relationships and associations between the three. This will now be discussed with reference to the category of the pronoun.

PRONOUN[29]

Personal reference can be expressed in various ways: depending on the occasion it is possible to refer both to oneself and to one's addressee using common nominal phrases, nouns and, of course, pronouns. Hence pronouns are one of the means of expressing the category of the person and the participants in a speech act.

Nouns and nominal phrases define the person descriptively while verbs reflect it formally in their conjugation and number; in the case of pronouns, however, the expression of person is more complicated. Pronouns mainly serve to replace (previously or later mentioned) names or nouns and are used in the interest of the economy[30] of the text[31] often by helping the author to avoid the repetition

---

29 | "Pronom, empr. du lat. pronomen, de pro, à la place de, et nomen, nom. Cette dénomination de pronom, qui nous vient des Latins, lesquels l'avaient empruntée aux Grecs (αντωνυμία), n'est pas adéquate à son objet; elle se trouve en contradiction avec les enseignements de linguistes éminents: "L'espèce de mot qui a dû se distinguer d'abord de toutes les autres, écrit M. Bréal, c'est, selon nous, le pronom." Je crois cette catégorie plus primitive que celle du substantif." Maurice Grevisse, *Le Bon Usage. Grammaire française avec des remarques sur la langue française d'aujourd'hui.* 1936. (Gembloux: Éditions J. Duculot, 1975) 448.

30 | "Die Pronomen tragen wesentlich zur Ökonomie der Sprache, d.h. zum sparsamen Gebrauch der sprachlichen Mittel, bei, indem sie unnötige Wiederholungen nicht nur vermeiden helfen, sondern häufig sogar unterbinden." Günther Drosdowski, *Duden: Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache.* (Mannheim: Dudenverlag, 1995) 326.

31 | "Le pronom est un mot qui souvent représente un nom, un adjectif, une idée ou une proposition exprimés avant ou après lui." Grevisse (1936/1975), 448.

or declaration of the subject. Operating in the discourse as a noun substitute, the pronoun can fulfil all its possible functions,[32] but the fact that it can appear in the text additionally or indirectly by other indicators or text markers also proves that a pronoun can involve information or textual elements that a noun cannot.[33] Therefore, the way a pronoun functions primarily in a discourse defines its grammatical classification.

Likewise, we have reflexive pronouns, personal pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, possessive pronouns and so on; the second person designating a personal reference belongs to the largest category, that of the personal pronouns, hence it is associated with the paradigm of person as mentioned in the previous section. The fact that the person reflects a certain role in the speech act affects the second-person pronoun as well as it is associated more with the role of the addressee inherent in the second person than a specific non-altering actual person.

Additional uses and functions of pronouns, apart from those already listed and classified, may vary, designating, among other

---

32 | "Pronouns are a closed class of words. Pronouns may substitute for or stand for the references to entities which full noun phrases make. [...] The interpretation of the meaning of individual pronouns depends heavily on the context in which they occur. Like nouns, pronouns can act as the heads of noun phrases and function as subject, object or complement of the clause, or as the complement of a proposition." Ronald Carter and Michael McCarthy, *Cambridge Grammar of English: A Comprehensive Guide: Spoken and Written English Grammar and Usage.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006) 375.

33 | "Le pronom est parfois employé absolument: il ne représente alors aucun mot, aucun adjectif, aucune idée, aucune proposition exprimée, et c'est improprement qu'il est appelé "pronom": l'appellation qui lui convient est celle de nominal." Grevisse (1936/1975), 448.

things, distance expressed as politeness/modesty,[34] impersonal/ collective entities[35]or even generic notional categories like those of generic person (French *on*) or gender (*who, they*).[36] Pronouns suggest a closed category of words;[37] as a class they tend towards reduction and never the other way round. Still, we rarely acknowledge the social and political implications of roles and stances that this evolvement of reduction really entails. To this extent, understanding second-person pronouns may be a process connected not only to canonised systems of grammar and syntax, but as briefly mentioned before, it should also include observations related to the richness of rhetoric that reflect social connotations and move beyond simple denotation.

Many determining factors of pronouns are shared with other nominal units such as rank, number, case or person while they may have similar syntactic functions; they are well understood as indicators, requiring contextual identification in order to acquire full meaning.[38] The presence of pronouns in the speech act may also be indirect and implied by other contextual elements such as the presence of a sub-noun or the functionality of a co-noun or may even be hidden. For example, in languages that decline their verbal units there may be no pronoun at all, as it is understood and inherent in

---

34 | "Quoique représentant un nom singulier, le pronom se met parfois au pluriel, selon l'usage du pluriel de majesté, de politesse ou de modestie." Grevisse (1936/1975), 451.

35 | "Le pronom représentant un mot collectif (ou générique) singulier s'accorde parfois, par syllepse du nombre, non pas avec ce nom, mais avec le nom pluriel suggéré par lui." Grevisse (1936/1975), 451.

36 | Otto Jespersen, *Selected Writings of Otto Jespersen*. (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1962) 516.

37 | "Die Pronomen haben einen Bestand von ungefähr 100 Wörtern. Dieser Bestand vermehrt sich kaum; er verringert sich eher, da einige Pronomen als veraltet empfunden und daher nur noch selten gebraucht werden." Drosdowski (1995), 326.

38 | Carter and McCarthy (2006), 375.

the ending of the verb.[39] Or when we use imperatives, second-person pronouns are not required and can be omitted since they are the only pronouns applicable to the verbal form; the same happens in the case of direct, face-to-face communication, where pronouns are omitted for profound reasons of necessity as the participants are in direct communication hence, often enough, the imperative is preferred to the indicative.

The location and frequency of pronouns in oral and written communication is different; more precisely the second person associated with direct communication and dialogue is more often omitted in non-mediated forms of the speech act, so when it is present in written form, it adds to a sense of contemporaneity and actuality.

To understand the impact of employing the second-person narrative technique in a given discourse we need to focus on why it was chosen over other options, i.e. the first- or third-person pronouns. Understanding the second-person narrative technique depends on understanding the relationship between the three pronouns available including their connotations. Benveniste discussed this in his *Problèmes de linguistique générale* from a linguistic point of view:

Dans les deux premières personnes, il y a à la fois une personne impliquée et un discours sur cette personne. "Je" désigne celui qui parle et implique en même temps un énoncé sur le compte de "je": disant "je", je ne puis ne pas parler de moi. À la 2ᵉ personne, "tu" est nécessairement désigné par "je" et ne peut être pensé hors d'une situation posée à partir de "je"; et, en même temps, "je" énonce quelque chose comme prédicat de "tu". Mais de la 3ᵉ personne, un prédicat est bien énoncé, seulement hors du "je-tu"; cette forme est ainsi exceptée de la relation par laquelle "je" et "tu" se spé-

---

39 | "Sometimes the subject is not expressed: Thank you! Confound it! Etc., and even more the subject may be left out (by "prosiopesis", an expression which however is not used in "Essentials"): (Have you) got a match? (I shall) see you again tomorrow. Very often a sentence consists only of a predicative: Splendid! How annoying!" Jespersen (1962), 501.

cifient. Dès lors, la légitimité de cette forme comme "personne" se trouve mise en question. [...]
La conséquence doit être formulée nettement: la "3ᵉ personne" n'est pas une "personne"; c'est même la forme verbale qui a pour fonction d'exprimer la *non-personne*.[40]

Benveniste argues that the second-person pronoun is dependent on the first and cannot be validly isolated from it because both pronouns reflect specific pre-conditioning roles within communication that are themselves interdependent. The two first personal pronouns reflect participation in the speech act and they stand in a closer relationship of interchange, whereas the third person that signifies the total opposite, the absent agent from this speech act, is actually their negation and could also be understood as the *non-person* pronoun.

On voit maintenant en quoi consiste l'opposition entre les deux premières personnes du verbe et la troisième. Elles s'opposent comme les membres d'une corrélation, qui est la corrélation de personnalité: "je-tu" possède la marque de personne; "il" en est privé:[41]

The first and second person function as personal role markers in the context and scheme in which they are involved, building a relationship of reversibility since an exchange of roles is expected for the continuity of the speech act: speakers become addressees and the other way round. Given that people actually interchange the positions of first- and second-person pronouns for the corresponding roles in the speech act, second person and first person are interchangeable in terms of the person they mark but not in the role they stand for, functioning as placeholders in the text that may apply to different people at different times.[42] However, it is also relevant that different people are associated with different degrees of depth:

---

40 | Benveniste (1966), 228.

41 | Benveniste (1966), 231.

42 | Benveniste (1966), 230.

whereas the first person stands for the authorial *I*, the second person can reflect depersonalised and generic instances (narrative entities) as well.[43] The ability of the second person to reflect more than one addressee simultaneously is reflected in the rhetoric of apostrophe, which enables the shifting in a given discourse between different referents of *you*. This will be analysed in more detail later in the chapter on rhetoric.

Therefore, it is widely used in articles and advertising texts and can suggest a certain social proximity as well as being appropriate for certain social circumstances when used, for example, in the polite form.

La définition de la 2ᵉ personne comme étant la personne à laquelle la première s'adresse convient sans doute à son emploi le plus ordinaire. Mais ordinaire ne veut pas dire unique et constant. On peut utiliser la 2ᵉ personne hors de l'allocution et la faire entrer dans une variété d'impersonnel. Par exemple "vous" fonctionne en français comme anaphorique de "on" [...] En mainte langue, *tu (vous)* sert de substitut à *on* [...] Il faut et il suffit qu'on se représente une *personne* autre que "je" pour qu'on lui affecte l'indice "tu", tout particulièrement – mais non nécessairement – la personne interpellée. Le "tu" ("vous") peut donc se définir: "le personne non-*je*".[44]

Apart from the correlation of person, the two first pronouns signify a certain gradation in subjectivity. Within the speech act, the referent using the first person opens up and gestures towards the referent, who is positioned in the role of second-person communication. This process of transcendence is linked to a process of objectifying the subjectivity of what is communicated from one to the other; it

---

43 | "*You* refers most frequently to the immediate addressee(s). But it can also refer more generally to any potential listener(s) or reader(s). This is especially so in advertising texts and public notices. *You* can also have generic reference (to people in general, including the speaker/writer)." Carter and McCarthy (2006), 377.

44 | Benveniste (1966), 232.

connotes, in other words, the interchange from the *personne-je* to the *personne-non-je,* who, by being external to that which is narrated, suggests a filter of objectivity.[45] This forms an input/output relationship fundamental to the dialogue and essential for its value and benefit to the interlocutors, as the ideas being discussed are formed and shaped cooperatively by both agents.

Au couple je/tu appartient en propre une corrélation spéciale, que nous appellerons, faute de mieux, corrélation de subjectivité. Ce qui différencie "je" de "tu", c'est d'abord le fait d'être. Dans le cas de "je", intérieur à l'énoncé et extérieur à "tu", mais extérieur d'une manière qui ne supprime pas la réalité humaine du dialogue. [...] [E]n outre, "je" est toujours transcendant par rapport à "tu". [...] Ces qualités d'intériorité et de transcendance appartiennent en propre au "je" et s'inversent en "tu". On pourra donc définir le "tu" comme le personne non-subjective, en face de la personne subjective que "je" représente; et ces deux "personnes" s'opposeront ensemble à la forme de "non-personne" (="il").[46]

The third person doesn't participate in this opposition of subjectivity and non-subjectivity (objectivity) that the first and the second person share since it reflects the *non-person* and acquires no attributes of this kind. Being anchored together, context-dependent and designating actuality and temporal synchronisation, the first two pronouns form a system of direct communication that cannot be experienced or shared by a third-person agent that designates the absence of personal, temporal or spatial determination. Moreover, this process of transcendence and interchangeability is linked to a general sense of ambiguity and lack of determination and specification. Suggesting the addressee, in a communicated discourse irrespective of the different persons adopting the role, the second person acquires an indefinite sense, designating the non-first-person to which the always fixed and determined *I* gestures.

---

45 | Benveniste (1966), 232.

46 | Benveniste (1966), 232.

Placeholders and relationship or role marker pronouns function as deictic forms and they enable shifting references to different extra-linguistic entities particular to each communicational setting. This shifting quality explains why Jakobson labelled the pronouns "shifters," after Jespersen.

Any linguistic code contains a particular class of grammatical units, which Jespersen labelled SHIFTERS: the general meaning of a shifter cannot be defined without a reference to the message.[47]

Shifters are considered grammatical units, which are contained in linguistic codes and cannot be understood without reference to the message. Combining both functions of representation and index, they belong to the class of "indexical symbols" according to Jakobson.[48] Although some might argue that the shifting character of pronouns may result in a disastrous lack of consistent, specific meaning, making the communication weaker and less successful, Jakobson maintains that pronouns do have a general meaning which is, however, met only in context, in actual existential relation between the speaker and the hearer participating in the utterance.

The inherent interchangeability that pronouns incorporate and presuppose results in a shifting dynamic of reference. This dynamic in the literary paradigm is associated with the rhetoric of apostrophe in its classic sense and it allows not only for narrative duplicity and added depth but also for ambiguity and openness with reference to an addressee. This lack of reference-determination also justifies in part the pronoun's obscurity as an object of research. These undefined and ambiguous reference shifters make a given message different from any other constituent of the linguistic code.[49] An additional quality of pronouns which determines their shifting nature

---

47 | Roman Jakobson, *Russian and Slavic Grammar. Studies 1931-1981*. (Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers, 1984) 42.

48 | Jakobson (1984), 42f.

49 | Jakobson (1984), 43.

is their efficiency, which relies on the paradox of amplification the more reduced their semantic depth is. Put differently, the less information they reveal about their referents, the more accomplished their shifting role.[50]

The key to understanding the second-person pronoun reference and function lies in its relationship to the first-person pronoun. The transformation of the *I* and its transition to a *you* builds a scheme that derives from the roles the pronouns have in the speech act and by their lack of determination in terms of reference as lexical placeholders. When exposing oneself to a *you*, the exposure to the other alters the perspective from the personal and internal to the external and more objective second-person perspective. Such a need of a different perspective that allows a certain distance from the narrated without, however, alienating the person from it, is vital to the poetics of second-person storytelling. It is reflected as *prosopopoeia* in the rhetoric of the text and expresses certain conditions where the continuity and authority of the *I* are challenged.

A good example of what is outlined above is offered by Jim Grimsley's childhood memoir *Winter Birds* (1994), which is written from various narrative perspectives including the second person:

Today is Thanksgiving and you are freed from school. You can lie in your bed of honeysuckle vine and dream all day beside the river. Walking there, you hug yourself with thin arms, your dark hair blown by the wind. Overhead the branches sway back and forth.[51]

The narrator (the authorial *I*) uses the second person to narrate his boyhood traumatic past, personified by little Danny (who, by the time he is named, has transcended into the third person). *Winter Birds* turned out to be a successful publication but as the author

---

50 | Beata Stawarska, *Between You and I. Dialogical Phenomenology.* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2009) 62.

51 | Jim Grimsley, *Winter Birds*. 1984. (Chapel Hill: Algonquin Books, 1994) 6.

comments in a personal communication: "... making the decision to keep *Winter Birds* in the second person was very difficult;"[52] he describes the process of writing the book in the second person as quite challenging both in terms of composition and in terms of getting published and argues that the choice of the second person actually was what established his autobiographical relationship to the protagonist (Danny) and to his book.

I tried three different versions of *Winter Birds*; the first two were in first person and third person, though I forget the order in which I tried them. **The first person version felt false because I was writing as if I were still that age in that family; it put me too far inside the pain of the story. The third person version felt false because it imposed too much distance between the narrative and me.** Since I was writing an autobiographical story, I felt I needed the form of the book to acknowledge my personal connection to Danny.

The third version eventually became the published book**; I tried the second person and found that it had the right voice, and embodied the true connection between writer and material.** I felt as if I were telling the story to myself at the age of eight. It was also in this story that I settled on the idea of confining the book to the Thanksgiving holiday.

In short, **the second person acknowledged the autobiographical nature of the relationship between me, as the author, and Danny as the protagonist, and that's why the book finally worked.** This decision cost me some years in terms of finding a publisher, however; very few publishers were comfortable with a book written in the second person.

I would like to use that point of view again, but I'm not sure where. *Dream Boy*, my second novel, would have worked well in this point of view.[53]

---

52 | Jim Grimsley, "The second person employment in *Winter Birds*." Email to Evgenia Iliopoulou, 10 October 2014.

53 | Jim Grimsley, "The second person employment in *Winter Birds*." Email to Evgenia Iliopoulou, 10 October 2014.

What Grimsley describes above is key to an understanding of second-person narrative technique and the reasons it is preferred on certain narrative occasions. Grimsley explains that it was ideal for expressing his autobiographical relationship to Danny as it also secured the distance created by the time that had passed, thus avoiding both the proximity of the first person and the alienation of the third.

Moreover, Grimsley emphasises the way autobiographical writing and second-person narrative perspective are related to each other, and he states that he could also have used the second-person perspective for his second semi-/pseudo-autobiographical novel *Dream Boy*. The author's statement implies that second person might be more appropriate in (certain) autobiographical writing. The phenomenon apparently derives from the fact that the second person reflects the aforementioned middle distance from the narrated, and hence it is linked to autobiography, in cases where a semi-distant/semi-close approach to the narrated is desired. Taking also into account the frequent appearance of second-person autobiographical narratives in general, the association of autobiography with second-person storytelling appears to be an aspect of the technique that needs to be discussed in detail, also in view of the concept of self and always in comparison with the other pronouns.

This observation is closely connected to a different concept of the self, namely to the perspective of the *Other*. Levinas and Clarkson have discussed this point in detail. Influenced by and expanding on Levinas' thoughts on the pronominal depiction of the *Other*, Clarkson claims that the second person is the most appropriate choice (instead of the third person) to reflect it. To think of the *Other* as *you* is a step forward from Levinas' thinking. To do so suggests that this *Other*, in a grammatical sense, is closer to the second person as an opposition to our *I* and it is to understand the *Other* as the non-*I* rather than as a person outside the context of our ego. For Clarkson, this dynamic efficiency occurs not just because of the *I-you* polar structure but more so because of the infinite (ceaseless) encounter with

the actual shifting *you* at the cultural (real) level.[54] What Clarkson cleverly points out is the fact that the relationship between speech and narrated event fulfils the condition of the *Saying* as stated by Levinas – "the relation proceeding from me to the other"[55] – though he insisted on the third person being the encounter of the invocation rather than the second.[56]

This association of the second person with the indefinite *Other* – the counter pole – reflects ambiguity and openness in the narrative and explains further the frequent use of the second-person narrative technique in autobiography. This phenomenon will be discussed in more detail later based on the narrative examples of Christa Wolf's *Kindheitsmuster* and Ilse Aichinger's *Spiegelgeschichte*. The second person serves as a voice of objectivity and authenticity and reflects the aspiration to improve and amplify self-awareness. By exposing or articulating the autobiographical – traditionally – first-person story in the second person, a persona is made out of the authorial *I* that can be better analysed and observed from a distance, thus confirming the unreliability of memory and the transformation of the self in time.

This change of perspective even within the self and the focussing on the perspective of others as a depiction of the not-self is a common theme not only in second-person autobiographies and storytelling but also was radically thematised by Jean-Paul Sartre in *Huis Clos (No Exit)*, a play that tells the story of four individuals trapped in the hell of the other characters' exclusive views, and that is in the second-person perspective. The characters of Sartre's play are not able or allowed after death to access the first-person perspective so as to see themselves in a mirror, hence they are sentenced to experience their perception of their selves only from the second-person

---

54 | Carrol Clarkson, "Embodying 'you:' Lévinas and a Question of the Second Person." In *Journal of Literary Semantics* 34/2 (2005) 95.

55 | Emmanuel Levinas, *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority.* Trans. Alphonso Lingis. (Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991) 121.

56 | Clarkson (2005), 99.

point of view, the angle of the others, those who are trapped with them in the same room. What is described as an extreme state of agony and torture is what characters and narrators of the texts discussed in the project have to deal with deliberately so as to restore the past image, the relationship with their selves and self-awareness.

Le bronze... (Il le caresse.) Eh bien, voici le moment. Le bronze est là, je le contemple et je comprends que je suis en enfer. Je vous dis que tout était prévu. Ils avaient prévu que je me tiendrais devant cette cheminée, pressant ma main sur ce bronze, avec tous ces regards sur moi. Tous ces regards qui me mangent ... (Il se retourne brusquement.) Ha! vous n'êtes que deux? Je vous croyais beaucoup plus nombreuses. (Il rit.) Alors, c'est ça l'enfer. Je n'aurais jamais cru ... Vous vous rappelez: le soufre, le bûcher, le gril ... Ah! quelle plaisanterie. Pas besoin de gril: l'enfer, c'est les Autres.[57]

A last comment on the pronouns concerns the variations they show within the different language systems. For example in Modern English the second person pronoun has one form, *you,* used everywhere for singular and plural reference, moreover it does not have different forms for the nominative and the accusative case but has the same for both. The lack of singular/plural distinction in the use of the second person sometimes makes for ambiguity, especially taking into account the fact that second person can also be used to refer to people in general, like *du* in German or *vous* in French. In such cases the use of the second person deflects attention from the actual addressee of the utterance, and makes the reference nonspecific and open-ended. Like the generic pronoun *one,*[58] *man* in German and *on* in French, it projects a third-person referent. The

---

57 | Jean-Paul Sartre, *Huis Clos suivi de Les mouches*. (Paris: Gallimard, 1947), 93.
58 | "One is rare in modern usage, especially in speech, and is confined to formal styles. It may refer to people in general including the speaker/writer, or, more rarely, as an oblique reference to the speaker/writer but excluding the listener/reader." Carter and McCarthy (2006), 379.

generic *you* is surprisingly frequent in spoken discourse and in non-fiction use such as in advertisements, press-headlines (imperative form) and guidebooks.

Die Vertautheitsform *du* gebrauchen demgegenüber alle Personen, die miteinander blutsverwandt oder verschwägert sind, auch bei entfernterem Verwandtheitsgrad. [...]
Unter Erwachsenen, die nicht miteinander verwandt sind, ist die gegenseitige Du-Anrede ferner allgemein üblich bei all denen, die sich der Arbeiterklasse zurechnen. Das Duzen ist hier ein Signal der Klassensolidarität. Dieses "solidaritäts-Du" oder "Genossen-Du" hat sich von seiner sozialen Basis auch in vielen politisch links orientierten Parteien, Gewerkschaften und anderen Gruppierungen dieser politischen Richtung ausgebreitet. Unter den skizzierten Bedingungen hat die Vertrautheitsform *du* also eine bestimmte politische Konnotation und ist in ihrem Vordringen oder Zurückweichen in der deutschen Sprachgemeinschaft von bestimmten politischen und gesellschaftlichen Konstellationen abhängig. [...]
So wird die Vertrautheitsform der Hörerrolle in Briefen, öffentlichen Bekanntmachungen und in der Werbung immer großgeschrieben, sowohl im Singular (*Du, Dich, Dir*) als auch im Plural (*Ihr, Euch, Ihnen*). Diese Großschreibung der Anfangsbuchstaben gilt auch analog für die Possessiv-Artikel und Possessiv-Pronomina der Hörerrolle.[59]

Weinrich describes second-person *du* as a form of trust and collectivity, an element which is inherent in the distinction between formal and informal address. This social dimension adds implications also inherent in the second person; those, however, change over time. Hence, in many cases, the choice of pronoun reveals the period in which a text is written and the social codes of the time. Such an example we see in Butor and Perec where *vous* and *tu* are used reflecting different connotations and social codes.

---

59 | Harald Weinrich, *Textgrammatik der Französischen Sprache.* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1982) 104-107.

In French the (second person) pronoun is frequently employed in a reflexive way.[60] Here the formal diversity shows in the syntax as French has a rather complicated system. *Toi*, for instance, can be employed to serve different functions: as a subject like the expected *tu* when followed by an adjective and before the positioning and use of the *fable form (e.g. toi, malade et triste, tu étais brave);* when followed by a relative pronoun; when comparisons and distinctions are necessary (e.g. *moi par écrire et vous par réciter*); when answering a question without a verb; when the subject is addressed among others; when analysing the second-person plural (e.g. *Ton père, toi, tes enfants serez honorés*); with the infinitive or as part of a phrase acquiring a highly deictic sense (e.g. *c'est toi!*). Moreover, *toi* functions as an object in various cases: when coordinated with a noun or pronoun of the same function in the context; when responding without a verb or subject; after certain formulas like *ne...que* or in other syntactic variations.[61] Other functions of the second person designate the forms of *tu* as: "compléments circonstanciels, compléments d'agent du verbe passif, appositions, compléments déterminatifs, compléments de l'adjectif or mots mis en apostrophe."[62]

In French the second-person plural form designates the polite form of address. The French *vous* applies with greater frequency than the German *Sie* (social coding in French makes speaking in the tu-form rather intimate almost to the level of the vulgar). Hence German *Sie* and French *vous* do not share the same connotations of distance and relationship. In French we also come across a diverse use of the third person singular (subject pronoun) *on*. There are cases, too, when *on* is used to evoke a sense of empathy, the speaker's actual or emotional involvement or simply out of modesty. The

---

60 | "Le pronom personnel est dit réfléchi lorsque, comme complément désignant le même être ou la même chose que le sujet, il indique que l'action revient ou se réfléchir sur le sujet: 2e pers. te, vous." Grevisse (1936/1975), 455.

61 | Grevisse (1936/1975), 448-493.

62 | Grevisse (1936/1975), 449.

generic point of view, designated in English by the collective *you* and by the impersonal *man* in German, is expressed by *on. On* corresponds further to other equivalent forms like *chacun, nul, tel* or *personne.*

In English the second-person pronoun has undergone a profound transition, in which the old way of distinguishing persons gave way to a new simpler system, moving from the four older second-person forms (*thou, thee, ye, you*) to an exclusive use of *you.* The causes for this change are not to be found exclusively in the system of language but they have socio-political and other psychological origins that are not addressed in a grammatical overview of contemporary language usage.[63] In current usage, *you* covers a large range of communication needs and social circumstances even though the lack of formal distinction between number, gender or case creates ambiguity and confusion in conversation. As a result, the determining factors of the second-person pronoun in contemporary English turn out to be natural and notional rather than grammatical; they rely on the linguistic and perceptional competence of the interlocutors and the circumstances of the conversation. The morphology of the second-person pronoun in English is extremely minimal: in a text *you* can be generic, used to signal a polite form of address, in imperatives, in conditionals, or as part of the marketing rhetoric extensively employed in the world of advertising.

The second person is easier to note and analyse in languages that have grammatical systems richer in formal variation. The analytical and – to some extent – more symmetric syntactic and morphological diversity of German serves as a good example in which to observe such a typology of the second person. Here, the complications are different from those resulting from the single-form confusion in English grammar that was described above, as the available forms for case and number are so inextricably mixed up in nouns that dealing with them separately is almost impossible. Moreover, as for the polite form in German that is reflected in the third person,

---

63 | Jespersen (1962), 506.

understanding the pronoun's relationships and its signals allows interlocutors to use *du* or *Sie* occasionally to reflect politeness, intimacy or even lack of social discretion:

Das Personalpronomen *du* ist als Bezeichnung für die **angesprochene Person** vor allem im intimen persönlichen Umfeld gebräuchlich: Man duzt sich in der Familie, zwischen Verwandten, Freunden, Jugendlichen; Erwachsene duzen Kinder. **Auch in Reden auf Beerdigung verwendet man doch *du*, wenn den Verstorbenen anredet, ebenso ist *du* die Anrede an heilige Personen, an Tiere, Dinge oder Abstrakta.** Daneben wird *du*, vor allem in der Umgangssprache, in kollektiver Bedeutung (anstelle von man) gebraucht. […] Das Personalpronomen *ihr* wird wie *du* im vertrauten Kreise gebraucht, und zwar für mehrere Personen. Gelegentlich, vor allem in bestimmten Gegenden, wird es auch gegenüber Personen gebraucht, die man einzeln mit *Sie* anredet (etwa ein Geistlicher gegenüber seiner Gemeinde).[64]

In the Duden-excerpt above, Drosdowski states that the second person is used to **address** a person and if in the singular, it is for someone with whom the relationship is rather personal. However, he also mentions that the same concept of address is occasionally used at funerals for people who have passed away, or for holy persons, animals, things and even abstracts, paradoxically everything that is not a living person. What actually happens in this case is treated in rhetoric with the figure of *prosopopoeia* and consequently such entities take over the powers and roles of a person. This shows how important rhetoric is to the process of understanding second-person storytelling and it reveals one variant in the typology of the second-person narrative that contains referents and forms that could not legitimately be considered persons in a grammatical or literary sense.

In summary, the role of the addressee played by the second person takes on a broader sense (taken by persons and inanimate figures) and is rich in implications since it can also be expressed

---

64 | Drosdowski (1995), 330f.

in non-second person forms, especially with regard to aspired-to objectivity, indefinite meaning and ambiguity. Social codes and circumstances, relationships within social constraints and communication policies are determined by these grammatical attributes that are transmitted in the rhetoric of the second person. In the pages that follow, we will see how the essentials of the second person as a grammatical category and its expression in a pronoun are built into the second-person narrative mode and what rhetorical tropes and figures are brought into play when used in the narrative. Finally, based on texts, the discussion advances to a close reading of the narratives themselves, drawing important conclusions for the second-person narrative technique in each narrative as related to the language system in which it is written.

THE RHETORIC OF THE SECOND PERSON

The technique of telling a story in the second person has been used since the time of the ancients. Homer used it in his epic poems, and he became the model for poets including Virgil who wrote epic poetry after him; the second person was used in psalms and prayers, in epistolary novels and in diaries. Telling a story in the second person was employed when transmitting philosophical dialogues into writing, appeared in guidebooks and instructions and was vital to hypnosis, reflecting a dramatisation of dialogue deriving from the theatre and plays. The narrative and communicational circumstances in which the second person appears reveal its richness and resilience; it establishes a narrative situation in which various implications and attributes can come into play. In prose, the second person gathers rhetorical elements and developments of different origins (poetry, drama) and applications, and forms a rich field of narratives in terms of thematic variation and poetic implication.