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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.
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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 language¹, especially the Estonian used in and around Tartu, uses two demonstratives see (this here) and too (that there). The Võro common language² 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)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>proximal</th>
<th>distal</th>
<th>article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Estonian</td>
<td>sjoo</td>
<td>taa</td>
<td>tuu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Estonian</td>
<td>see</td>
<td></td>
<td>see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Estonian with North Estonian influences</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>too</td>
<td>too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard and common Estonian</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>(too)</td>
<td>see</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 themselves 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Est</td>
<td>Võ</td>
<td>Tartu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Est</td>
<td>Võ</td>
<td>Tartu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Võ</td>
<td>Est</td>
<td>Viljandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>Võ</td>
<td>Est</td>
<td>Tallinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7</td>
<td>Est/Võ</td>
<td>Est/Võ</td>
<td>Tartu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>Est</td>
<td>Võ</td>
<td>Pärnu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8</td>
<td>Võ</td>
<td>Est</td>
<td>Tartu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9</td>
<td>Võ</td>
<td>Est</td>
<td>Võromaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Est</td>
<td>Võ</td>
<td>Tartu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) 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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>demonstrative</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>see</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>too</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nood</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sjoo</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tuu</em></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>taa</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>noo</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 (.) et **sjoon loo** as like 1SG say.PST last time also that DEM.GEN story.GEN

pääkirõ võis olla mo ello kõgõ pikemb üü
title could 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~sjoon** 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 päälle 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 understanding 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.aed 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.impr 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 sõövitas 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 visualised. 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
ollı (.) ja kõnõlõsi sääle 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 **ollı** (. ) ma arva  
DEM happen.PST.3SG then when 1SG child be.PST.1SG 1SG think.1SG  
et vast **möne-n** tösõ-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 **möne**  
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 käeverjämmüse (.) 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) *säälä 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 hobõsö 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>narrator</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>nood/noo/no</em> (NOM)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nood</em> (other case)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>na/nä/nu</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nee</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>need</em> (other case)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demonstratives in Võro and Estonian

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

(18) ja ma pelksı *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–sjoö, 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 *sjoö* siin
om (.) et ka mis *tuu* maan om *taa* om pliiätõs (.) *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 (.) tiää ku vana ma olli sis ma käve karah karah (.) ma olli imä man lüpsja (.) köik aigu ma ole tüümii tüüd tenni väiksest päalle 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 vâ (.) kes oll säääl 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>demonstrative system</th>
<th>demonstratives used</th>
<th>narrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>seo~sjoo-taa-tuu</strong></td>
<td>3, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td><strong>seo~sjoo-tuu</strong></td>
<td>1, 2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td><strong>taa-tuu</strong></td>
<td>5, 6, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>tuu</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>narrator</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>words</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>6088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstratives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>narrator</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>see</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>too</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>need</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>taa</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 lsg really get.PST.LSG reason that see ole-ks võinud olla ka mu viimane lugu DEM be-COND can.PST.PTCP be.INF also lsg,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 olnud 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 lsg still tahtsin inimeste-le hea-d teha ja ja päästa neid want.PST.LSG 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 jätud 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 nime-tada seda ka surmalähedaseks kogemuseks (. ) sest mu esimene laps sündis kisrilõikega (. ) see ei olnud sugugi planeeritud kisrilõige ja ma ole toda oma edsimese latse luku mõnõlõ iks kõnõlnu (. ) ja tõnõkõrd isikki üliõpilaste-le 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 nõ 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

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

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

‘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 ütes 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 poisi-kõsõga väikese poisikõsõga (.) et kulle ka 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 saelt jupiks ajaks neid tulepuid

ja üts võimalus oll siis minna nigu mäkke ülesse ja mägi ülles oli nigu säänne lame või (.) sään oll olnud vana tomatiistandus (.) ja ja tomatiistandusel oll aid ümbr ja (.) aiapostid olliva (.) nu siis harutit välla säält nu aiaroika säält traate seest (.) võtset hindale säänse puni selgä töid 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>narrator</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>see-too</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>see-too</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>see-too</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>see-too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Võro</td>
<td>seo~sjoos-tuu</td>
<td>seo~sjoos-tuu</td>
<td>seo~sjoos-taa-tuu</td>
<td>see-se</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>see-too</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>see-too</td>
<td>see-too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Est</td>
<td>Est</td>
<td>Võ</td>
<td>Est</td>
<td>Est</td>
<td>Võ</td>
<td>Est/Võ</td>
<td>Võ</td>
<td>Võ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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~sjoos-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

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

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 analüüsimat ja mis **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 (**too** oll üts hullumaja **tuu tuu** tunnõ ja **tuu** hais (**too** tõ kerje koorik mis **see** õkvalt maru kähku päälle 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, nā).

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.
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