DEMONSTRATIVES IN VÕRO AND ESTONIAN ORAL NARRATIVES

Liina Tammekänd
University of Tartu

Abstract. The paper discusses the nature of Estonian and Võro demonstrative systems used by nine bilingual respondents when narrating an emotional past story in both languages. The main interests were whether the Võro three-way person-oriented demonstrative system has disintegrated, what systems are used instead and how the Võro and Estonian demonstrative systems interact with each other in the same respondent. It was found that the Võro three-way person-oriented demonstrative system has almost disappeared and three main types of demonstrative systems are used in its place. The respondents combine Võro and Estonian demonstrative systems differently and no clear patterns can be established.

1. Introduction

1.1. Demonstratives and demonstrative systems in general

Demonstratives are cross-linguistically widespread; however, in different languages they have different forms, meanings and uses (Levinson 2005, Diessel 2012). Demonstratives have semantic characteristics that can be divided into two groups: 1. non-deictic characteristics, which describe the type of a referent, e.g. its visibility, elevation, shape and direction (Diessel 1999 and 2012; Levinson 2006) and 2. deictic characteristics, which refer to the location of a referent in relation to the deictic centre (Diessel 2012). The deictic centre is "the centre of a coordinate system that underlies the conceptualization of the speech situation", i.e. "the speaker's location at the time of the utterance" (Diessel 2012). Deictic expressions, including demonstratives, are used to refer to the locations of referents relative to the deictic centre (*ibid*.). Deictic characteristics of demonstratives are usually conveyed by

spatial terms (*ibid*.). A referent close to the deictic centre is referred to with a proximal demonstrative (e.g. English 'this') and a referent further away from the deictic centre is referred to with a distal demonstrative (e.g. English 'that') (Frawley 1992, Yule 1996). In most languages, there are two (e.g. English) or three (e.g. Irish) spatial terms, forming two- or three-way demonstrative systems respectively. However, there are languages that have more than three demonstratives (Diessel 2012). The demonstrative systems with four or more demonstratives may include also non-deictic characteristics (as highlighted above) (Levinson 2006).

According to Diessel (1999, 2012 and 2013), there are at least two basic types of demonstrative systems: distance-oriented systems and person-oriented systems (speaker-anchored systems and speaker/ addressee-anchored systems Levinson 2006). The present paper will use Diessel's terminology. Levinson (2006) claims that languages with two demonstratives generally have a distance-oriented demonstrative system, while a three-way demonstrative system may be distance-oriented, person-oriented or a mix of the two. Distance-oriented systems are often based on the contrast of proximal and distal referents referring to their relative distance from the deictic centre and demonstratives referring to these referents (Levinson 2006, Diessel 2013), but in some cases also a medial location is referred to by a medial demonstrative (Diessel 1999, Levinson 2006). In person-oriented systems, one of the demonstratives may refer to a referent close to the addressee (e.g. Japanese) (Diessel 2013). Languages with more than three demonstratives almost always have a person-oriented demonstrative system and use demonstratives to refer to referents close to the addressee (*ibid*.).

1.2. Demonstrative systems in Estonian

In versions of Estonian, different combinations of several demonstratives are used for endophoric reference. These demonstratives are *see*, *seo~sjoo*, *taa*, *too* and *tuu*. North Estonian dialects use only one demonstrative, namely *see*. The South Estonian language[1], especially the Estonian used in and around Tartu, uses two demonstratives *see* (this here) and *too* (that there). The Võro common language[2] uses a

---

1   The general spoken language at the southern border of the Finnic linguistic area (Iva 2007, Mets 2007)
2   The Võro common language is based on the Võro variety and it has not preserved special characteristics of Võro sub-varieties (Iva 2007).

three-way demonstrative system: *seo~sjoo* to refer to an object that is in the speaker's sphere, *taa* to refer to an object that is in the listener's sphere and *tuu* to refer to an object that is at an equal distance from both the speaker and the listener. (Pajusalu 1996, 1997) The demonstratives *see*, *too* and *tuu* can be used also as definite articles (Pajusalu 2000, 2006). Standard Estonian uses *too* as well, but it does not occur often (Pajusalu 2006). Table 1 gives an overview of Estonian demonstrative systems.

Table 1. Estonian Demonstrative Systems (Pajusalu 2006, 2015)

	proximal		distal	article
South Estonian	sjoo	taa	tuu	tuu
North Estonian	see			see
South Estonian with North Estonian influences	see		too	too
Standard and common Estonian	see		(too)	see

Pajusalu (2006, 2015) argues that the three-way person-oriented demonstrative system of the Võro common language is disappearing and a two-way demonstrative system is taking its place. In 1996 interviews, the older generation (then 70 years old) employed a three-way person-oriented demonstrative system, which associates *seo~sjoo* with the speaker's sphere and *taa* with the listener's sphere when referring to small and movable objects. These two demonstratives need a dialogical situation to function in a person-oriented demonstrative system and alternate in an exchange between two people *see-mul* (1SG.POS) and *taa-sul* (2SG.POS) (Pajusalu 1998). The older generation switched occasionally to a distance-oriented demonstrative system used to refer to large stationary objects at an equal distance from both the speaker and the listener (Pajusalu 2006). The younger generation employed the three-way person-oriented demonstrative system differently. The demonstrative system contrasting the speaker and the listener was used only from the point of view of the speaker (Pajusalu 2006), and in many cases *seo~sjoo* was on the verge of being assimilated by the standard Estonian demonstrative *see*.

1.3. The research questions, respondents and method of the present study

The present paper focuses on the demonstratives used in Võro and Estonian oral narratives told by nine bilingual respondents. As the research deals with oral narratives, spatial reference cannot be expected, and therefore demonstratives of the speaker's and listener's sphere gain prevalence. The research questions posed are as follows: 1. Do the respondents' narratives show that Võro speakers have lost the three-way demonstrative system? 2. Which demonstrative systems are used instead of the three-way system? 3. How do(es) the new system(s) interact with the systems used in Estonian narratives?

Nine respondents, four females and five males, participated in the study. All respondents have a secondary education and eight of them hold a university or associate degree in philology, theology, music, physics or engineering. All respondents either live or study in the city. To acquire the information about the respondents' L1 and L2, open-ended, semi-structured interviews were conducted to record their language biographies. The respondents assessed their Võro skills them-selves and their choice of L1 might be a declaration of their identity as a *võroke*[3] rather than an actual assessment of their L1 skills. From the language biographies, it appeared that only two respondents use Võro daily. Others speak Võro when they meet Võro friends or visit relatives in Võromaa. Table 2 gives an overview of the respondents' L1 and L2.

Table 2. Respondents' L1 and L2

	L1	L2	residence
F1	Est	Võ	Tartu
F2	Est	Võ	Tartu
F3	Võ	Est	Viljandi
M6	Võ	Est	Tallinn
M7	Est/Võ	Est/Võ	Tartu
M5	Est	Võ	Pärnu
M8	Võ	Est	Tartu
M9	Võ	Est	Võromaa
F4	Est	Võ	Tartu

3   *Võroke* is a term used by people who come from a certain part of southeast Estonia (Võromaa) and speak or understand the Võro common language.

The upper part of the table represents the older generation (age 50–60) and the lower part the younger generation (age 30–40). Two respondents identified Estonian as their L1 but their language biography shows that they acquired Estonian and Võro parallelly, making it a case of bilingual L1 acquisition. One respondent (M8) did not wish to establish his L1.

In addition to the language biography, the respondents were asked to tell an emotional past story either in Estonian or Võro. During the next session, they told the same story either in Võro or Estonian. There was at least a two-week pause between the two sessions. Hence, nine pairs of narratives on the same topic were collected. The bilingual narratives were recorded, transcribed and analysed thematically and linguistically. For the present paper, a statistical analysis of demonstratives used in the bilingual narratives was conducted and different combinations of used demonstratives were studied.

The present contribution is divided into five parts. The introduction is followed by an overview and analyses of Võro and Estonian demonstratives. Then the two analyses are linked in the discussion followed by the conclusion.

2. Demonstratives in Võro narratives

4.2% of the words used in the Võro narratives were demonstratives. Although more demonstratives were used in longer narratives, the frequency of demonstratives seems to depend on the personality of the respondent (henceforth the narrator) and the narrative techniques used. Four narrators used many demonstrative adjectives and used *üks* 'one' and *mingi* 'some' as indefinite articles in addition to demonstrative determiners and pronouns. Table 3 gives an overview of the length of Võro narratives and the number of demonstratives used in them.

Table 3. The length of Võro narratives and the number of demonstratives

narrator	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	total
words	931	438	1698	716	1611	356	238	755	524	7267
demonstratives	18	7	95	46	67	10	12	37	17	309
	1.9%	1.6%	5.6%	6.4%	4.1%	2.8%	5.0%	4.9%	3.2%	4.2%

Statistically, the demonstrative *tuu* is used the most (78%), followed by the plural demonstrative *nood* (8.4%) and *too* (5.2%) (see Table 4).

Table 4. Demonstratives in Võro narratives

narrator	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		total
see	2	0	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	8	2.6%
too	0	1	3	1	6	0	3	1	1	16	5.2%
need	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1.0%
sjoo	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	1.9%
tuu	12	4	83	37	50	9	4	26	16	241	78.0%
taa	0	0	2	0	2	1	3	1	0	9	2.9%
noo	0	1	4	4	8	0	0	9	0	26	8.4%

Table 4 shows that almost all narrators mix demonstrative systems (standard Estonian *see*, South Estonian *see* and *too* and Võro *seo~sjoo*, *taa* and *tuu*).

2.1. *seo~sjoo* and *taa*

In the analysed Võro narratives, the demonstratives *seo~sjoo* and *taa* appear far less often than the demonstrative *tuu* (see Table 4). The demonstratives *seo~sjoo* and *taa* are used for pointing and require a dialogical situation that is not usually provided by a past narrative. In the analysed Võro narratives, the demonstrative *seo~sjoo* is used six times by five narrators and the demonstrative *taa* is used nine times by five narrators. It is often difficult to decide between the demonstrative *taa* and the 3Sg pronoun *ta*. Only the cases where the vowel length made it possible to claim that the narrator has used the demonstrative *taa* have been included into the present study.

It is possible to identify three different contexts where the demonstratives *seo~sjoo* and *taa* appear:

a) at the beginning and/or the end of a narrative where the narrator creates a dialogical situation when addressing the listener and uses the demonstratives *seo~sjoo* and *taa* to refer to the whole story. (1) appears at the beginning and (2) at the end of a narrative.

(1) nii nigu ma ütli   eelmine kõrd kah (.)⁴ et **sjoo   loo**
     as like 1SG say.PST last   time also   that DEM.GEN story.GEN

     päälkiri võis   olla mo   ello   kõgõ pikemb üü
     title   could.COND   be.INF 1SG.GEN life.GEN the long.SUPL night

     'As I already said last time, the name of this story could be the longest
     night of my life.'

(2) säänne   on   **taa jutt** marja-st
     this kind be.3SG DEM story berry-ELA

     'This is the story of a berry.'

   b) in indirect speech, which transfers the narrator and the listener
from discourse-time to story-time and communicates the words or
thoughts of a character by creating a dialogical situation necessary for
the functioning of the demonstratives *seo~sjoo* and *taa*, as in (3) and (4).

(3) esi ütel   viil üle ola   et (.) et sa ei   tohi
     self say.PST more over shoulder.GEN that   that 2SG not must

     inne   lukõ   ku   jõuvat sinna suurõ tii   pääle et (.)
     before read.INF when get.2SG there big   road on.ALL that

     sääl võit **seä**⁵   **kirja**   lukõ
     there can.2SG DEM.PART letter.PART read.INF

     'He did say over his shoulder that you cannot read the letter before you
     get to the big road. There you can read **this letter**.'

(4) ja siis sakslase   ütliva   et kuule   et aga (.)
     and then German.PL say.PST.3PL that listen.IMP that but

     helista kiirabi   välja et ega siin nalja   ei ole
     call.IMP ambulance out   that NEG here joke.PART NEG be.3SG

---

4 I have added pauses (.) at the end of utterances to facilitate the reading and understand-
   ing of longer examples.
5 Not a regular form

ja (.) et   parembas   ei lähe   et   läheb tõnõ hullembas
and   that good.COMP   no go.3SG that go.3SG other mad.COMP

Jaanil   **taa olemine**
Jaan.ADE DEM being

'And then the Germans said listen, call 911; it is not funny anymore
and it is not getting   any better; it is getting worse, this situation with
Jaan.'

c) other uses, like time expressions, that cannot be considered to be a
dialogical situation, as in (5) and (6).

(5) nii nii **sjoo päiv**   ta olli   säänne no (.) ei saa
     so so DEM day   he be.PST.3SG such   well   no can

     ütelda   et   ta   nüid kuri   oll   mu   pääle aga ta
     say.INF.IMPRS that 3SG now angry be.PST.3SG me   at   but 3SG

     es   taha   taha   minno   sinna
     not want.PST.3SG want.PST.3SG 1SG.PART there

     'So, this day he was kind of, well one cannot say that he was angry at
     me, but he did not want me there.'

(6) et **taa asi**   nigu om   nii hõel   et   ta   süü   mo
     that DEM thing like be.3SG so vicious that 3SG eat.3SG 1SG.GEN

     mao   är (.) või söövitas   või
     stomach away or corrode.3SG or

     'That this thing is so vicious that it eats my stomach away or erodes it
     or…'

These three contexts are very similar to Pajusalu's 2015 findings
about newspaper texts, according to which *seo~sjoo* is used in indirect
speech or in contexts where an actual physical situation can be visual-
ised. Additionally, similarly to Pajusalu (2015), *taa* in my examples is
used to refer to the whole story.

2.2. *see*

Standard Estonian demonstrative *see* was used eight times by five narrators (see Table 4). They used it either unintentionally, as in (7), or code-switched, as in (8), since they might not have considered the utterance as part of the narrative anymore.

(7) ja   ma   ole   toda   oma edsimese latse   luku
and 1SG be.PRS.1SG DEM.PART my   first.GEN   child.GEN story.GEN

mõnõ-lõ   iks   kõnõlnu   (.) ja   tõnõ-kõrd isski üliõpilastele
some-ALL   still tell.PST.PTCP   and other-time even   student.PL.ALL

kõnõlnu   **selle**   **mõtte-ga**   et   äkki   neil on
tell.PST.PTCP DEM.GEN   thought-COM   that maybe   they be.3SG

kunagi   kasu   tuu-st   loo-st
someday benefit.PART DEM-ELA story-ELA

'And I have told the story of my first child to some people and occasionally even to students with the thought that they might learn something useful from that story.'

(8) **see** oli   selline naljakas juhtum
DEM   be.PST.3SG such   funny   case

'This was this kind of a funny case.'

2.3. *too* and *tuu*

The demonstrative *too* was used 16 times by seven narrators. The narrators who did not use the demonstrative *too* belong to the older generation, but one identified Estonian as her L1 and the other Võro as his L1. It seems that it might be important for them to keep Võro and Estonian demonstrative systems apart. The demonstrative *too* was used only twice in the nominative case, as in (9). In (9), it can be seen that the narrator is not sure which demonstrative should be used.

(9) **tuu** mu   lihm **too** lehm **tuu** lehm kelle   selän   ma
DEM   1SG.GEN cow   DEM   cow   DEM   cow   who.GEN back.INE 1SG

olli   (.) ja   kõnõlõsi   sääl   lehmägä   juttu   (.) **tuu**
be.PST.3SG   and talk.PST.3SG there cow.COM talk.PART   DEM

es	panõ	tähele	edimene	ots	kos	nüüt	tõsõ	lehmä
NEG.PST	put	notice	first	end	where	now	other.PL	cow.PL

ommava
be.3PL

'My cow, who I was riding and whom I was talking to, did not notice at first where the   other cows were.'

In other instances the demonstrative *too* appears in some other case, as in (10) and (11), especially in the partitive case, as in (12). In the Võro narratives there is a tendency that both Võro *tuu* and South Estonian *too* are declined as in Võro, except for the partitive case of South Estonian *too*, which in most cases is declined as in Estonian (*toda*).

(10)
ja	ja	huvitav	et	ee	et	tõesti	mähendustki
and	and	interesting	that	erm	that	really	no.kind.of

emotsiooni	es	käü	**too-ga**	üten
emotion.PART	NEG.PST	go	DEM-COM	with

'And it is interesting that there was no emotion attached to this.'

(11)
ja	**too-st**	**kirä-st**	är	ei	tohi	sa	kellelegi
and	DEM-ELA	letter-ELA	no	not	must	2SG	anyone

midägi	kõnõlda
anything	speak.INF

'And you mustn't tell anyone anything about this letter.'

(12)
ja	ja	määnegi	hain	sääl	om	aga	aga	mida	palutada
and	and	some	hay	there	be.3SG	but	but	what	burn.INF

saa	**toda**	piät	iks	otsima	põhjalikult
can	DEM.PART	must.3SG	still	seek.SUP	properly

'And there is a kind of hay, but the material one wants to burn must be thoroughly sought after.'

As said above, the demonstrative *tuu* is the most popular choice as a demonstrative (78%) in Võro narratives, referring to animate, inanimate and abstract entities and acting as a determiner. Different contexts as with *seo~sjoo* and *taa* cannot be discerned. In (13), the demonstrative

tuu is used to refer to the whole story at the beginning of a narrative and in (14) it is used in indirect speech.

(13) **tuu** juhtu   siis ku   ma lats olli   (.) ma arva
     DEM happen.PST.3SG then when 1SG child be.PST.1SG 1SG think.1SG

   et   vast mõne-n tõsõ-n   või kolmanda-n klassi-n
   that maybe some-INE second-INE or third-INE   class-INE

   'This happened when I was a child. I think I was maybe in the second or third grade.'

(14) ja kui ta vahel   vanaimä   käest küssü   mõne
     and when 3SG sometimes granny.GEN from ask.PST.3SG some.GEN

   asja   kottale et   vanaimä mille **tuu** nii om (.)
   thing.GEN   about   that granny why DEM   so be.3SG

   siis   vanaimä üttel   et   a   selle
   then   granny say.PST.3SG that because that

   'And when she sometimes asked Granny about some things like why is it like that, Granny, then Granny said that's because.'

2.4. Plural demonstratives

The narrators who described the surroundings, especially nature and natural phenomena, used plural demonstratives the most. Nevertheless, there are few plural demonstratives in the Võro narratives and thus it is difficult to find a meaningful pattern. However, it seems that the plural demonstrative system is more unstable than the singular demonstrative system (see Table 5). The most frequently used plural demonstrative in the Võro narratives is *nood*, as in (15).

(15) ja siis timä saagsõ   ja ma siis tõmpsi   **noid**
     and then 3SG saw.PST.3PL and 1SG then pull.PST.1SG   DEM.PL.PART

   leparoikit   vai vai toomingaroikit   mis   sääl
   alder branch.PL.PART   or or chokecherry branch.PL.PART what there

   olliva (.) **nood** olliva   iks siukse käevarrejämmüse (.) ma
   be.PST.3PL DEM.PL be.PST.3PL still such arm thick.PL   1SG

siis   tõmpsi   **noid**   alla   ja
then   pull.PST.1SG   DEM.PL.PART   down   and

'And then he sawed and I pulled those alder branches or chokecherry branches that were there. Those were as thick as an arm. I pulled those down.'

In one Võro narrative, plural demonstratives in the forms *na*, *nä* and *nu* can be found, as in (16) and (17). These forms of plural demonstratives have been considered together as there are too few of them in the analysed narratives.

(16) sääl **na**   anuma   olliva   nii rassõ   kõik
     there DEM.PL vessel.PL be.PST.3PL so   heavy   all

'All those vessels were so heavy there.'

(17) mu-l   olli   ikäv   kara-n   (.) ja   ma kaie
     1SG-ADE be.PST.1SG boring   herd-INE   and 1SG see.PST.1SG

     et   hobõst   mu-l   ei   olõ   aga   mu-llõ   miildüsi
     that   horse.PART   1SG-ADE NEG be   but   1SG-ALL like.PST.3SG

     nä   **hobõsõ**   kõik kõik (.) tahtsõ   sõita (.) ma
     DEM.PL horse.PL   all   all   want.PST.1SG ride.INF   1SG

     mõtli   noonii aga lehmä **nu**   omma   sama
     think.PST.1SG so   but   cow.PL DEM.PL be.3PL same.PART

     mõõtu   (.) mille ma-i   või lehmä-gä   sõita
     measure.PART   why   1SG-NEG can   cow-COM   ride.INF

'I was bored when herding and I thought that I do not have a horse, but I liked all those horses. I wanted to ride them. I thought that, well, cows are of the same size, why can I not ride a cow?'

Table 5. Plural demonstratives in Võro narratives

narrator	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	total
nood/noo/no (NOM)	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	3	0	8
nood (other case)	1	0	2	1	5	0	0	4	0	13
na/nä/nu	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	0	5
nee	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
need (other case)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The standard Estonian plural demonstrative *need* was used once by one narrator, in (18).

(18) ja   ma   pelksi   **neid**   suuri   **koiri**
    and   1SG   fear.PST.1SG   dem.PL.PART   big.PL.PART   dog.PL.PART

    'And I was afraid of those big dogs.'

Two narrators seem to have added a Võro plural nominative case ending (a glottal stop that can be heard from the recording) to the standard Estonian plural demonstrative *need*, as in (19).

(19) tull   nee   nende   tütär   Tiina   tull   kodo=ni
    come.PST.3SG   DEM   their   daughter   Tiina   come.PST.3SG   home=and

    nii (.)   then   Tiina   ai   **nee**   võõra   **koira**   minemä
    so   siis   Tiina   chase.PST.3SG   DEM   strange.PL   dog.PL   away

    'Their daughter Tiina came home. So, then Tiina chased away these strange dogs.'

It could be said that the narrators have tried to keep the Võro and Estonian plural demonstrative systems apart: there are twice as many partitives of Võro plural demonstratives in Võro narratives than the mixed forms discussed above.

2.5. Demonstrative systems used in Võro narratives

Based on the present data, the demonstrative systems used by the narrators in Võro can be divided into three main groups.

Group 1: Two narrators (3 and 7) use in their Võro narratives all Võro demonstratives, *seo~sjoo*, *taa* and *tuu*. Both narrators, a female and a male, belong to the older generation (age 50–60) and their L1 is Võro. The following example (20) is indirect speech where the narrator has created a dialogical situation to use a person-oriented demonstrative system.

(20) ja kui Heini Jaan sääl äkki nakkas mukka kõnõlema (.) noh poisikõsõga
    väikese poisikõsõga (.) et kulle kae mis **taa** om (.) et poiss mis **sjoo** siin
    om (.) et kae mis **tuu** maan om **taa** om pliiäts (.) **taaga** kirotatakse umma
    nimme et (.) ei ei tohi nii lohakas olla

'And when Heini Jaan started talking to me, to a boy, to a small boy, that listen, see what **taa** is, that, boy, what **sjoo** is here, that see what **tuu** is there on the ground? **Taa** is a pencil. With **taa** one writes one's name. You can't be so sloppy.'

Group 2a: Three narrators (1, 2 and 4) use the demonstratives *seo~sjoo* and *tuu* in their Võro narratives, as in (21). This demonstrative system is similar to the South Estonian *see-too* system. The narrators using this demonstrative system are female, two of whom belong to the older generation (age 50–60) and one of whom belongs to the younger generation (age 30–40). All identify Estonian as their L1.

(21) **sjoo** lugu om (.) ma-i tiiä ma olli ka üts (.) tiiä ku vana ma olli sis ma käve karah karan (.) ma olli imä man lüpsja (.) kõik aigu ma ole tüümii tüüd tennü väiksest pääle joba (.) mul oll sõbranna kes oll brigadiri tütär (.) Mari oll nimi viil Mari Kivi (.) ja ma olli lüpsmän (.) ja ku ma jo kasusi vähä suurõmbas joba sis mind lasti karja kah (.) **tuu** oll hää elo joba (.) kui ma pidäsi lüpsmä lehmi sis **tuu** oll üts (.) **tuu** oll nii ull tüü et üüsi kell kolm pidit üleväl olõma joba lehmi lüpsmä minemä

'**Sjoo** story is. I don't know I was one… I don't know how old I was, but I went herding cattle. I had been a milk maid at my mother's work place. I have been working from a very early age. I had a friend who was a foreman's daughter. Her name was Mari. Mari Kivi. And I was a milk-maid and when I got older a bit, I was allowed to herd cattle. **Tuu** was a comfortable life. When I had to milk cows, **tuu** was one… **tuu** was such crazy work that you had to get up at three o'clock in the morning and go to milk cows.'

In the previous example (21), the narrator used the demonstrative *sjoo* in the dialogical situation of the introduction of the story to address the listener. Later, the narrator used only the demonstrative *tuu*.

Group 2b: Three narrators (5, 6 and 8) use the demonstratives *taa* and *tuu* in their Võro narratives, as in (22). The narrators are male, one of whom belongs to the older generation (age 50–60) and two of whom belong to the younger generation (age 30–40). Two of them have identified Võro as their L1 and one Estonian as L1.

(22) üts inemine tull sinna nigu kaema meid vä (.) kes oll sääl kunagi kas olnud või või olliva tal tutva või (.) ja **tuul** oll telefon üten (.) ja siis sakslase ütliva et kuule et aga (.) helista kiirabi välja et ega siin nalja ei ole ja (.) et parembas ei lähe et läheb tõnõ hullembas Jaanil **taa** olemine ja

'One person came there, like, to see us. He had been staying there or he knew someone there. **Tuu** had a phone with him and then the Germans said listen, call 911; it is not funny anymore and it is not getting any better; it is getting worse, **taa** situation with Jaan.'

Group 3: One narrator (9) uses only the demonstrative *tuu* in the Võro narrative. This system is similar to the standard Estonian system with only the demonstrative *see*.

Table 6 gives an overview of the different main demonstrative systems the narrators used in their Võro narratives.

Table 6. The main demonstrative systems used in Võro narratives

demonstrative system	demonstratives used	narrators
1	*seo~sjoo-taa-tuu*	3, 7
2a	*seo~sjoo-tuu*	1, 2, 4
2b	*taa-tuu*	5, 6, 8
3	*tuu*	9

Conclusion: There are few occurrences of the Võro demonstratives *seo~sjoo* and *taa* in the Võro narratives analysed for the current study. They are used in three contexts: a) in a dialogical situation at the beginning or end of a narrative, b) in a dialogical situation in indirect speech and c) in other contexts, like time expressions. The demonstrative *see* seems to be random in the Võro narratives. The demonstrative *too* is mostly used in the partitive case. Although the narrators use the Võro plural demonstratives *noo/no* more in their Võro narratives, it seems that the plural demonstrative system is more unstable than the singular demonstrative system. There are variations of the Võro plural demonstrative *noo* used in the Võro narratives and it seems that the Võro plural ending (the glottal stop) has been added to the Estonian plural demonstrative *need*. Based on the present data, it seems that the narrators use three main types of demonstrative systems: system 1, which uses all Võro demonstratives (the *seo~sjoo-taa-tuu* system); system 2a, which uses the Võro demonstratives *seo~sjoo* and *tuu* (the *seo~sjoo-tuu* system); system 2b, which uses the Võro demonstratives *taa* and *tuu* (the *taa-tuu* system); and system 3, which uses the Võro demonstrative *tuu* (the *tuu* system).

3. Demonstratives in Estonian Narratives

3.5% of the words used in Estonian narratives (told by the same narrators) were demonstratives (see Table 7).

Table 7. The length of Estonian narratives and the number of demonstratives

narrator	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	total
words	607	553	954	610	1324	386	466	692	496	6088
demon-stratives	8	14	45	17	53	9	23	39	11	219
	1.3%	2.5%	4.7%	2.8%	4.0%	2.3%	4.9%	5.6%	2.2%	3.5%

Statistically, the demonstrative *see* was used the most (83.1%), followed by the plural demonstrative *need* (10.5%) and South Estonian *too* (5.5%). The Võro *taa* was used as part of code switching. In two cases the vowel length makes it possible to claim that the narrator has actually used the demonstrative *taa*, while in three cases the demonstrative *taa* might actually be the 3SG pronoun *ta*. Table 8 gives an overview of the demonstratives in Estonian narratives.

Table 8. Demonstratives in Estonian narratives

narrator	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	total	
see	3	12	40	16	43	9	17	32	10	182	83.1%
too	1	0	3	0	0	0	4	3	1	12	5.5%
need	4	2	2	1	10	0	0	4	0	23	10.5%
taa	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0.9%

Table 8 demonstrates that four narrators use a demonstrative system with a single demonstrative *see* and five narrators use a demonstrative system with two demonstratives *see-too*. South Estonian *too* is used less than anticipated. *too* is used to refer emphatically to the past in (23) and to emphasise an object or an entity in order to contrast them in (24). Referring to the past and emphasising objects or entities to contrast them are two ways in which *too* is used in standard Estonian. In (24), a Võro influence can be detected.

(23) aga see lugu on   selletõttu oluline (.) et   hiljem (.) mitte
but DEM story be.3SG because   important that late.COMP   NEG

to-l   hetke-l   (.) ma tõepoolest sain   aru   et
DEM-ADE moment-ADE   1SG really   get.PST.1SG reason that

see   ole-ks   võinud   olla   ka   mu   viimane lugu
DEM   be-COND can.PST.PTCP be.INF also 1SG.GEN last   story

'However, this story is important because later, not at that moment,
I realised indeed that this could have been also my last story.'

(24) aga noh see selle-ks   see ei   olnd   üldse oluline (.)
but well DEM DEM-TRNSL DEM NEG be.PST.PTCP at.all important

eks   olulisem   oli   võibolla **too** et   ma ikka
maybe important.COMP be.PST.3SG   maybe   DEM that 1SG still

tahtsin   inimeste-le hea-d   teha   ja ja päästa neid
want.PST.1SG people-ALL good-PART do.INF and and save.INF them

kurja   mure   käest
evil.GEN worry.GEN from

'But well, that's that; it wasn't important at all. More important was
the fact that I did want to do good to people and save them from this
serious worry.'

Conclusion: South Estonian *too* is used to refer to past time and
also to refer to objects or entities to contrast or emphasise them. The
narrators use two demonstrative systems in Estonian narratives: the
standard Estonian demonstrative system with one demonstrative *see*
and the South Estonian system with two demonstratives *see* and *too*.
The narratives analysed for the present study appear to show that the
South Estonian demonstrative system with two demonstratives *see* and
too might also be becoming unstable, as *too* is used mostly in fixed
phrases referring to past time.

4. Võro and Estonian demonstratives and demonstrative systems in interaction

As there are more demonstratives in Võro than in Estonian, it can be
anticipated that Estonian *see* has several equivalents in Võro narratives.

It is also interesting to see whether there is any correlation between the demonstrative systems used in Võro and Estonian.

4.1. Collation of Võro and Estonian demonstratives used in the bilingual narratives

Below, the bilingual narratives have been collated to see how demonstratives have been used in parallel thematic blocks. Sentences that are as similar as possible have been chosen.

Instead of Estonian *see*, the narrators have used the Võro demonstratives a) *tuu*, b) *seo~sjoo*, c) *taa* and d) *seo~sjoo*, *taa* and *tuu*. Instead of the Estonian plural demonstrative *need*, the Võro plural demonstrative *noo/no* and its variants have been used.

a) Estonian *see* corresponds to Võro *tuu*.

In (25), the narrator introduces her narrative in the introduction by referring to it in Estonian with *see* and in Võro with *tuu*. The topic and theme are not exactly the same in the particular thematic block, but still the distinction between Estonian *see* and Võro *too* is clear.

(25) **sellel lool** võibolla ei olegi päris pealkirja (.) **see** on mu esimese lapse sündimise **lugu** (.) aga **see lugu** on selletõttu oluline (.) et hiljem (.) mitte tol hetkel (.) ma tõepoolest sain aru et **see** oleks võinud olla ka mu viimane **lugu** (.) kui meditsiin ei oleks olnud arenenud 91se-89ndal aastal nii kaugele kui ta siis juba oli (.) ja **see** oleks võinud olla ka niisugune **lugu** mis lõpetaks nii mu esimese lapse loo (.) ja oleks jätnud ära ka ülejäänud kahe lapse loo (.) nii et eem (.) ma tean et ee **see** oleks võinud olla minu elukäigu **lõpp** (.) ja võibolla tõesti siis võiks nimetada **seda** ka surmalähedaseks kogemuseks (.) sest mu esimene laps sündis keisrilõikega (.) **see** ei olnud sugugi planeeritud **keisrilõige**

ja ma ole **toda** oma edsimese latse **luku** mõnõlõ iks kõnõlnu (.) ja tõnõkõrd isski üliõpilastele kõnõlnu selle mõttega et äkki neil on kunagi kasu **tuust loost** (.) aga Võro keelen ma **toda luku** kõnõlnu ei ole (.) ja ma esi mõtli ka täitsa huviga et ku ma nä nüüd edimest kõrda **tuud luku** kõva häälega välja ütlema naka (.) et mis **tunne tuu** hindal või olla (.) kui esi kuulet kuis sa **tuud luku** kõnõlõd (.) a ma siis proovi (.) et ega ma ei tiia kuis **tuu lugu** tule et ee

Sellel story maybe does not have an actual title. **See** is the **story** of the birth of my first child. However, **see story** is important because later, not at that moment, I realised indeed that **see** could have been also my last **story** if medicine hadn't been as advanced as it was in 1991–1989. And **see** could have been a **story** that would have ended both the story of my first child and would have undone the stories of my other two children. So I know that **see** could have been the **end** of my life. Maybe **seda** could be dubbed as a near death experience because my first child was born via a caesarean. **See** was not a planned **caesarean**.

And I have told **toda story** of my first child to some people and occasionally even to students with the thought that they might learn something useful from **tuust story**. I have never told **toda story** in Võro and I think to myself really excitedly that when I now start telling **tuud story** in a loud voice what kind of feeling I might get if you hear yourself how you tell **tuud story**. I will try, but I do not know how **tuu story** works out, erm.

b) Estonian *see* corresponds to Võro *seo~sjoo* as in (26).

(26) **sellel lool** võibolla ei olegi päris pealkirja (.) **see** on mu esimese lapse sündimise **lugu**

nii nigu ma ütli eelmine kõrd kah et **sjoo loo** päälkiri võis olla mo ello kõgõ pikemb üü

'**Sellel** story maybe does not have an actual title. **See** is the **story** of the birth of my first child.'

'As I said last time, the title of **sjoo story** might be the longest night of my life.'

c) Estonian *see* corresponds to Võro *taa*.

In (27), the narrator speaks about a poisonous plant that he had mistakenly ingested. In Estonian he refers to it with *see* and in Võro he uses *taa*.

(27) siis oli ma mäletan mulatist arst oli (.) siis ta ütles et ee (.) me paneme sulle nüüd midagi et (.) noh tilgutame sulle midagi et (.) et kaitsta su kõhtu et (.) et muidu **see asi** sööb sul kõhu ära või mao või

veiva sinna ja sääl oli siis säänne mulattarst meesarst (.) tuu siis ütel et ee ta pand mulle määnsegi tilga (.) et ee et mu magu kaitsta et (.) et **taa asi** nigu om nii hõel et ta süü mo mao är (.) või söövitas või

'Then I remember that there was a mulatto doctor who said that we will use an IV machine with something on you now, that we will drip something into you to protect your stomach, that otherwise **see thing** eats your stomach away.'

'And there was a kind of a mulatto doctor, a male doctor who said that he gave me some IV treatment to protect my stomach that **taa thing** is so vicious that it eats or corrodes away my stomach.'

d) Estonian *see* corresponds to Võro *seo~sjoo-taa-tuu* as in (28).

(28) aga tema nüt tuli vot et **see** on nüüd **selleks** et (.) **see** on nüüd pliiats ja **see** on **selle** jaoks et oma nime kirjutada ja **see** on väga tähtis asi

ja kui Heini Jaan sääl äkki nakkas mukka kõnõlema (.) noh poisikõsõga väikese poisikõsõga (.) et kulle kae mis **taa** om (.) et poiss mis **sjoo** siin om (.) et kae mis **tuu** maan om **taa** om **pliiäts** (.) **taaga** kirotatakse umma nimme et ei ei tohi nii lohakas olla

'But then he said that **see** is for **selleks** that **see** is a pencil and **see** is for **selle** to write one's name and **see** is a very important thing

'And when Heini Jaan started talking to me, to a boy, to a small boy, that listen, see what **taa** is, that, boy, what **sjoo** is here, that see what **tuu** is there on the ground? **Taa** is a **pencil**. With **taa** one writes one's name. You mustn't be so sloppy.'

e) Estonian *need* corresponds to Võro *nuu* as in (29).

(29) teadsin et seal üleval on siuke tasandik ja (.) on vana mahajäetud tomatiistandus kus on **neid roikaid** palju (.) noh et köidan traadiga kokku toon alla sealt saab jupiks ajaks **neid tulepuid**

ja üts võimalus oll siis minna nigu mäkke ülesse ja mägi ülles oli nigu säänne lame või (.) sääl oll olnud vana tomatiistandus (.) ja ja tomatiistandusel oll aid ümbre ja (.) aiapostid olliva (.) **nu** siis harutit välla säält **nu aiaroika** säält traate seest (.) võtset hindale säänse pundi selgä tõid alla ja hulgas aos oll siis tulepuud

'I knew that up there is a kind of a plane and an old abandoned tomato plantation where there are a lot of **neid pales**. I can bind them together with a wire and bring them down. There will be **neid firewood** for a long time.'

'And one possibility was to go up the hill and there was a kind of a plane. There had been an old tomato plantation which had been surrounded by a fence made of pales. **Nu** were taken out of the fence, **nu pales** from the wires. You took a bundle on your back and brought it down. There was then firewood for a long time.'

4.2 Võro and Estonian demonstratives used by the narrators and the systems these form

Table 9. Estonian and Võro demonstratives and L1 of the narrators

narrator	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Estonian dem.-s	*see-too*	*see*	*see-too*	*see*	*see*	*see-too*	*see-too*	*see*	*see-too*
Võro dem.-s	*seo~sjoo-tuu*	*seo~sjoo-tuu*	*seo~sjoo-taa-tuu*	*seo~sjoo-tuu*	*taa-tuu*	*taa-tuu*	*seo~sjoo-taa-tuu*	*taa-tuu*	*tuu*
L1	Est	Est	Võ	Est	Est	Võ	Est/Võ	Võ	Võ

The narrators can be divided into four groups according to the use of demonstratives in Võro and Estonian (see Table 9).

I. Two narrators (3 and 7) use all three demonstratives (*seo~sjoo-taa-tuu*; Võro demonstrative system 1, see Table 6) in Võro narratives and two South Estonian demonstratives *see-too* in Estonian narratives. Both narrators belong to the older generation. One of them identified Võro as her L1; the other did not wish to establish his L1, although his language biography shows that he learned Võro first and Estonian later.

Both narrators use also Estonian *see* in their Võro narratives, but in both cases it happens rather at the beginning of the narrative, when the switch from Estonian to Võro is recent. Therefore, it could be argued that the narrators know how to keep Võro and Estonian demonstrative systems apart and attempt to do it while narrating. In the Estonian narrative, one narrator uses *too* only to refer to past time (*at **that** moment*, *on **that** day*). A similar time expression can be found also in the Võro narrative, as in (30).

(30) **tol hetkel** ei olnud veel võimalust ultraheliga ega mingite tarkade masinatega seda asja kontrollida

ultraheli ega midagi säänest **tuul aigu** es ole viil

'At **tol moment**, there was no possibility to check it with an ultrasound or any other sophisticated machines.'

'There was no ultrasound or anything like that at **tuul time**.'

The other narrator uses the demonstrative *too* to emphasise or contrast an object or an entity in (31).

(31) ja kunagi hiljem ma alles nigu hakkasin nigu analüüsima et (.) võibolla alles mõni aasta tagasi et (.) et mis **see** siis oli et et **too** Hiini Jaan ee no piimamees (.) noh **too** oli kusagil võibolla aastal 1890 sündind

'And only later, I started analysing, maybe only a few years ago, what **see** was. **Too** Hiini Jaan, the milkman, **too** might have been born in 1890.'

II. Four narrators (2, 4, 5 and 8) use two demonstratives in Võro narratives (*seo~sjoo-tuu or taa-tuu*; Võro demonstrative systems 2a and 2b) and one demonstrative *see* of standard Estonian in their Estonian narratives. These narrators belong to both the older and the younger generation. Three narrators speak Estonian as their L1; one narrator identified Võro as his L1.

Three narrators keep Võro and Estonian demonstrative systems apart. One of them has a reason to prefer standard Estonian because of work. Two narrators live in north and west Estonia, where they probably do not have many contacts with South Estonian any more to introduce *too* into their Estonian narrative. One narrator exhibits problems when using Võro plural demonstratives or keeping apart Võro and Estonian demonstrative systems, as in (32), which could indicate lower Võro proficiency.

(32) ja ma sadasi õkvalt lämmi sita sisse (.) **tuu** oll üts hullumaja **tuu tuu** tunnõ ja **tuu** hais (.) tõ kerge koorik mis **see** õkvalt maru kähku pääle tull sitalõ

'And I fell right into manure. **Tuu** was bedlam: **tuu tuu** feeling and **tuu** smell, the slight crust that **see** covers manure really quick.'

III. Two narrators (1 and 6) use two demonstratives in Võro narratives (*seo~sjoo-tuu* or *taa-tuu*; Võro demonstrative systems 2a and 2b) and two South Estonian demonstratives *see* and *too* in their Estonian narratives. One narrator belongs to the older generation and the other to the younger generation. One narrator identified Estonian as her L1 and the other Võro as his L1. Their Võro proficiency is not comparable. One of them uses Võro only when visiting relatives in Võromaa; using correct standard Estonian is a must at work. The other uses Võro also at work both when speaking and writing.

One narrator uses *too* only to refer to past time; the other uses *too* to refer to past time and also to contrast or emphasise an object or an entity, as in (33).

(33)   ja see kõsõl peaks tähendama punast (.) et selle kommunismi võ võimu ajal oll see pandud **see** linna nimi (.) ma ei tea mis **too** enne oli

'And this kõsõl should mean red. It was dubbed like that during the communist time, **see** name of the town. I do not know what **too** was before.'

IV. One narrator uses the Võro demonstrative *tuu* in the Võro narrative. In Estonian, he uses the South Estonian demonstratives *see-too*. The narrator belongs to the younger generation, lives in Võromaa and uses Võro daily.

Conclusion: The analysed and collated data shows that *see* is prevalent in Estonian narratives and *tuu* in Võro narratives. One narrator uses all three Võro demonstratives *seo~sjoo*, *taa* and *tuu* instead of Estonian *see*. Two narrators exhibit the three-way person-oriented demonstrative system. In reference to the interaction between the Võro and Estonian demonstrative systems, no substantive pattern emerges as each narrator uses his or her own unique combination of Võro and Estonian demonstratives. It could be argued that Võro demonstrative system 2a (the *seo~sjoo-tuu* system) is similar to the South Estonian demonstrative system *see-too*. However, not all narrators who use the *seo~sjoo-tuu* demonstrative system in the Võro narrative use *too* in the Estonian narrative.

5. Conclusion

The nine studied Võro narratives do not exhibit the Võro demonstratives *seo~sjoo* and *taa* often. It appears that the Võro demonstratives *seo~sjoo* and *taa* are used in three contexts: a) in a dialogical situation at the beginning or end of the narrative, b) in a dialogical situation in indirect speech and c) in other undefined contexts, as well as in time expressions. Although the standard Estonian demonstrative *see* appears in some places in the Võro narratives, it seems that the narrators have tried to keep Estonian and Võro demonstrative systems apart.

Compared to the Võro singular demonstrative system, the Võro plural demonstrative system seems to be more unstable. The Võro plural demonstrative *noo* (also *no* and *nood*) is generally used less and can take on different forms (*nu*, *ne*, *nä*).

In the nine Estonian narratives, the demonstratives *see* and *too* are used. *too* is used either to refer to past time or to refer to entities by contrasting or emphasising them. Võro demonstratives appeared in Estonian narratives only during clearly signalled code switching.

Collating the Võro and Estonian narratives showed that Estonian *see* is generally replaced by Võro *tuu*. Hence, *tuu* is the most prevalent demonstrative in Võro narratives: all narrators used it in their narratives. *see* is the most prevalent demonstrative in Estonian narratives. In Estonian, *see* is accompanied mostly by *too* and in Võro *tuu* by *seo~sjoo* and *taa*. Only one narrator used all three Võro demonstratives instead of Estonian *see*.

It must be noted that the narrators told a past story where they did not have an opportunity to establish a dialogue and they had to create a dialogical situation by addressing the listener at the beginning and at the end of the narrative or introducing indirect speech into their narrative. Thus, the experiment itself might have hindered the use of the person-oriented demonstrative system in Võro narratives.

In Võro, the two-way demonstrative system is used more than the three-way demonstrative system. As only two narrators out of nine used a three-way person-oriented demonstrative system in the Võro narrative and the remaining narrators seemed to use *seo~sjoo*, *taa* and *tuu* differently, it could be argued that the Võro three-way person oriented demonstrative system is on the verge of disintegration. The exact degree of disintegration of demonstrative systems seems not to depend on age, gender or residence, although the only narrators who used all three Võro demonstratives belong to the older generation and

speak Võro as their L1. Based on the present data from the nine narrative pairs, it seems that the narrators use three basic types of demonstrative systems: system 1, featuring all the Võro demonstratives (the *seo~sjoo-taa-tuu* system); system 2a, which uses the Võro demonstratives *seo~sjoo* and *tuu* (the *seo~sjoo-tuu* system); system 2b, which uses the Võro demonstratives *tuu* and *taa* (the *tuu-taa* system); and system 3, using only the Võro demonstrative *tuu* (the *tuu* system). The present data suggests that the South Estonian system with two demonstratives *see* and *too* might also be becoming unstable, as the demonstrative *too* is used mostly in fixed phrases referring to past time in the analysed narratives. Regarding the possible connection and interaction between the Võro and Estonian demonstrative systems, it cannot be concluded that a particular Võro system would be inherently associated with a particular Estonian system or that there would be some common ground on which the narrator decides which demonstrative system to use in each language. Each narrator uses their own distinctive set of Võro and Estonian demonstrative systems and it is not currently possible to establish patterns in their use.

Address:
Liina Tammekänd
Eesti ja üldkeeleteaduse instituut
Tartu Ülikool
Jakobi 2, 51014 Tartu
E-mail: liina.tammekand@ut.ee

Abbreviations

In the glossings appear the following abbreviations not included in Leipzig glossing rules: ADE – adessive, ELA – elative, IMPRS – impersonal, PART – partitive, SUP – supine, SUPL – superlative, TRNSL – translative.

References

Diessel, Holger (1999) *Demonstratives: form, function, and grammaticalization*. (Typological Studies in Language, 42.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Diessel, Holger (2012) "Deixis and demonstratives". In Claudia Maienborn, Klaus von Heusinger, and Paul Portner, eds. *Semantics: an international handbook of natural language meaning* 3, 2407–2432. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Diessel, Holger (2013) "Distance contrasts in demonstratives". In Matthew S. Dryer and Martin Haspelmath, eds. *The world atlas of language structures online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Available online at http://wals.info/chapter/41. Accessed on 28.03.2015.

Frawley, William (1992) *Linguistic semantics*. London: Routledge.

Iva, Sulev (2007) *Võro kirjakeele sõnamuutmissüsteem*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.

Levinson, Stephen C. (2006) "Deixis". In Laurence R. Horm and Gregory Ward, eds. *The handbook of pragmatics*, 97–121. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Mets, Mari (2007) "South Estonian written standard and actual spoken language: variation of the past participle markers". *Linguistica Uralica* 43, 3, 161–172.

Pajusalu, Renate (1996) "Pronoun systems of common Estonian and Estonian dialects in a contrastive perspective". *Estonian Typological Studies* 1, 145–164. Tartu.

Pajusalu, Renate (1997) "Eesti pronoomenid I. Ühiskeele *see*, *too* ja *tema*/*ta*". *Keel ja Kirjandus* 2, 106–115.

Pajusalu, Renate (1998) "Eesti pronoomenid II. Võro *sjoo*, *taa*, *tuu* ja *timä*". *Keel ja Kirjandus*, 3, 159–172.

Pajusalu, Renate (2000) "Indefinite determiners *mingi* and *üks* in Estonian". In Mati Erelt, ed. *Estonian: typological studies* IV, 87–117. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.

Pajusalu, Renate (2006) "Death of a demonstrative person and time: the case of Estonian *too*". *Linguistica Uralica* 42, 4, 241–253.

Pajusalu, Renate (2015) "Võro demonstratives: changing or disappearing?" *Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics* 6, 2, 167–190 (this volume).

Yule, Georg (1996) *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kokkuvõte. Liina Tammekänd: Demonstratiivid Võro ja eesti suulises narratiivides. Artikkel käsitleb üheksa keelejuhi jutustatud Võro-eesti samateemalistes minevikunarratiivides kasutatud demonstratiivide süsteeme. Uurimisküsimused olid järgnevad: kas Võro kolmeosaline demonstratiivide süsteem on lagunenud, milliseid süsteeme selle asemel kasutatakse ning kas ja kuidas Võro ja eesti demonstratiivide süsteemid omavahel suhtestuvad. Ilmnes, et Võro kolmeosaline demonstratiivide süsteem on peaaegu kadunud ning selle asemel kasutatakse uuritavates narratiivipaarides kolme tüüpi demonstratiivide süsteeme. Katseisikud kombineerivad eesti ja Võro demonstratiivide süsteeme erinevalt ning selles osas selgeid mustreid ei ilmne.

Märksõnad: demonstratiivid, demonstratiivide süsteemid, kakskeelsed suulised narratiivid, Võro, eesti