaker (Tanja) or generally (in third person).

- (59) *Сколько раз я обращался за помощью к профессорам. Приедут, напустят научного тумана, в простых вещах разобраться не могут. Навертят формул, а потом все равно сам решаешь, как тебе опыт да интуиция подсказывают. - Ишь, расхвастался, - сказала Лиза.*

Beside the former speaker (Viktor), a third person (Andrej) is present. It is not possible to decide whether Viktor is talked to or about. But it is not important.

3.7. Finally, some words should be said about the claim that Russian zero subjects are stylistically marked for colloquial Russian (cf., e.g., Nilsson 1979a, 70). There is no doubt that zero subjects are more usual in speech than in writing. However, I think that the causal relation in the above-mentioned

claim is not quite correct: the colloquial style does not come about via zero subjects; the colloquial style is signalled via a certain FSP strategy - the message is mostly limited to its minimally necessary elements. Everything else is reduced into zero anaphora, zero deictic elements, unstressed pronouns instead of full NPs etc.

Similarly Adamec is, of course, right when he notices the connection between the ellision of Russian objects and the use of zero subjects. (Adamec 1959, 34-5)

(60) *А ведь он тебе тоже, кажется, нравился немножко? - Никогда... Ненавижу.*
However, the impossibility of *Я ненавижу* in (60), is not primarily caused by the ellision of the object. It is caused by the FSP needs. The pronominal subject would have signalled a higher degree of CD than the zero object, which is unacceptable in this context where the subject is the theme proper, the thematic element with the lowest degree of CD.

Barbro Nilsson reminded me (personal communication) that when the object is deleted, other subject than zero is prohibited, not only pronominal subjects (**Наташа ненавидит*). This may also be dictated by the FSP requirements: if the sentence is pronounced with the intonation centre on *ненавидит*, i.e. if the verb is rhematic, there would arise a too big gap between the CD degrees carried by the deleted object (the theme proper) and the thematic subject, which carries a higher degree of CD anyway. If the subject is the rheme as the answer to *Кто ненавидит его?* the object still cannot be omitted. But what about *Кто его НЕНАВИДИТ?* ? Then it seems more acceptable to answer *Наташа ненавидит*. In that case, the verb in the answer, being the rheme of the question, carries a lower degree of CD, is more "obvious", than in the preceding case and the CD gap between the thematic verb and the thematic object is so small that the ellision of the object seems possible. However, the question of "unsuitable CD gaps" will be studied in another paper.

Also Adamec's remark that the historical praesens contributes to the use of zero subjects (ibid. 37), can be explained as a FSP phenomenon. In such sentences, the speaker pretends an actuality of the action that makes the subject more context-dependent, more "given", as if the action took place now and here.

4.0. Mathesius (1947, 286-293) considers certain cases of pronominal subjects in Czech caused by rhythmical needs of utterances. One part of these problems can be easily identified

with FSP needs: Mathesius says that "a quiet introduction" (i.e. an explicit theme) is needed at the beginnings of paragraphs (ibid. 289). But this is nothing else than the need to introduce new themes (or to confirm that the same theme is used still), mentioned in 3.3. (E.g. *Mamínko, já mám hlad.*)

It is more difficult to place the other sort of rhythmically motivated pronominal subjects in FSP. Mathesius shows that sequences of two highly stressed syllables are avoided in Czech. Therefore thematic pronominal subjects and certain communicatively "near empty" words are used to separate such stressed syllables:

(61) *'To já 'nevím.*

(62) *'Mám já to 's vámi bídu.*

(63) *'To já zas 'přijdu.*

The "enclitic" pronominal subjects seem to be doublets to Czech zero subjects. And, indeed, we can find Czech sentences where no need for Mathesius' rhythmical "fillers" exists and where the unstressed pronominal subject is placed as the first of enclitics instead of the auxiliary verb, which can then be omitted (64, 66).

(64) *Včera já ho potkal na nádraží.*

(65) *Karlovi já jsem nic neřekl.*

(66) *O Marii já mu nic neřekl.*

These sentences may not be approved in the written form, but they are quite normal in the colloquial Czech. It seems that what is needed is a little more stress on the initial part of the sentence.

4.1. These Czech enclitic subjects differ from the Polish enclitic subjects which, according to Nilsson (1979a), signal a change of the theme (i.e. in our concept an increase of CD) without the marking connected with an initial pronominal subject (in our concept: still higher degree of CD). They also differ from the Russian inverted pronominal subjects that signal the thematicity of the verb (ibid. 66-67):

(67) *W oczach Zygryda, sledzących ten ruch w górze, spostrzegłem łzy.
Spływały mu one po upudrowanych policzkach.*

- (68) *Стройная и гибкая стюардесса показала пассажирам, как пользоваться спасательным жилетом. Делала она это с улыбкой и кокетством манекеницы.*

The Czech enclitic subjects may possibly be compared with those unstressed Polish and Russian non-initial pronominal subjects (Nilsson 1979a, 67-68) which are stylistically marked as colloquial.

4.2. The former of the two sorts of rhythmical principles mentioned in 4.0. is related to another FSP motivation for pronominal subjects discovered in Mathesius (1947) for Czech, and confirmed by Adamec (1959, 27) for Russian. This motivation is the desirability of pronominal subjects in sentences where their absence would change the intended objective word-order into the subjective word-order or vice versa:

- (69) *Наташа, я тебя люблю, - шепотом проговорила Даша.*

- (70) *Я его раньше уеишу.*

- (71) *Pojď sem, já tě učešu.*

If the pronominal subjects were omitted, the objective word-order wouldn't be retained. For Mathesius, even the automatic placement of the enclitic in *Učešu tě* changes the objective word-order into the subjective one. Nilsson (1979a) would not agree with this view, since she insists that (72) is not expressively marked (ibid. 63) and the subjective word-order is generally judged as expressively marked:

- (72) (*Wiem co zrobię.*) *ZABIJĘ Kramarza.*

I assume that Mathesius' standpoint must be modified. A sentence consisting of a rhematic verb and an enclitic pronoun only, can hardly be said to have the subjective word-order, since the enclitic cannot be placed in any other than the second position. What we can say is that in "učešu tě" the difference between the objective and subjective word-order is neutralized. (Therefore the weaker formulation above, about the objective word-order that would not be retained has been used about (69) - (71).)

As for Nilsson, I am at doubt whether she is right or not. Her position is certainly valid for Polish enclitic pronouns,

which behave as the Czech enclitics, i.e. they cannot stand in any other place than in second position. On the other hand, the object in (72) is not obligatorily bound to second position. As the subjective word-order in Slavic languages is the "rheme first, theme second" word-order (cf. e.g. Firbas 1964), (72) may be judged as a sentence with subjective word-order. However, Nilsson objects that the other word-order (*Kramarza ZABIJE*) would be used for another communicative purpose - *Kramarza* would be "topicalized", which (in this case) can be translated into our terminology as *Kramarza* would receive a lower degree of CD than in (72) (cf. Ebeling 1958, 12-16). Nilsson also reminds us that the sentence contains a zero subject. If we could postulate that the zero subject stands initially, we would get a sentence starting with the theme proper - i.e. a sentence with objective word-order. However, such a solution would hardly be consistent with this paper.

In the previous text I tried to hint, without saying it explicitly, that the zero subject should be considered as the first of all enclitics. Thus we have arrived at a point that is not covered by the FSP theory: two sentences have roughly the same theme-rheme structure and differ from each other only in the communicative purpose they can be used for and by the word-order. Are we to say that the opposition between the objective word-order (which is unmarked as for expressiveness) and the subjective word-order (which is expressively marked) is neutralized in (72), or shall we say that (72) has the subjective word-order even though the other variant with the same theme and rheme is not freely exchangeable with (72)?

Adamec says that *люблю тебя* in (70) would create a sentence with subjective word-order (And *тебя люблю* would increase the CD carried by the pronominal object - *МВ*.) Also in (71), *Раньше его увижу* would change the objective word-order into the subjective one, while *Увижу его раньше* would change the "normal" Russian objective word-order with the rheme in the middle of the sentence into the less usual objective word-order

in Russian with a final rheme (Adamec 1959, 27).

On the other hand, the subjective word-order achieved via a zero subject, can be retained even with a pronominal subject, provided that the pronoun is unstressed and placed clitically (cf. Adamec 1959, 29):

(73) *Хорошо работаете, Татьяна Петровна.*

(74) *Хорошо сказали вы, - тихо воскликнул он. - Хорошо.*

4.3. The use of pronominal subjects in the cases discussed in 4.0. - 4.2., does not refute the markings suggested in 2.4. The speaker has a certain freedom to make some "subjective" changes of the "objective" FSP (for an analysis of the subjective, empathic side of FSP see Bily 1978b). Thus the speaker can, for example, repeat thematic full NPs (those consisting of more than a pronoun), instead of pronominalizing them, even when these NPs are no new themes. This is done in order to assure the listener that the same theme is still talked about and to re-identify it. In the same way the speaker may use pronominal subjects in the West Slavic languages as if pretending that he reaffirms that the same theme is talked about. Also this is restricted by the objective side of FSP. Therefore we can find sentences where the subjective modification of the objective FSP is prohibited. Cf. e.g. (15) and (16) in 2.2.

Similarly, (22) in 2.3. testifies that the speaker cannot just decide that any NP is very thematic and use the Russian marking for the decrease of CD.

5. To sum up, we have come to the conclusion that the use of pronominal and zero subjects complies to the FSP requirement on a sentence; the subjective, empathic side of FSP included. In Czech, the zero subjects are unmarked and the pronominal subjects are marked /+ Increase of CD/. In Russian, the pronominal subjects are unmarked and the zero subjects are marked /+ Decrease of CD/. The decisive role of FSP in the choice of pronominal or zero subjects, which is already implied in Adamec's description, regardless of its shortcomings, has been confirmed in this paper. Various levels

taken into consideration by Brčáková are reducible to the FSP level. Even the rhythmical principle of Mathesius operates on and within the limits of the FSP level.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamec, P. (1959): "Pronominální podmět a významová výstavba věty v ruštině a v češtině", *Bulletin VŠR JL* 3, Prague.
- (1966):
- Bílý, M. (1978a): "Some Thoughts about Functional Sentence Perspective, Empathy, and Reflexives", *Working Papers* 15, Department of General Linguistics, Lund University.
- (1978b): "Reflexives and the Subjective ('Empathic') Side of FSP", *Papers from the Fourth Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*, Odense University Press, 227-233.
- (1980): *Intrasentential Coreference and Cooccurrence, Functional Sentence Perspective, and Universe of Discourse* (forthcoming).
- Brčáková, D. (1968): "Pronominální podmět a promluvvové modifikace v současné ruštině", *AUC Slavica Pragensia* X, 207-218.
- (1974): "Aspekty užívání pronominálního podmětu v ruštině (na pozadí češtiny)", *Konfrontační studium ruské a české gramatiky a slovní zásoby*, Universita Karlova, Prague, 119-131.
- Dahl, Ö. (1969): "Topic and Comment: A Study in Russian and General Transformational Grammar", *Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, Slavica Gothoburgensia* 4.
- Ebeling, C.L. (1958): "Subject and Predicate, Especially in Russian", *Dutch Contributions to the Fourth International Congress of Slavists, Moscow, September 1958*, Mouton, 's-Gravenhage, 1-39.
- Firbas, J. (1959): "Thoughts on the Communicative Function of the Verb in English, German and Czech", *Brno Studies in English* 1, 49-68.
- (1964): "From Comparative Word-Order Studies", *Brno Studies in English* 4, 111-128.
- Firbas, J. -Golková, E. (1976): *An Analytical Bibliography of Czechoslovak Studies in Functional Sentence Perspective*, Brno.
- Mathesius, V. (1947): *Čeština a obecný jazykozpyt*, Praha.
- Mistrík, J. (1975): "Ausdrucksmittel der Hypersyntax", *Zeitschrift für Slavistik* 20; 5/6, 643-646.
- Nilsson, B. (1979a): "Placering av personliga pronomen som subjekt i ryska och polska", *Kontrastiv lingvistik och sekundärspråksforskning*, Stockholm, 61-71.
- (1979b): "Zaimki osobowe jako remat", *Slavica Lundensia* 7, 119-132.

- Padučeva, E. V. (1978): "Aktualnoe členenie predloženiija i struktura imen ob'ektov", *Tekst. Język. Poetyka*, Wrocław, 59-71.
- Panevová, J. (1978a): "Inner Participants and Free Adverbials", *Prague Studies in Mathematical Linguistics* 6, 227-254.
- (1978b): "K významové stavbě větného centra", *Slovo a slovesnost* 39:1, 33-39.
- Potebnja, A. A. (1958): *Iz zapisok po ruskokj grammatike I-II*, Moskva.
- Šachmatov, A. A. (1925): *Sintaksis ruskogo jazyka*, Leningrad.