UNIVERSITY OF TARTU

FACULTY OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES

INSTITUTE OF ESTONIAN AND GENERAL LINGUISTICS

DEPARTMENT OF FINNO-UGRIC STUDIES

Eda-Riin Leego

# IŽMA KOMI DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS AND THEIR PRAGMATIC USE

MA thesis

Supervisor: Prof. Gerson Klumpp

TARTU 2019

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF TABLES

# ABBREVIATIONS

All abbreviations in glossings are in accordance with the Leipzig glossing rules (https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php). In addition the following abbrevations have been used:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ABE | – | abessive |
| CN | – | connegative |
| ≡CNTR | – | contrast |
| CMP | – | comparative |
| DER | – | derivative |
| DP | – | discourse particle |
| EGR | – | egressive |
| ELA | – | elative |
| ILL | – | illative |
| INE | – | inessive |
| IP | – | index particle |
| PART | – | particle |
| PX | – | possessive suffix |
| =QP | – | question particle |
| (Ru.) | – | elements belonging to Russian |
| SF | – | short form of the pronoun |
| SUPL | – | superlative |
| TERM | – | terminative |

# 1. INTRODUCTION

In the recent years the most notable work on researching Komi pronouns has been done by Galina Fedjuneva, whose monography "Первичные местоимения в пермских языках" ("*The Primary pronouns in Permic languages*") (2008: 120) mostly focuses on the etymology and historical development of these pronouns. Her predecessors, most notably Klara Majtinskaja (1969), have done the same and pragmatical funcions of these pronouns have stayed on the background. With this study I hope to offer a much needed insight into the role the demonstrative pronouns play in communication.

Demonstrative pronouns are deictic, meaning that we need context to understand their meaning. Many languages have a deictic system where spatial opposition plays a role. For demonstratives it means that different forms are used to indicate a distance contrast between the things that are referred to. According to Majtinskaja (1967: 147), same applied for the Proto-Finno-Ugric language, where demonstratives expressed the distance of the thing talked about, but also carried an anaphoric function. For spatial opposition, *t*-based demonstratives were used and the degree of distance was expressed by the stem vowel – front vowels were used for proximal demonstratives and back vowels for distal ones; there were also *s*-based demonstratives, which were used more for general indication or in anaphorical sense (Fedjuneva 2008: 75).

In contemporary Finno-Ugric languages the spatial opposition (where it still exists) can be marked in different ways, with some languages still mainly using the vowel alternation in *t*-based demonstratives and some having an opposition between *s*- and *t*-bases instead. Permic languages belong to the latter group, but that does not mean that the vowel alternation marking is totally gone in these languages (Fedjuneva 2008: 75, 118). In Permic languages the proximal demonstratives are *t*-based and the distal ones are *s*-based (Fedjuneva 2008: 119).

Personal pronouns have developed from demonstrative ones. While the 1$^{st}$ and 2$^{nd}$ person pronouns seem to have separated earlier on, being distinct already in the Proto-Uralic language, the 3$^{rd}$ person pronouns developed later. The *s*-based demonstrative

acted as a 3$^{rd}$ person pronoun in most Proto-Finno-Ugric dialects. In Permic languages the 3$^{rd}$ person pronouns started to develop, presumably, rather late, due to which they are still not fully personal, as they still have the role of general indication (Fedjuneva 2008: 140). Raja Bartens (2000: 163) writes that in Komi demonstrative and 3$^{rd}$ person pronouns are differentiated only in plural, since only the personal pronouns have the *s-n* opposition. While this holds true for the literary language and most dialects, as the plural for demonstrative pronouns is formed with the plural suffix there, it does not apply for the Ižma and Vym dialects, where the plural forms of demonstrative pronouns are also *n*-based (Fedjuneva 2008: 125, 146). These *n*-based plural forms are still separated into demonstrative and personal pronouns, but as will be featured in this study, it is questionable how clear-cut this separation actually is. The fact that the *t*-based proximal demonstrative pronouns can also be used in a 3$^{rd}$ person pronoun function further indicates the lack of a proper personal pronoun (Fedjuneva 2008: 141).

While in both grammars, that of the Komi Literary Language (Bubrix 1949) and that of the Ižma dialect (Saxarova and Sel'kov 1976), demonstrative and 3$^{rd}$ person pronouns are handled as separate categories, as these works offer an overview of the language focusing on traditional categories. I do not feel the need to do the same in a work studying the pragmatic functions of these categories that are not actually fully distinguishable from each other. Thus this work will be about Ižma Komi demonstratives, some of which also carry the functions of 3$^{rd}$ person pronouns.

The nature of this work is exploratory, with an aim to describe the pragmatic functions of Ižma Komi demonstrative pronouns, descriptions of which have so far been only theoretical and rather scarce. The Ižma Komi dialect was chosen for research because there exists a video corpus of Ižma Komi spoken language, which provides a good research material (videocorpora.ru, a more in depth description of the corpora will be given in chapter 4). In addition, the Ižma Komi demonstrative system is rich in forms and has some features that are not shared by the literary language or other dialects, making it a very interesting research subject. This variety of used forms also poses an additional research topic – mapping the forms that are actively used in today's spoken Ižma Komi dialect.

The thesis consists of five chapters. The following second chapter will introduce different deictic use types and pragmatic uses that have been described for demonstrative pronouns crosslinguistically. Based on theoretical literature I will create a classification of uses that I will later apply in the empirical part of my research.

In the third chapter I will introduce the Ižma Komi dialect and its demonstrative system, comparing it to the literary language and other dialects where needed.

The fourth chapter will be an empirical study of Ižma Komi demonstrative pronouns. For that I will use the aforementioned video corpus at the Komi media collection. In the first part of this chapter I will introduce all the different forms of demonstrative pronouns that appeared in my material and analyze the possible reasons for their variation. In the second part I will try to describe patterns in the pragmatic use of these pronouns, relying on the theory introduced in chapter one.

The fifth chapter contains the conclusions, where I will summarize the observations I made in the empirical part and suggest ways to further study some appeared phenomena.

The work is also equipped with an appendix giving background information on the speakers who participated in the recordings where the examples are taken from. All the examples will be glossed and equipped with an English translation. A list of tables and a list of glossing abbreviations are given in the beginning of the work. I have chosen to present the examples and full forms of demonstratives in Cyrillic as they would be written according to Komi orthography. This choice was motivated by the fact that this work is probably mostly of interest to people who are already familiar with the Cyrillic script. When talking about phonemes, I use the IPA transcription. Different demonstrative stems are written in the Latin script, since they are not exclusive to Komi and are already mentioned in relation to other Finno-Ugric languages. For proper names and lesser known place names originally written in Cyrillic I use the scientific transliteration of Cyrillic. Place names that already have an established form in English will be referred to by them.

## 2. PRAGMATIC USE OF DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

As deictics, the main pragmatic function of demonstratives is to help us orientate in communication. Different types of deictic uses were first described by Karl Bühler (1934/1990) who separated them into three modes: ocular, anaphorical and imagination oriented deixis (*Deixis-am-Phantasma*). After him many researchers have introduced their own systems, added and regrouped usage types.

Below I will present the classification of different pragmatic usage types of demonstrative pronouns that I will further use in my work. I use the word *pragmatic* instead of *deictic*, because some of these types are less traditionally deictic than others. For example, in subchapter 2.4 I will describe the use of demonstratives when speakers are having word-formation trouble. While the categories presented below are established on the basis of the context of the reference, pronoun choices can also be affected by other things, for example the speaker's emotion towards the referent. John Lyons (1977: 677) calls this the emotional deixis, but it has also been called the affective deixis. Maria Averintseva-Klisch (2016) has written about pejorative use of demonstratives, which falls under a similar category.

### 2.1 Exophoric use

Holger Diessel (1999: 93) follows M.A.K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan (1976: 57–76) and separates the deictic uses of demonstrative pronouns into *exophoric* and *endophoric*, with exophoric use referring to an entity present at the speech situation. Nikolaus P. Himmelmann (1996: 219) calls this use the *situational* use. The exophoric use has three distinctive features not shared by the endophoric use: it establishes a deictic center, it is distance sensitive (in languages that have demonstrative pronouns that contrast in distance) and it may be accompanied by pointing (Diessel 1999: 94). Himmelmann (1996: 220) writes that in languages with more than two demonstratives, only some of them are applicable for the exophoric use.

Charles Fillmore (1997: 63) distinguishes between two exophoric uses which he calls the *gestural* and the *symbolic* use. The gestural use requires a physical gesture to locate the referent in the surroundings, while with the symbolic use the listener has to activate their knowledge of the speech situation and the referent. In my work I will consider demonstrative uses where the entity referred to is present in the speech situation and could be identified by a gesture under gestural use even if a gesture doesn't occur, since if we go beyond first mention, in Komi present entities tend to be referred to exophorically also in later mentions.

Diessel (1999) and Himmelmann (1996) also consider the exophoric notion of *Deixis-am-Phantasma* 'deixis in the imagination'. Lyons (1977: 579) calls this use *deictic projection*. Deixis-am-Phantasma is a term coined by Bühler, who further devides it into three groups: in the first group, the speaker projects the imagined referents to their surroundings, and in the second, they project themselves into imagined surroundings where the referents are located. The third type is intermediate – both the speaker and the entity referred to stay in their real surroundings, but the speaker still sees it in their mind-eye and can gesture to the direction they see it in (Bühler 1934/1990: 149–152). This use can also be accompanied by pointing (Diessel 1999: 94–95).

## 2.2   Endophoric use

While the exophoric use draws its referents from the surrounding language-external context, the aim of the endophoric use is to create a language-internal coherence, with referring to entities from the surrounding discourse (Diessel 1999: 159). Diessel (1999) also considers the recognitional use endophoric, stating that his division is based on exophoric versus all else uses. I will not follow his classification here, as I feel that recognitional use could be looked at under a category of its own. I will however consider the other two endophorical uses from his classification under the same lable.

## 2.2.1 Tracking use

While Diessel (1999: 95) calls this use the anaphoric use, Himmelmann (1996: 226) prefers the term tracking use, since *anaphoric* and *co-referential* are used in a wider sense. I am following Himmelmann's nomenclature, since the term anaphoric also plays a role concerning the discourse deictic discussed in the next subchapter.

Tracking use means the tracking of participants mentioned in a discourse (Himmelmann 1996: 226). Pronouns used for tracking are co-referential with a noun phrase appearing in the previous discourse (Diessel 1999: 95). In languages where demonstrative pronouns and 3rd person pronouns form different categories, both of them, as well as other devices, can be used for tracking, but there seems to be a difference in their function. Demonstrative pronouns are used less than 3rd person pronouns and they might signal low topicality of the referent or a problem with ambiguity that might otherwise arise. Demonstratives are sometimes also used for tracking right after first mention, this signals that the referent will be thematically prominent (Diessel 1999: 96).

## 2.2.2 Discourse Deixis use

A discourse deictic doesn't have a co-referential noun or a noun phrase, but it refers to an immediately adjacent proposition. Discourse deictics can refer both to previous (anaphoric) and following (cataphoric) parts of the discourse. In some languages the anaphoric and cataphoric use differ in form, for example in English, the proximal demonstrative *this* can be used both anaphorically and cataphorically if it refers to utterances produced by the same speaker and distal *that* can only be used anaphorically (Diessel 1999: 102–103). Discourse deictic use is usually not tracked further (Himmelmann 1996: 224–225).

Lyons (1977: 667–668) differentiates between pure text deixis and impure text deixis, the latter of which is the same as discourse deixis described here. Pure text deixis is an exophoric use instead, where the linguistical entities (lexemes, expressions etc) not their

meaning are referred to. Lyons also says that pure and impure text deixis are often hard to tell apart.

## 2.3 Recognitional use

Recognitional use means that the entity referred to should be recognizable from specific knowledge that the speaker and listener share. Uncertainty about how accessible the referent is for the listener usually prompts the speaker to use this tactic. Specifying information about the referent, or *you know?*-type tag questions that open up a possibility to ask for specification may accompany the recognitional use. The recognitional use often refers to participants with low topicality and is thus not tracked further. While it can appear as a first mention in a given conversation, it can also refer to participants already mentioned. In the latter case it can be hard to tell apart from tracking use (Himmelmann 1996: 239). Recognitional use can only occur adnominally (Diessel 1999: 93). Auer (1984) has discussed recognitional use using the term *indexicality marking*. Lakoff (1974) marks the sympathetic nature of the deixis, calling it *emotional deixis*.

## 2.4 Using demonstratives as filler words

In his book Diessel (1999: 154) writes about demonstratives grammaticalizing. He mentions the use of demonstratives as signals of hesitation as one of the examples of a currently ongoing grammaticalization process. Himmelmann (1996: 234–236) mentions hesitation as one of the characteristics of recognitional use. Makoto Hayashi and Kyung-Eun Yoon (2010: 34–35) argue that while demonstratives used in hesitative contexts can be functionally similar with the recognitional use, the differences are big enough for this category to receive separate attention. They single out two functions the demonstratives may occur in when the speaker has trouble formulating a word: the placeholder and the interjectional hesitator.

A placeholder, produced when the speaker has trouble coming up with a word, takes on the syntactic role of the word searched and participates as a constituent of the sentence. When using a placeholder, the speaker already knows what they want to convey, they just have trouble coming up with a specific lexical item. The placeholder serves as a referent for the more specific lexical item which it substitutes. Demonstratives can also be constituents of fixed expressions that function as placeholders. Placeholders can look similar to cataphoric demonstrative use, but the main difference is the motivation: placeholders are used when the speaker has problems with lexical retrieval, the cataphoric use is not associated with that. Also the demonstrative forms used for cataphoric reference and placeholders can be different. Same goes for differentiation between the recognitional and placeholder use – different demonstrative forms may be applied: recognitional always being adnominal, while placeholder tends to be pronominal. Even when the placeholder use is adnominal, the following noun isn't usually descriptive like with recognitional uses, but generic – *place, thing* etc. Placeholders also don't have additional anchoring expressions like recognitional use often does. The requirement of shared knowledge between speakers is also something that the placeholder use doesn't imply. The main divergence seems to lie in the type of trouble the speaker is facing. With recognitional use the trouble lies in the fact that the speaker is not sure if the reference produced by them is accessible enough for the hearer. With placeholder use it is coming up with the referent that troubles the speaker (Hayashi and Yoon 2010: 36–43).

Interjectional hesitators also signal a delay in producing the next item in discourse, but, unlike placeholders, they don't fill a syntactic role. They can come up anywhere during an utterance and they don't have a referent. Since they have no referent they are further removed from the standard usage of demonstratives. Hayashi and Yoon make sure to distinguish the process the interjectional hesitator demonstratives have gone through as pragmaticization not grammaticalization, since while the demonstratives used like this haven't moved in to a new restricted grammatical role, they do serve a new pragmatic role. In many languages interjectional hesitators don't only signal trouble with coming up with an utterance, they also serve pragmatic functions, such as signaling upcoming conversational moves. For example, in Japanese and Korean they can signal a change in

the conversation topic. They can also be used as conversation starters, so called "attention-getters", which means that while not referential, they still have some pointing value, drawing the listener's attention to where it is needed (Hayashi and Yoon 2010: 43–47).

In an earlier article, Hayashi and Yoon (2006: 501–507) also mention a third type of demonstrative use when the speaker has trouble formulating a word – the *avoidance use*. Similar to the placeholder use, these demonstratives serve as a syntactic constituent and have a referent, but the trouble with producing the lexical item is not cognitive but rather social. One of the subtypes of this use is the *taboo use*, where instead of a taboo name, a demonstrative is used for a lexical entity that the speaker doesn't want to say out for some reason, being it the fear to offend or something else.

# 3. IŽMA KOMI AND ITS DEMONSTRATIVES

In this chapter I will give a brief introduction of the Ižma Komi dialect and, as much is needed in regard to studying one of its dialects, the literary Komi language. The main focus of this chapter will be on introducing the demonstrative system of Ižma Komi and the pragmatical functions of the demonstratives as much as they are described.

## 3.1 Background on the Ižma Komi dialect and the Komi language

Ižma Komi, one of 10 Komi dialects, is spoken by Ižma Komis, whose traditional place of inhabitance is in northern Komi Republic, by the Ižma River. First Komi settlements in these areas date back to the 16$^{th}$ century, when Komis from Udora and Vym Okrugs moved up north. During the 19$^{th}$ century the Ižma Komis expanded their area, moving east and settling along the middle course of the Pechora River, along the Usa River and finally also establishing their villages beyond the Ural Mountains, on the Ob river. Some Ižma Komis also moved west, settling on the Kola Peninsula. Today Ižma Komi settlements outside of the Komi Republic can be found in Tyumen Oblast in Yamalo-Nenets and Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug and in Arkhangelsk Oblast in the Nenets Autonomous Okrug and in the Murmansk Oblast (Saxarova and Sel'kov 1976: 3–4).

The exact amount of Ižma Komi speakers is hard to pinpoint. In 2002 and 2010 Russian census it was possible to mark yourself as an Ižma Komi, separate from just Komi. Kirill Istomin and Juri Shabaev write in their article "Ižma Komi and Komi-Permiak: Linguistic Barriers to Geographic and Ethnic Identity" (2016) that while there has been some historical opposition between northern and southern Komis, this separate ethnic identity (endonym Iz'vatas) is a recent thing and common only for Ižma Komi speakers who live along the Ižma River. According to the 2010 Russian census 228,235 people in the Russian Federation had considered themselves Komi and 6420 people Ižma Komi. The general language statistics don't separate the two, marking only the number of Komi speakers as 156,099. Separate statistics made by Okrugs do mark Ižma Komi

speakers in the Komi Republic separately though, reporting that out of 202,348 Komis in the Komi Republic 130797 considered themselves Komi speakers and out of 5725 Ižma Komis 5387 could speak their native language (VPN). The fact that according to the census 94% of Ižma Komis know their language while the same goes for only 65% of Komis supports the notion that marking yourself as an Ižma Komi in that census is more a question of strong self-identity than it actually being a strongly separated group. This means that there most likely are speakers of Ižma dialect who have just marked themselves as Komis and Komi speakers in the census, thus the actual amount of Ižma Komi speakers is not be visible from the census.

Main contact languages for the Ižma dialect have been Russian and Nenets from north, Russian and the Vym dialect from west, the Upper Vyčegda dialect from south and the Pechora dialect from east (Saxarova and Sel'kov 1976: 3).

As can be seen below, the demonstrative system of Ižma Komi has many features different from the literary language and other dialects.

### 3.2 Ižma Komi demonstrative pronouns

As stated in the introduction, in this work I will not consider demonstrative pronouns and 3rd person pronouns as separate categories, as in the Komi language and its Ižma dialect they have not fully separated, but rather some demonstrative pronouns also fill the function of 3rd person pronouns.

Demonstrative pronouns in Ižma Komi can be divided into proximal and distal:

|  | **Proximal** | **Distal** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Singular** | тая, та<br>этая, эта | сыа, сы<br>эсія, эсыа, эсы<br>этія, этіі, эты |
| **Plural** | (ная, на)<br>эная, эна | (ныа, ны)<br>энія, эніі, эны |

*Table 1: Ižma Komi demonstrative pronouns (Fedjuneva 2008: 399–400; Saxarova and Sel'kov 1976: 74)*

In Table 1 we can see the *t-s* opposition between the proximal and distal demonstrative pronouns that is also present in the literary language, where the proximal demonstrative pronouns are *тайö* and *этайö*, and the distal ones *сійö* and *эсійö* (Bubrix 1949: 109–110). In addition, we can see a stem-vowel based opposition between *t*-pronouns: the open vowel /ɑ/ occurs in the proximal demonstratives *этая* and *эта*, and the closed vowels /i/ and /ɨ/ in the distal demonstratives *этія*, *этіі*, and *эты*. This kind of stem-vowel based opposition (open : closed, or back : front), common also to some other Finno-Ugric languages, is not preserved in the literary language, but it can still be found in some dialects, for example the Udora and Lower-Vyčegda dialects also have *t*-based demonstratives with a back vowel in the stem, *тія* and *тыя* respectively, that carry a distal meaning. These kinds of forms are preserved in even more dialects, as well in Ižma Komi, with the prefix э- attached to them, although in many of these dialects they have lost the distal indication (Fedjuneva 2008: 123; Popova and Sažina 2014: 171).

The distal demonstrative *сыа* is also used in the 3rd person pronoun function as is *сійӧ* in the literary language (Bubrix 1949: 109; Saxarova and Sel'kov 1976: 64).

Raja Bartens (2000: 163) writes that in Komi demonstrative and 3rd person pronouns are differentiated only in plural, since only the personal pronouns have an *s-n* opposition. In most dialects and the literary language this holds true, since the plural forms for demonstratives are formed with the general plural marker -jɑs (*тайӧ-яс, этайӧ-яс, сійӧ-яс, эсійӧ-яс* in the literary language) and a separate *n*-based form (*найӧ* in the literary language) acts a 3rd person plural pronoun. In the Ižma dialect, though, the plural forms of demonstratives are also *n*-based, as we can see from Table 1 (Fedjuneva 2008: 125). Besides the Ižma dialect this kind of plural formation can only be found in the Vym dialect[1]. While this contradicts the *s-n* opposition being a dividing criteria between 3rd person pronouns and demonstrative pronouns, we still see different forms listed as Ižma Komi 3rd person plural pronouns and plural demonstrative pronouns in the Ižma dialect chrestomathy (Saxarova and Sel'kov 1976: 64, 72): *эная, эна энія, эніі, эны* are named as demonstratives and *ныа* and *ная* as personal pronouns. The difference between *ныа* and *ная* is explained as *ныа* being used for referents that are not in sight, less close or less know and *ная* for referents that are in sight, and closer or more known. This kind of spatial distinction is in fact common for demonstrative pronouns, not personal ones (Himmelmann 1996: 210–211). Visibility (Diessel 1999: 41–42) and recognizability (see Jarbou 2010 about Arabian Jordanian) have also been described as characteristics that can be conveyed by the choice of demonstrative pronoun. All this suggests once again, that the personal pronouns can not be considered fully separated from the demonstrative ones. While Saxarova and Sel'kov (1976: 75) suggest that the opposition between aforementioned demonstratives *эная, эна* and *энія, эніі, эны* comes from a similar opposition between *ная* and *нія*, *ныа*, at the same time considering them as personal pronouns, Fedjuneva (2008: 146–147) writes that she has not seen such a spatial opposition between *ная* and *нія*, *ныа* in her Ižma Dialect data. She also argues that the declinational paradigm and postpositional constructions for 3rd

---

[1] In Vym, the *n*-based plural is only formed for a proximal demonstrative, the plural distal demonstrative is formed from the *s*-based distal demonstrative plus plural suffix (Fedjuneva 2008: 125, 400).

person plural pronoun are based on the *ны-* stem of *ныа* and a separate paradigm for *ная* is missing, meaning, that while the *n*-stem is not fully separated from the demonstrative pronouns, it is moving towards it, having lost the spatial opposition. Based on my data I would argue that the *на-* stem is still productive for some speakers and in today's language use the choice between these pronouns seems to depend more on the individual speakers and their geographic and/or sociolinguistic background (see chapter 4.1.1).

What concerns number, Fedjuneva (2008: 144–145) also writes that in Komi-Permyak the singular form of the 3rd person pronoun (*сыа*, here described as a singular distal demonstrative pronoun) can be used in a plural meaning, but that in Komi such forms have not been noted. In the Ižma Komi corpus I have found a few examples where the speakers use *сыа* and *сія* to refer to plural subjects (see chapter 4.2.2.1).

All Komi demonstratives, both singular and plural, can attach an *e*-prefix (Bubrix 1949:110). Fedjuneva considers it to most likely be a borrowing from Russian, where it was especially widely used in Northern-Russian dialects, which were the main contact language of Komi (2008: 108–110). In older Russian the *e*-prefix was added to *t*-based demonstrative stems to mark proximity and it could also appear unattached from these forms. In todays language we see the *e*-prefix in Russian demonstrative pair *это-то*, where the first one is proximal and second distal (Černyx 1952: 195). In Komi dialects, including Ižma Komi, it does not carry a spatial notion but is rather just an amplifying expressive element. The fact that the *e*-prefix doesn't contribute to the spatial opposition in any way is also seen as a proof of it being a loaned element. In Komi-Permyak, on the other hand, it still has a function in expressing proximity, with the opposition in most dialects and the literary language being between proximal *эта* or *этія* and distal *сія*. This kind of distinction suggests that the *e*-prefix was borrowed rather late. In the other Permic language, Udmurt, this prefix does not appear nor does it in any other Finno-Ugric language (Fedjuneva 2008: 123, 125–127; 130–131).

Demonstrative pronouns inflect like regular nouns, the case ending is added to the short form of the pronoun: *та*, *сы* or *ны*, all of which can also appear with the *e*-prefix, and *эты* (Fedjuneva 2008: 134–135). In Table 2 I will present the declinational paradigms for *(э)тая* and *(э)сыа* and next to it the paradigms for corresponding literary language forms *(э)тайö* and *(э)сийö*.

|  | Ižma Komi | Literary Komi | Ižma Komi | Literary Komi |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Nominative** | (э)тая | (э)тайö | (э)сыа | (э)сийö |
| **Genitive** | (э)талэн | (э)талöсь | (э)сылэн | (э)сылöсь |
| **Ablative** | (э)талысь | (э)талысь | (э)сылысь | (э)сылысь |
| **Dative** | (э)талы | (э)талы | (э)сылы | (э)сылы |
| **Accusative** | (э)тае | (э)тайöс | (э)сіе | (э)сийöс |
| **Instrumental** | (э)таен | (э)таöн, тайöн | (э)сыен | (э)сыöн, (э)сыйöн |
| **Comitative** | (э)такэд | (э)такöд | (э)сыкэд, (э)сыкедэ | (э)сыкöд |
| **Abessive** | (э)татэг | (э)татöг | (э)сытэгя | (э)сытöг |
| **Consecutive** | (э)тала | (э)тала | (э)сыла | (э)сыла |
| **Inessive** | (э)таын | (э)таын | - | (э)сыын |
| **Elative** | (э)таысь | (э)таысь | (э)сыысь | (э)сыысь |
| **Illative** | - | (э)таö | - | (э)сыö |
| **Approximative** | (э)талань | (э)талань | (э)сылань | (э)сылань |
| **Egressive** | (э)тасьань | (э)тасьань | (э)сысьань | (э)сысьань |
| **Transitive** | - | (э)таті | (э)сыті, (э)сытіыс[2] | (э)сыті |

---

[2] In Ižma Komi the transitive form *сытіыс* is only used when the demonstrative pronoun is used in a 3rd person function (Fedjuneva 2008: 392, 401).

| Terminative | (э)таедз | (э)таӧдз | (э)сыедз | (э)сыӧдз |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Preclusive | - | - | - | (э)сысьа[3] |

*Table 2: Declinational paradigms for (э)тая and (э)сыа* (Fedjuneva 2008: 392, 401, 403–404; 405–406)

From Table 2 we can see that case endings, that in literary language would contain the vowel *ö* [ə], appear with *e* [e] in the Ižma dialect, as is to be expected due to the vowel change ə > e in non-initial syllables. The accusative case formation also differs: in literary language the accusative marker *-ös* [əs] is used, while in the Ižma dialect no *s* appears. In plural the accusative form would be *ніе* and in Lovozero, Murmansk Oblast *ныe* is also used (Saxarova and Sel'kov 1976: 66).

All Ižma Komi demonstrative pronouns have almost a full declinational paradigm with the exception of *сыа, эсыа, эсія* and *ныа* not declining in illative and inessive, *тая*, *этая, эная* in illative and transitive, *этія*, *этій* in inessive, illative and transitive and *энія*, *эній* in transitive (Fedjuneva 2008: 389, 404, 406, 408, 410, 412). Some of these forms are rarely used though, for example Fedjuneva (2008: 136) writes that the *t*-based demonstrative with a front vowel in the stem that in many dialects is preserved in forms with the *e*-prefix – in Ižma Komi distal *этія*, *этій*, *эты* – has in theory a full declinational paradigm, but its use is questionable, since in spoken language they usually appear in the nominative form and fill a modal particle role. In chapter 4.2.4 I will discuss their use as demonstrative fillers and discourse markers.

When used pronominally, demonstrative pronouns inflect for case. In adnominal use demonstrative pronouns appear in their full form only in nominative and accusative case, agreeing with the head noun, for other cases the non-inflected short form is used. If the adnominal demonstrative is a prepositive possessor, it will appear in full genitive form with a nominative head and full ablative form with an accusative head, otherwise it will also appear in the short form. Short forms are also used for postpositional

---

[3] In the literary language the preclusive case form *сысьа* and its plural counterpart *насьа* only appears if the demonstrative pronoun is used in a 3rd person pronoun function (Fedjuneva 2008: 392, 401).

constructions. Postpositional constructions can exist parallel with many case forms, carrying the same meaning. In adnominal constructions with demonstrative pronouns the head usually attaches the 3rd person possessive suffix (Saxarova and Sel'kov 1976: 69–71, 75–77). Popova and Sažina (2014: 172) write almost 30 years later that in Ižma dialect both long and short forms can be used as adnominal demonstratives. In my material the short forms appear rarely outside of postpositional constructions, with the exception of *эта* and *эна* which can also appear pronominally.

As already mentioned in the introduction, pragmatic functions of these pronouns are described scarcely – Fedjuneva has mentioned the modal particle function of *этiя* in spoken language and Saxarova and Sel'kov (1976: 77) mention the placeholder function of *тайми* and lexicalized construction *сы мый*, first of which should already be considered a grammaticalized particle.

# 4. EMPIRICAL PART

The empirical part of my study is based on the data available on an online video corpus consisting of recordings made during field works for the project "Iźva Komi: Building an annotated digital corpus for future research on Komi speech communities in northernmost Russia" (https://langdoc.github.io/IKDP). It consists of 45 recordings made from 2014 – 2016 during field works to the Districts of Ižma and Sosnogor in the Komi Republic, the Nenets Autonomous Okrug and Murmansk Oblast. Most of the recordings are in interview form, with an Ižma dialect speaking interviewer asking the interviewees questions about their life, but some of the recordings also feature Ižma dialect speakers presenting songs and chastushkas or participating in a workshop. All the recordings are from 20 minutes to one hour long and feature 196 speakers of the Ižma dialect between 12 and 86 years old. The corpora also features 16 older audio recordings. All the recordings are transcribed and, at least to some extent, translated into Russian and English.

For my analysis, I first created a database using all the video recordings that were conducted in an interview form and had a Russian and English translation. That criteria was matched by 15 recordings featuring 19 different Komi speakers. A longer description for each of the recordings used can be read in Appendix: Data. The database consists of all instances of demonstrative pronoun use in these recordings, altogether amounting to 1610 instances. From these 1610 instances 261 were omitted from the analysis because they were (i) used by a non-native interviewer, whose use of language, while surely very interesting on its own, doesn't give a real overview of how the language is used by native speakers, (ii) they were a part of false starts and interrupted speech acts, making it hard to determine, what the speaker wanted to convey with the uttered pronouns (not to be confused with demonstratives used for word-formation trouble, which will be described in chapter 4.2.4), (iii) they were a part of lexicalized constructions (the placeholder constructions used in case of word-formation trouble were included to the analysis and will be discussed in chapter 4.2.4) or (iv) they didn't actually appear in the conversation and were probably transcribed mistakenly. This

number also contains 17 instances left out because the motivation for the pronoun use was left too ambiguous for me. Some of these instances are probably uncorrected mistakes, but they were categorized separately in case of future research. That leaves 1349 instances that I analyzed and grouped into different demonstrative usage categories, which I will discuss below, when I describe the pragmatic functions of the analyzed pronouns. In addition, in some cases where the initial database seemed inconclusive, I also used other recordings from the corpus to gather additional data on certain phenomena. These instances will be separately marked and the necessary metadata will be given in the text when they appear.

In chapter 4.1 I will present all the forms that were used according to my data and analyze their variation and possible motivations for it through some examples.

In chapter 4.2 I will describe the observed pragmatic functions of these propouns. For that I will use the theoretical background knowledge from chapter 1. In my analysis, I focus on the form of the demonstrative, weather it appears pronominally, adnominally or in other constructions, the function it fills in the sentence and number and animacy of the referent it conveys. I also pay attention to extralinguistic elements like gestures.

## 4.1 Variety of used forms

In this chapter the variety of used forms will be discussed. Tables 3–5 show all the 1610 instances and the forms they were transcribed as in my initial material.

| Form | Case | Quantity in the transcription | Used for analysis |
|------|------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| сы | Short form | 48 | 44 |
| сыа | Nominative | 492 | 439 |
| сія ~ сіа | Nominative | 49 | 45 |
| сіяс[4] | Nominative | 1 | 1 |
| сіе | Nominative / Accusative | 174 | 135 |
| сійö | Nominative | 44 | 13 |
| сійöс | Accusative | 2 | 1 |
| сіес | Accusative | 52 | 49 |
| сылöн | Genitive | 8 | 5 |
| сылэн | Genitive | 47 | 46 |
| сылы | Dative | 33 | 30 |
| сылысь | Ablative | 1 | 1 |
| сіен[5] | Instrumental | 21 | 9 |
| сыкöд | Comitative | 8 | 4 |

---

[4] The actual form uttered is most likely *сія*, since I don't hear an /s/ element in the end, but the transcription could have been motivated by the fact that in this context the form is semantically plural.

[5] Some instances of *сіен* were left out of the analysis since this form has also grammaticalized into a conjunction (meaning 'because of that') and thus they can't be considered demonstrative pronouns. The origins of this conjunction do seem to be in a deictic use, more presicely discourse deictic.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| сыкед | Comitative | 15 | 15 |
| сыысь | Elative | 12 | 12 |
| сыын | Inessive | 1 | 1 |
| сыэ[6] | - | 1 | 0 |

*Table 3a: s-based forms*

| Form | Case | Quantity in the transcription | Used for analysis |
|---|---|---|---|
| - | - | - | - |

*Table 3b: s-based forms with e-prefix*

| Form | Case | Quantity in the transcription | Used for analysis |
|---|---|---|---|
| на | Short form | 5 | 5 |
| ны | Short form | 6 | 6 |
| ныа | Nominative | 44 | 42 |
| ная | Nominative | 125 | 109 |
| наа[7] | Nominative | 11 | 11 |
| найö | Nominative | 23 | 12 |
| нае | Nominative / Accusative | 18 | 11 |
| наес | Accusative | 18 | 16 |

[6] The form sounds like *сыа* and is a part of a lexicalized construction.

[7] Forms transcribed as <наа> in the corpus seemed to actually represent either *ныа* or *ная*, but due to the phonetic ambiguity of these instances, it was often hard to tell.

| ніе | Accusative | 9 | 8 |
|---|---|---|---|
| ніес | Accusative | 1 | 0 |
| ные | Accusative | 3 | 3 |
| ныес[8] | Accusative | 1 | 1 |
| найöс | Accusative | 1 | 1 |
| налöн | Genitive | 6 | 4 |
| налэн | Genitive | 20 | 16 |
| нылэн | Genitive | 20 | 19 |
| налы | Dative | 9 | 9 |
| нылы | Dative | 8 | 8 |
| нылысь | Ablative | 2 | 2 |
| налысь | Ablative | 2 | 1 |
| ныысь | Elative | 1 | 1 |
| наköд | Comitative | 1 | 1 |
| ныкед | Comitative | 4 | 4 |
| накед | Comitative | 6 | 6 |

*Table 4a: n-based forms*

---

[8] Listening to this instance, it sounds rather ambiguous and the other instance of plural accusative use for this speaker is transcribed as (and sounds like) *наес*. If we search for the form *ныес* in the corpus, we find one other speaker, not included in the initial data, who supposedly uses this form in addition to *наес*. In her speech a different vowel instead of /ɑ/ is a bit more clearly heard in the *ныес* instance. Of course to know if these unconventional forms are a real strategy motivated by something or perhaps just phonetical mishaps or examples of free phonetic variety, we would need more than just a few examples.

| Form | Case | Quantity in the transcription | Used for analysis |
|------|------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| эна | Short form | 1 | 1 |
| энія | Nominative | 1 | 1 |
| эная | Nominative | 1 | 1 |
| энае | Nominative | 1 | 1 |
| энаес | Accusative | 1 | 1 |

*Table 4b: n-based forms with e-prefix*

| Form | Case | Quantity in the transcription | Used for analysis |
|------|------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| та | Nominative | 7 | 5 |
| тая | Nominative | 23 | 19 |
| тія | Nominative | 1 | 1 |
| тайö | Nominative / Accusative | 21 | 5 |
| тае | Accusative | 62 | 36 |
| таес | Accusative | 1 | 1 |
| таысь | Elative | 2 | 2 |

*Table 5a: t-based forms*

| Form | Case | Quantity in the transcription | Used for analysis |
|------|------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| эта | Short form | 78 | 75 |
| этая | Nominative | 8 | 8 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| этаа[9] | Nominative | 20 | 20 |
| этiя | Nominative | 12 | 12 |
| этае | Accusative | 7 | 7 |
| этаес | Accusative | 1 | 1 |
| этiе | Accusative | 4 | 1 |
| эталэн | Genitive | 3 | 3 |
| эталысь | Ablative | 1 | 1 |
| это*[10] | Nominative* | 1 | 1 |

*Table 5b: t-based forms with e-prefix*

In Tables 3–5, most of the forms are already familiar from subchapter 3.2, but there are also forms not mentioned previously: (i) in addition to the expected nominative forms *тая, этая, сыа, ныа, ная, этiя* we see the literary language forms *тайö, сийö* and *найö* and *тае, сiе* and *нае* that we would expect to see only in accusative function; (ii) there is also *мiя* which is reported to be a distal demonstrative pronoun in Udora and Lower-Vyčegda dialects but not in Ižma, and (iii) *сiя ~ сia*, which is the nominative form of the singular distal demonstrative in most other Komi dialects besides Ižma (Popova and Sažina 2014: 163). We also see that both *ныа* and *ная* are used quite a lot and other cases formed from the *на-* stem also exist. In the following subchapters I will discuss all these phenomenas in more detail.

---

[9] Forms transcribed as <этаа> in the corpus often sounded like phonetically ambiguous forms of *эта*, *этая* or *этае*.

[10] The pronoun это is Russian not Komi. This was the only instance where a Russian pronoun appeared in otherwise Komi context and is counted in because of that. Other appearances of Russian pronouns were not included because they were always used in a codeswitching situation, meaning that the lexical context surrounding them was also Russian.

4.1.1 Stem variation

According to the transcription of the interviews, 6 out of 17 speakers used both *ныа* and *ная*, 2 speakers used *наа* in addition to *ныа*, 7 used only *ная* and 2 did not produce neither of the forms. When it comes to other cases, 3 used both *на-* and *ны-* based case forms besides nominative, 6 only *ны-* based forms, 6 only *на-* based forms and 2 didn't produce any of these case forms. While this is the description according to the transcription, the real use might differ a little, since some of the forms were hard to distinguish due to unclear pronunciation or technical problems. In the case of two speakers who supposedly use both *на-* and *ны-* based non-nominative case forms, I clearly hear a base different from the one transcribed, making the amount of speakers who in these recordings produce case forms with both stems only one. The solitary *наа* forms used by speakers who otherwise used *ныа* and other *ны-*based forms also seems questionable and might not be a conciously motivated choice for another pronoun, but a phonetically ambiguous form where the first vowel /ɨ/ is shortened. It still seems that both, *ныа* and *ная* can be used by the same speaker, but I did not detect a pattern in these uses. For example, there was one speaker who used *ныа* only once versus *ная* 19 times and all other case forms of that pronoun were also *на-*based (short form *на*, accusative *наес*, comitative *накед*, dative *налы*, ablative *налысь*). The one instance where *ныа* was used is the following: the interviewee is talking about her home village, how there used to be kolkhoz but now there isn't and many people don't have a job, so they breed horses and grow everything themselves. The *ныа* used in the following example refers to the village people, but there is actually no co-referring NP – the village is mentioned and the following verbs occur without an overt subject, but with a 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural marker.

(1) AEKan'eva and VIKan'ev: 23:20–23:37

| AEK: | *Олэны,* | *картошка* | *уна* | *быдтасны* | *да* | *эта,* | *зэй* |
|------|----------|------------|-------|------------|------|--------|-------|
|      | live.PRS.3PL | potato | a_lot | grow.TR.FUT.3PL | and | DEM.PROX | very |

| *уна* | *малина* | *быдтэны* | | *деревняас* | *да.* | *Овощи* |
|-------|----------|-----------|--|-------------|-------|---------|
| a_lot | raspberry | grow.TR.PRS.3PL | | village.INE3SG | and | vegetables |

| *ставыс* | *вед* | *быдме:* | | *огурцы,* | *помидор,* | *морков,* |
|----------|-------|----------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| all.PX3SG | DP | grow.INTR.PRS.3SG | cucumber | tomato | | carrot |

| *капуста* | *свекла* | ***Ныа*** | *на всю зиму* | | *ставсэ* |
|-----------|----------|-----------|--------------|--|----------|
| cabbage | beetroot | DEM.PL | for_all.ACC_winter.ACC (Ru.) | | everything.ACC3SG |

| *быдтэны,* | *ставсэ* | *солаласны.* |
|------------|----------|--------------|
| grow.TR.PRS.3PL | everything.ACC3.SG | salt.FUT.3PL |

'People live, grow a lot of potatoes, lot's of raspberries grow in the village and. All the vegetables grow: cucumbers, tomato, carrot, cabbage, beetroot. They grow and salt everything for the winter.'

If the speaker really differentiates between *ная* and *ныа* in function, this example raises at least two theories in addition to the spatial and/or emotional distance mentioned by Saxarova and Sel'kov: (i) *ныа* is chosen because the topic shifts from the activities done in the village (and the village people implied to be doing them) to the vegetables that grow there and then back to the village people (this time personalized) or (ii) that before personalizing the village people, they are only referred to by person endings on the verbs and their identity is only implied by the association: village = people who live there. We do see a similar situation with the use of *ная*, though. In the following example the interviewee tells how there is not much left in her home village, only school and some other things, prompting the following exchange with the interviewer:

(2) AEKan'eva, VIKan'ev 24:49–24.57

| MSF: | *Сэн* | *тоже* | начальнэй классъ-*яс* | только, да*?* |
|------|-------|--------|------------------------|---------------|
| | there | also | beginning_grade(Ru.).PL | only_yes(Ru.) |

| | *велэдэны* | *Устеас?* |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| | teach.PRS.3PL | Uste.INE3SG |

| AEK: | *Оз.* | *Энi* | до восьмого | ***ная*** | *велэдэны.* |
|------|-------|-------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| | NEG.PRS.3SG | now | until_eighth.GEN(Ru.) | DEM.PL | TEACH.PRS.3PL |

'MSF: There are also only the beginning grades, right? taught in Uste? AEK: No. Now they teach until the 8th grade.'

Here the subject is again only implied by the collective noun school and before only verb endings are used to imply the subject. This leaves the topic-change theory, since I'd expect the impersonal villagers and impersonal teachers of Uste to be on the same end of the scale both in spatial and emotional distance. All uses of *ная* tracked a continuing topic. But looking at other speakers who use both *ная* and *ныа*, this pattern does not seem to continue. This of course doesn't rule this out as a motivation for this specific speaker: I have also theoretized about similar motivation for the use of *эна* in examples (48) and (49). In general, the only pattern that seems to be emerging is that some speakers have a preference for *на*-based forms and some for *ны*-based forms. This could have something to do with the speaker's backgrounds, like the people from the Komi Republic who come into closer contact with other dialects and the literary language preferring *на-* based forms, but this would need a bigger database and some additional information on the speaker's sociolinguistic background to be confirmed. Also a third form – *нія* – can be found from the additional recordings in the corpus, making the picture even more diverse. I do think that the tendency to prefer one pronominal stem and the possible motivation for choosing the pronoun for the speakers who still use multiple variables should definitely be studied further.

In the following examples the same referent is referred to with different based pronouns by different speakers:

(3) NNČuprov 00:36–00:48

| MSF: | *Краснощельеас* | *Тіян* | ***ай-мамныд*** | *олісны?* | |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | Krasnoshchel'e.INE3SG | PRO.2PL.GEN | father-mother.PX.2PL | live.PST.3PL | |

| NNC: | *Но.* | | | | |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | DP | | | | |

| MSF: | *A* | ***ная*** | *кытысь* | *локтісны?* | |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | but | DEM.PL | where.ELA | come.PST.3PL | |

| NNC: | ***Ныа,*** | ***ныа*** | *волісны* | ***ныа*** | *Ловозерасянь.* |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | DEM.PL | DEM.PL | be.PST.3PL | DEM.PL | Lovozero.EGR |

'MSF: Did your mother and father live in Krasnoshchel'e? NNC: Yes. MSF: But where did they come from? NNC: They, they, from Lovozero were they.'

In the following example *налэн* and *ныⷭлэн* both refer to the Nenets people whose clothing they are discussing:

(4) DAKan'eva 01:06:15–01:06:22

MSF: *А    на-лэн       вӧлі       сертэм?*
     but  DEM.PL-GEN  be.PST.3PL  pattern.ABE

DAK: *Ны-лэн         сертэм,     ны-лэн        мужикъясыслы*
     DEM.PL-GEN    pattern.ABE   DEM.PL-GEN   man.PL.PX3SG.DAT

     *нойтор         пуктасныс*
     cloth_piece    put.FUT.3PL

'MSF: And theirs was without pattern? DAK: Theirs was without pattern, for their men they put a small cloth …'

A nominative form *сія ~ cia* instead of expected *сыа* is used by 9 speakers. For five of them it seems to be an isolated case and due to phonetical ambiguity and the fact that the isolate case doesn't seem to differ from the use of *сыа* (or probably adnominal short form *сы* in one case) that they use in all other instances, it could just be a mistake in the transcription or a random moment of phonetical ambiguity as can happen in spoken language. The other four use it regularly though, one uses it parallel with the literary form *сійӧ* and nominative *cie* which will be discussed in the next paragraph and three speakers use it parallel with *сыа* according to the transcription. Backgroundwise these speakers are rather different – two of them are from southern Ižma areas, one from northern and one from Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug. For all of these speakers, the phonetic difference between the parallel versions seems not very clear and in some cases non-existent to me, making me believe that while their pronoun use might vary on the phonetic scale, there is no systematical motivation behind it. This is also supported by the fact that these differently transcribed pronouns don't seem to differ in function when compared to others. If we look at the whole corpora, we can see the *сія* form also

used by some speakers not included in the initial data. While some of the forms transcribed as *сия* seem to be accusative *cie* instead, we also find some speakers who seem to use *сия* regularly, if not exclusively (with the phonetic ambiguity of some forms it is hard to tell). Interestingly one of them is from the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug, one from the souther part of Ižma dialect area and one, although she is from the Nenets Autonomous Okrug herself, mentions that their mother was from Ust'-Ižma, the same village that one of the northern Ižma speakers using *сия* was from, so a geographical picture is starting to form, although based on way too little data to make any real conclusions.

4.1.2 Accusative forms

We see the nominative use of forms *mae*, *cie*, *нае*, which by Ižma declination should be the accusative forms. This phenomena is most clearly seen in a speaker who also regularly uses literary forms. With *cie* and *нае* it seems again to be a case of phonetical ambiguity of spoken language for the other four people who, according to the transcription, use these forms in a nominative context, but with *mae* the nominative use seems a bit more common and in addition to the speaker with strong literary language influence can be seen in the speech of 7 speakers. Such use is not mentioned in theoretical literature about the Ižma dialect, which could mean, that is a newer tendency, maybe an influence of the literary language, where the literary forms undergo the *ö > e* phonetical change that happens in non-initial syllables in the Ižma Dialect. This theory is supported by the fact that the speakers who most clearly use these forms as nominatives have a background connecting them to the literary language.

We can also see variation in the accusative case, which should traditionally be marked with an *-e* in the Ižma dialect: forms like *maec, ciec, наес, ніес, энаес* and *этаес* are additionally marked by *-s* which is a traditional component in the accusative marking only for the the literary language and few other, southern dialects (Fedjuneva 2008: 401, 403). According to the transcription we see *s*-marked accusatives in the speech of 10 informants. 6 speakers who use s-marked accusative form *наес* don't use an *s*-less

parallel form to that, but out of 7 speakers who use *s*-marked accusative form *ciec*, only one doesn't use it parallel to *cie*. 2 of those 7 speakers use *ciec* only once and in all those cases I don't really hear the *s*-marking, meaning, it could just be a mistake in the transcription. S-marked singular forms seem to be used mostly by educated and younger speakers, making it possibly a literary language influence.

We can also see the 3<sup>rd</sup> person possessive accusative suffix sometimes attach to the pronouns. This marking doesn't actually signal an accusative case form but is a emphatic clitic, described in that function along with the second person singular possessive accusative *-mö* first by Bubrix (1949: 55–56) who marks its contrastive function and compares it to Russian enclitic particle *=mo*. The functions of this clitic has later been discussed by Boris Serebrennikov (1963), Vadim Ponarjadov (2000) and Gerson Klumpp (in preparation). The pronoun *cie=сэ* used in example (5) does have this contrastive reading with the contrast between not being sure in some things but knowing this particular thing.


(5) DAKan'eva 01:09:23–01:09:26

DAK: *Абу*        *татысь,*      **cie=сэ**                 *ме*            *төда*
         NEG         here.ELA       DEM.DIST.ACC=CNTR    PRO.1SG      know.PRS.1SG

'Not from here, that I know (…)'


I did however find an instance from the rest of the corpus where this suffix was used with a pronoun to as accusative marking. In the recording titled *Иван Андреевич Артеев* the interviewee is using the form *маясэ* as accusative, since the adnominal construction acts as an object to the verb 'forget'.

(6) *Иван Андреевич Артеев* 04:54–05:06

IAA:     *кучемке*      толчок для себя дать, чтобы      *ме*      *иг*
           some_kind      push_for_self_give_so_that(Ru.)      PRO.1SG      NEG.PRS.1SG

           *вуныд*      **тая-сэ**      *культура,*      **таясэ**      *кыв*
           forget      DEM.PROX-ACC3SG      culture      DEM.PROX-ACC3SG      language

'(…) give somekind of a push to myself, that I won't forget this culture, this language (…)'

This example is a bit problematic though, since the language proficiency of the speaker is not very good – he often struggles to express himself and mentions that his family language switched to Russian when he went to school. In that case it might offer some interesting research material for studying language loss.

The accusative form *ные*, used in Murmansk Oblast according to Saxarova and Sel'kov (1976: 66), appears 3 times in the transcriptions of the recordings I used, used twice by a speaker from the Komi Republic and once by a speaker from the Murmansk Oblast. From the rest of the corpus we also find a speaker from the Nenets Autonomous Okrug, who uses *ные* three times, and a speaker from Murmansk oblast who uses it twice. All except for the last one also use *ніе* according to the transcription and when listening to the supposed *ные* forms, they don't sound very distinct from the *ніе* forms produced by same speakers. This could just point to a slight phonetic variation, not necessarily separate forms. The speaker who only uses *ные* has a rather clear /ɨ/ vowel in the pronoun though, showing, that this form is definitely still used.

### 4.1.3 Demonstrative pronoun *тія*

The form *тія* appears in my initial data only once, when the interviewee is talking about one of her relatives and then mentions the relative's brother:

(7) DAKan'eva: 01:01:17–01:01:22

DAK:      *Вот*   *эні*      *вокыс*      *тай*      *тія*      *гöвно*
           IP      now      brother.PX3SG      DP      DEM.DIST      shit

| *татэн* | *шляйтче,* | *да* | *ог* | *тӧд.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| here.INE | loiter3SG | and | NEG.PRS.1SG | know.CN |

'Well now his brother, that shit, loiters around here and I don't know.'

It is also possible that the form used is actually *этiя*, but the preceding /i/ melts together with /e/, making it hard to distinguish the form.

This form appeared a few more times in another recording that wasn't used for my initial data. In the recording titled *Дети оленеводов* the form *тiя* could be more clearly heard and was used as a placeholder both times.

In the following examples the interviewed kids are recalling animals they have seen in tundra.

(8)  Deti olenevodov 05:52–05.55

| OAK: | *Да,* | *тiя* | *дзодзегъяссэ.* |
|---|---|---|---|
| | yes | DEM.DIST | goose.PL.ACC |

'Yes, whatchacallit, geese.'

(9)  Deti olenevodov 06:07–06:10

| OAK: | *Тiя* | *мый,* | *абу* | *енот=а?* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | DEM.DIST | what | NEG | raccoon=QP |

'What's that, not raccoon?'

## 4.2    Pragmatic use

### 4.2.1 Exophoric use

In my database I have categorized 112 instances of demonstrative use as exophoric, making up about 8%. This low statistic is largely due to the nature of the material – the interviewers usually ask people about the lives they have led, not so much about the immediate surroundings.

According to my data, for exophoric use, *t*-based demonstratives are usually chosen and the spatial opposition is conveyed by the differing stem vowels. There are a few cases where an *s*-based demonstrative seems to be used exophorically – those examples and their possible motivation will also be discussed under the subtype they represent.

Since the exophoric use is rather unrepresented in my data, additional examples have been searched for and used from the corpus, especially concerning the spatial opposition and expected *n*-based plural forms.

#### 4.2.1.1    Gestural use

The gestural use refers to an exophoric use of the demonstrative, where the referent is located by a pointing gesture. As mentioned in chapter 2.1 I will also discuss gesturless refererences to present entities under this use, if they could be identified by a gesture if needed, since this will play a role in the non-initial mentioning of these entities. In my data this kind of use made up 7 of the 112 exophoric uses. In my initial data only *t*-based proximal forms appear: *ma, mae* and *эта*.

The forms *ma* and *эта* are short forms of *мая* and *этая* respectively. While the short form *ma* appeared in a postpositional construction as is to be expected, *эта* was used pronominally. In the following example the interviewee is talking about her handicraft

skills and how her grandson took some slippers for sale. When talking about slippers she stretches out her legs and the interviewer points to interviewee's slippers and asks:

(10)   DAKan'eva 17:38–17:39

MSF:   ***Эта***        *асьныд*        *вуринныд?*
       DEM.PROX.SF   PRO.REFL.2PL   sew.PST.2PL

'Did you sew these yourself?'

This example is interesting for three reasons: (i) pronominal demonstratives are expected to appear in their full form, (ii) we would expect an accusative marked form here since the slippers are an object to the verb 'sew' and (iii) the referent is plural and in Ižma the stem for plural forms is *n*-based. The plural use of singular pronouns is something that keeps occurring in my data under other uses also as we will see in the upcoming subchapters. The pronominal use of a short form is also not an isolated case here, but it seems to be restricted to *эта* in my data (for the possible pronominal use of *эна* see example (48) on page 59). While out of the scope of this paper, this raises some questions about possible convergence with *это* – the proximal demonstrative pronoun in Russian, the most influencial contact language for the Komi language today.

The form *mae* appeared both ad- and pronominally in my data and represented the nominative form in all these cases. In the following example the interviewer is pointing to the building they are standing next to and asks what it is:

(11)   APFilippov: 22:36–22:39

MSF:   *Кутшем нэ   тае*        *зданиеыс?*
       what_kind DP   DEM.PROX   building.PX3SG

APF:   *Тае*           *склад.*
       DEM.PROX      warehouse

'MSF: What is this building? APF: This is a warehouse.'

Example (11) also brings up the topic of non-initial mention of present entities. As shown in chapter 4.2.2.1 the pronoun of choice for tracking participants is almost always *s*-based. This means that when the referent is present in the speaker's surroundings, it can be continued to be mentioned with an exophoric *t*-based pronoun.

The statistic of only seven gestural uses is very low for getting an overview of the exophoric use of demonstratives. For that I searched the corpus for recording where the gestural use was more prominent. As a result I found 2 recordings where gestural use was more present.

Firstly a recording titled *Мастер-класс по изготовлению традиционных кукол-оберегов* 'A workshop on making traditional talisman-dolls'. The only background information given is that it is recorded in Ižma, but we can recognize some of the interviewers as participants of the workshop. The main speaker in the video is the woman (marked by initials VVA) who is leading the workshop and who we can assume is an Ižma Komi speaker. In the beginning she introduces different types of dolls. Example (12) is taken from the introduction of one of the doll types.

(12)  *Мастер-класс ...* 00:51–59; 01:08–01:13

VVA:  **эта**        *кудз*    бы           *сувенирнэй*   *вариант*   *нин.*
      DEM.PROX.SF   like      COND(Ru.)    souvenir      variant    already

      *Зэй*    *интереснэй*   **тая**,     *дельнэй*    *образыс*      **та-лэн**
      very    interesting    DEM.PROX    practical    form.PX3SG    DEM.PROX-GEN

      *куклаыслэн*       *Вот*    **сы-лэн**         *важъя,*     *важен*      *сэтшем*
      doll.PX3SG.GEN    IP      DEM.DIST-GEN     old.ADV     old.INE     like this

'(…) this would already be like a souvenir version. This one is very interesting, this doll has a practical form (…) Well it has [it] in old style, in old times that kind (…)'

We can see that the doll is first mentioned by an *e*-prefixed short form *эта*, but then referred to with pronouns without the *e*-prefix. We see a similar pattern in her introduction of another dolls. Since there are more than one doll present at the situation, the initial mention with the prefix probably signals the contrast from other dolls. When the referent has already been established, it doesn't have to be emphasized anymore. We can also see that the same referent will be referred to with an *s*-based pronoun a bit later.

One way would be to still consider it an exophoric reference, where the use of an *s*-pronoun is motivated by something, but I think it just goes to show that when a situationally present entity has been established as a referent, further mentions could go either way - be continuingly exophoric or be endophoric tracking.

From the corpus we also find a recording titled *Ирина Викторовна Канева*. The interviewee is a woman from and living in Murmansk Oblast born in 1959 and a big part of her recording is her talking about dolls she has made. The collection of dolls is on the table in front of her and she also introduces them separately. This prompts a lot of gestural demonstrative use – I counted the amount of these instances to be 34, this also includes the forms produced by the interviewer, Marina Fedina. According to the transcription the following demonstratives were used for exophoric gestural use: proximal *тая, тае, таес, эта, этая, этаа, этае, этія, нае* and distal *этія* and *энія*. The forms *эта, этая* and *этая* sounded rather ambiguous to me at times and I consider it possible that some of them could be transcribed as others instead. The one instance of *нае* also sounded like *энае* to me, which would also be more expected, if we consider the *n*-forms without the *e*-prefix to be more personal pronoun like and the forms with the prefix more demonstrative like. Looking at the forms which include both proximal and distal demonstratives according to the theoretical literature about Ižma demonstrative pronouns, we would hope to see some kind of opposition between these forms. In the following examples the speaker uses the distal plural form *энія* when she refers to all the dolls that are in front of her, but when she introduces the different dolls one by one, she exclusively uses *t*-based proximal demonstratives: *эта, этая* and *этае*.[11] It should also be noted that while the plural distal adnominal *энія* modifying an accusative head stays in its nominal form, the singular proximal adnominal *этая* takes on the accusative form *этае* in front of an accusative head.

---

[11] The speaker seems prone to codeswitching to Russian, which also happens during introducing the diferent types of dolls. Then the whole utterance is said in Russian and the Russian demonstrative pronoun *это* is used. Example (timestamp 05:27–05:29):

| *Но* | **это** | *пусть* | *будет* | *уже* | *сразу* | *жених.* |
|------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|----------|
| DP | DEM.PROX | OPT.PART | be.FUT.3SG | already | soon | groom |

'Well this one will already soon be a groom.'

(13)  Ирина Викторовна Канева 05:00–5:18

IVK:  *A*  ***энія***  *куклаяссэ*  *ме*  *велэдти,*
      and  DEM.DIST.PL  doll.PL.ACC3SG  PRO.1SG  study.PST.1SG

      *Ветлі*  *Нарьян-Маре,*  *вӧліс*  *семинар*  *Да,*  *карны*
      go.PST.1SG  Naryan-Mar.ILL  be.PST.3SG  seminar  yes  make.INF

      *вот*  *именнэ*  ***энія***  *куклаяссэ.*
      IP  exactly  DEM.DIST.PL  doll.PL.ACC3SG

'And these dolls I learned to (make), went to Naryan Mar, (there) was a seminar … Yes, make exactly these dolls.'

(14)  Ирина Викторовна Канева 06:03–06: 09

IVK:  *A*  *вот*  ***этае***  *кукласэ*  *ме*  *кари,*
      but  IP  DEM.PROX.ACC  doll.ACC3SG  PRO.1SG  make.PST.1SG

      ***этае***  *уже*  *атюм*  *кари*  *кукласэ*  *…*
      DEM.PROX.ACC  already (Ru.)  PRO.RELF.1SG  make.PST.1SG  doll.ACC3SG

'But this doll here I made, this one I already made myself, the doll …'

The instance where *(э)нае* is used is when the interviewer asks about the dolls not having faces:

(15)  Ирина Викторовна Канева 09:43–09:55

MSF:  *A*  *мыля*  *вот*  ***тая***  *куклаясыслэн,*  *но,*  *висьталам,*
      but  why  IP  DEM.PROX  doll.PL.PX3SG.GEN  DP  say.PRS.2PL

      *чужемыс*  *абу*  *рисуйтэма?*
      face.PX3SG  NEG  draw.PERF

IVK:  *A*  *чужемыс*  *абу,*  кукла-оберег  ***энае,***  *оберег*  *да*
      a  face.PX3SG  NEG  doll_talisman(Ru.)  DEM.PROX.PL  talisman and

'MSF: But why these dolls, well, let's say, why the face is not drawn on? IVK: There is no face, these are doll-talismans, talismans and (…)'

The choice of proximal versus distal demonstratives doesn't seem to come from a clear distal opposition in these examples, since the dolls are on the table in front of the interviewee the whole time and the interviewer sits just opposite from her, so the dolls are close to both of them. The singular distal demonstrative *этія* is also used three times by the interviewee, two of which can definitely be considered exophoric gestural use.[12] In example (16) the interviewer asks about the size of the interviewee's doll collection and she signals to the same dolls on the table, saying that this is what's left and in example (17) the interviewee decides to gift one of the dolls to the interviewer.


(16)  Ирина Викторовна Канева 17:42–17:47

MSF:  *И        ыджыд=э     Тіян          коллекцияыс      кукла?*
       and    big=Q       PRO.2PL.GEN   collection.PX3SG   doll

IVK:  *А  вот  **этія**    колис         мый.*
       a   IP   DEM.DIST   be_left.PST.3SG   what

'MSF: And is your collection of dolls big? IVK: This is what's left.'


(17)  Ирина Викторовна Канева 19:43–19:46

IVK:  *Но    вот   **этія**     ме        бабсэ,         навернэ,    тэныд*
       DP    IP    DEM.DIST   PRO.1SG   woman.ACC3SG   probably    PRO.2SG.DAT

      *сета,             пӧдарок.*
       give.PRS.1SG      gift

'Well this woman, probably, I will give to you, a present.'

---

[12] The third example isn't referring to the dolls anymore, the interviewer is searching for a picture of the woman who taught her to make dolls from a magazine and when she finds it and shows it to the interviewer (and the filming crew), she says (timestamp 21:10–21:12):

*Вот        таенэ,     этія.        Вот      она.*
IP(Ru.)    IP.PROX    DEM.DIST    IP(Ru.)   PRO.3SG.FEM (Ru.)

'Look, here, this. Look, she.'

The referentiality of *этія* isn't as clear here as in other examples and it might be a hesitator of some sort instead.

Example (15) also raises two observations. Firstly, the adnominal *мая* is modifying a clearly plural marked noun and, secondly, while the interviewee exclusively uses forms with the *e*-prefix attached, the interviewer does not. The function of the *e*-prefix has not been described well, but some sort of emphasis has been marked. Looking at the demonstrative instances produced by the interviewee, we can see some kind of contrast in all of them – in the beginning between earlier mentioned store-brought dolls and self-made dolls, then between the individual dolls and in the case of example (16) between the dolls she used to have and the ones she has now. The interviewer however just talks about the dolls in sight and doesn't have to emphasize them or contrast with anything.[13] As the data presented has already shown, the amount of variation between different forms used by different speakers is quite big. Due to this I find it also important to mention that the interviewee in the discussed recordings is (one of the) only people who uses an *s*-based pronoun with the *e*-prefix (see example (50)) and whose *n*-based plural personal functioning pronoun of choice seems to be *нiя*. If Ižma Speakers really do have rather different pronominal systems they apply, these observations might be in relation with her constant *e*-prefix use and the use of *энiя*. This is of course only a speculation, since most other recordings don't offer a setting for the exophoric demonstrative pronoun use to really come out.

4.2.1.2  Symbolic use

While the gestural use of a demonstrative requires a gesture to locate the referent, the symbolic use does not, instead the listener has to activate their knowledge of the speech situation. In my data the symbolic use counted for 17 instances and the following demonstratives were used: *тае*, *тая*, *эта, этаа, этае*, *этаес*, *эна, эная*.

---

[13] The interviewer also uses the the accusative form *мае* or *маес* a few times to refer to the activity of doll making, which we can probably consider exophoric gestural use, although she is behind the scene and we can't actually see any accompaniying gestures.

The demonstratives conveying symbolic exophoric use were mostly used adnominally. This seems expected to me, considering the interview form of the recordings.

(18)  AJTerent'ev 07:04–07:10

AJT:  | *Мый* | *миянэс* | *никод* | *из* | *вунэд,* | *и* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| COMP | PRO.2PL.ACC | PRO.NEG | NEG.3.PRS | forget | and |

| *сыа* | *актуальнэй* | ***тая*** | *мирас.* |
|---|---|---|---|
| DEM.DIST | topical | DEM.PROX | world.INE3SG |

'So that no one would forget us and that is topical in this world.'

(19)  MVFilippova 01:04–01:08

MVF:  | *Вот, а* | *сэсся* | *ме* | *эстче* | *локті,* | потому | что |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| IP | but | after | PRO.1SG | here.ILL | come.PST.1SG | because(Ru.) |

| *зэй* | *ёна* | *любита* | ***этаес*** | *просторъяссэ.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| very | strong.ADV | love.PRS.1SG | DEM.PROX.ACC | open space.PL.ACC3SG |

'So then I came here, because I love these open surroundings very much.'

In one case the demonstrative actually followed the noun it was modifying. The postnominal position of the demonstrative is most likely related to a topic switch. Example (20) is from a recording made in Ižma during a forum[14] where the interviewer came to participate in. After one of the conversation topics (differences between speech between the local people and what the interviewer is used to) kind of gets stuck, the interviewer decides to change the topic. He chooses the forum currently happening around them as a new conversation topic and asks:

(20)  LPČuprova 05:01–05:05

VPC:  | *Но,* | *ладнэ. А* | *мый* | *сетэ* | *тэныд* | *личнэ* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| DP | okay but | what | give.PRS.3SG | PRO.2SG.DAT | personally |

---

| *форумыс* | ***тае?*** |
|---|---|
| forum.PX3SG | DEM.PROX |

'Well, okay. But what does this forum give you?'

There was also one instance of pronominal use, prompted by the interviewer mentioning something about almost drowning while visiting a place near there yesterday. The interviewee then refers to the flood outside with a pronominal *эта*, because it is clear from the context what she is referring to.

(21)  AEKan'eva & VIKan'ev 44:28–44:38

| MSF: | *Да,* | *тöрыт* | *тай* | *ми* | *ветлім,* | *этша* | *иг* | *пöдэ.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | yes | yesterday | DP | PRO.1PL | go.PST.1PL | little | NEG.1PL | drown |

| AEK: | *Ааа.* | *Хехе.* | ***Эта*** | *миян* | *быд* | *тулыс,* | *эстчедз.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | aaa | hehe | DEM.PROX | PRO.1PL.GEN | every | spring | here.TERM |

'MSF: Yes, yesterday we went, nearly drowned. AEK: Aaa, haha. We have this every spring, up to here.'

In example (19) we saw the adnominal singular demonstrative modifying a plural marked head. In my data there is a speaker who also uses a plural pronoun in an adnominal construction where the head is plural marked. Before that she also uses a singular form in a similar construction, but that one has another singular modifier, which might play a role in that specific pronoun choice.

(22)  DAKan'eva 07:32–07:38

| DAK: | *Тае* | *тай* | *ме* | ***этая*** | *бöр* | *лунъяс=сэ* | *бура* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | DP | DP | PRO.1SG | DEM.PROX | last | day.PL=CNTR | good.DER |

| *виси,* | **эная** | *лунъяс=сэ* | *öттöръе* | *вися* [15] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ail.PST.1SG | DEM.PL | day.PL=CNTR | constantly | ail.PRS.1SG |

' Well, these last days I strongly ailed, these days I constantly ail (…)'

While with the symbolic use gestures aren't necessary to locate the referent, they may still appear. In the following example the interviewer has asked the interviewee why she chose to stay in Naryan Mar after leaving the reindeer herding life in tundra, instead of moving back to her home village for example. The interviewee explains that all her children have gotten married to this area and so on. She mentions the apartment she lives in and where the interview is taking place, saying that it was given to her husband after they left tundra. The utterance is accompanied by looking around the apartment and gesturing with hands. I think it would be understandable even without gestures that she means the same apartment that surrounds them during the discussion, the gestures are used as an extra not main device here.

(23)   DAKan'eva 42:58–43:01

| DAK: | *И* | **этае** | *квартирасэ* | *дедколы* | *сетісныс.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | and | DEM.PROX.ACC | apartment.ACC3SG | old_man.DAT | give.PST.3PL |

'And this apartment was given to my husband.'

When it comes to *e*-prefix forms versus prefixless forms, the comparison is a bit harder to do since in this subcategory most of the forms are produced by different speakers and the strategies they use might differ. A contrast seems unlikely in some examples, like number (22) where the flooding doesn't really contrast with anything.

---

[15] *Этая* is originally transcribed as *эта*, and *эная* as *энае*, but I hear the long nominal forms. The accusative marking on the head nouns is the emphatic clitic described on page .

4.2.1.3   Deixis-am-Phantasma

Deixis-am-Phantasma meaning 'deixis in the imagination' is used when the speaker either projects themselves to an imagined surrounding or an imagined referent to their current real surroundings. With 79 instances, this kind of use was the most prevalent exophoric use in my data which is also to be expected due to the nature of the material – the interview format favours narrations and descriptions of things, situations and places that aren't really there. In a way this was also the motivation of deictic use easiest to misclassify since the speakers could slip in and out of their imagined deictic grounds even during the same conversation topic. In the instances I classified as Deixis-am-Phantasma following demonstrative pronouns were used: *тая, тае, тайö, эта, этаа, этая, этае, эталэн, эталысь, энаес, накед, этія, эті, эния* and *сылэн*. The demonstratives in this use appeared both pronominally (42 instances) and adnominally (37 instances) and referred to both animate and inanimate entities.

In chapter 2.1 I described the three types of this use, all of which were also accounted for in my data. While I didn't subclassify all the examples of Deixis-am-Phantasma use, I will now present some more illustrating and interesting examples of the different type uses I came across.

In the first type the speaker projects an invisible entity to their surroundings and refers to it as it is there. In example (24) the interviewer wants to know how does the interviewee, who is a reindeer herder know which fawns belong to which reindeer? She makes hand gestures that point to an imaginary fawn and and imaginary reindeer.

(24)   APFilippov 12:28 – 12:31

MSF:   *A      вот    кудз    тэ          тöдмалан,    но      кудз    мукедыс*
       but     IP     how     PRO.2SG     know.PRS.2SG DP      how     other.PX3SG

       *вобше   тöдмалэны,      мый     тае         тае*
       DP      know.PRS.3PL    COMP    DEM.PROX    DEM.PROX

       *теляыслэн        кöрпиыс?*
       reindeer.PX3SG.GEN fawn.PX3SG

'But how do you know, well how does anyone know at all, that this is this reindeer's fawn.'

The second use type is the opposite – instead of the referred entity the speaker projects themselves into another place. In example (25) the interviewee is talking about how some Russian people in Komi Republic are opposed to studying Komi at school. He then goes on to quote them, shifting the deictic centre to another place and also person:

(25)   AJTerent'ev 15:12 – 15:19

AJT:   *мый*      *вылэ*    ***тая***     *коми кылыс*          *колэ,*
       what       on.ILL    DEM.PROX    Komi language.PX3SG   to_be_needed.PRS.3SG

       ***тая***          всё равно      *кулас.*       *Сёрнитэны*   *сӧмын*
       DEM.PROX        anyway(Ru.)    DIE.FUT.3SG    speak.PRS.3PL  only

       *сиктъясын да*               *бабъяс-дедъяс,*                  *томъяс*
       village.PL.INE and         grandmother.PL_grandfather.PL     young.PL

       *сіен*              *оз*        *сёрнитны.*
       DEM.DIST.INST     NEG.3PL    speak.INF

' (…) for what is this Komi language necessary, it will die anyway. It is spoken only in villages and (by) grandmas-grandpas, young people don't want to speak it.

The third use type is described as intermediate by Bühler. In example (26) the interviewee is describing how the town of Naryan Mar has changed and how it would have been nice if they would have left the centre of the town more like it was in the old days. When mentioning the bad big houses she points behind her with her thumb.

(26)   AEKan'eva and VIKan'ev

AEK:   *Да,*     *топ мый нэ,*   *кудз*    *ыджыд*   *городъясад,*      *миян*
       yes       DP             how      big       town.PL.INE2SG    PRO.1PL.GEN

       ***эта***        *лёк*   *ыджыд керкаяссэ*              *стрӧитісны.*
       DEM.PROX      bad     big     house.PL.ACC3SG         build.PST.3PL

'Yes, of course, like in big cities, they built these bad big houses here.'

This use can also appear recognitional at first (see subchapter 2.3), but it is the physical gestures that point towards a Deixis-am-Phantasma use. It is also arguable if the referent, the bad big houses, would be recognizable to the interviewer, since it appears the interviewees and the interviewer are not acquainted beforehand and the interviewer isn't local. In the following example the recognitional aspect is even bigger, since the interviewer and the interviewee are from the same village and it has been made clear that they know each other well enough. In the example they are talking about reindeer herding in their village and nearby. The interviewee says that he himself nor his family doesn't take part in it. He then brings up a man from their village who does:

(27)  AFXozjainov 17:49 – 17:57

AFJ:   *Миян*        *на* ***тае***      *суседныд*            *тай Егор, Канев,*
       PRO.1PL.GEN   also  DEM.PROX  neighbour.PX2PL   DP   Egor  Kan'ev

       *Егорыс*        *Пакесь Егорыс,*        *сыа*        *тоже    кӧр      доре*
       Egor.PX3SG    Pakes'  Egor.PX3SG     DEM.DIST   also      reindeer to.ILL

       *ветліс.*
       go.PST.3SG

'Well we also have this one here, your neighbour, Egor, Kan'ev Egor, Pakes' Egor, he also used to go reindeer herding.'

Between *тае* and *суседныд* there is a pause and *тае* is accompanied by a head nod in a certain direction. Here it is clear that the interviewee thinks the interviewer should know who he is talking about, but also follows the term neighbour by a specification, the neighbour's name. The pause gives reason to think that the speaker might change the strategy of introducing the referent midway through the utterance, making it a mixed strategy.

Gestures became an important feature in categorizing the last two examples as exophoric, but example (25) shows that they aren't a compulsory element in the Deixis-

am-Phantasma use. Example (25) also shows that if the speakers remain in that different deictic reality, the already named entities will also be mentioned with an exophoric *t*-based pronouns. The ending of that same example, where the Komi language, before mentioned with *тая*, is referred to with *сіен*, also shows, that the same entities can later be tracked by an endophoric pronoun, meaning that the speaker has probably moved away from the deictic projection.

It becomes clear from my material that some speakers are more prone to the Deixis-am-Phantasma use than others. While some speakers describe events that have happened and things outside of their real surroundings with endophoric pronouns, tracking with them the referents usually introduced by NPs, others will project things (or themselves) very easily. These instances of projection are often accompanied by hand motions and visible disconnection from their real surroundings – for example they often don't hold eye contact with their communication partner. This phenomena appears a lot in the recordings of Darja A. Kan'eva and Evgeni A. Iguśev. In Darja A. Kan'eva's extensive Deixis-am-Phantasma use another interesting things occurs. She uses both front vowel and back vowel stemmed *t*-based pronouns, but they don't seem to be motivated by a distance contrast. Once she even refers to the same imagined referent with different pronouns: when talking about her youngest son with whom and whose family she seems to live with, she gestures towards a certain direction, possibly their living spaces, but in example (28) she uses the proximal demonstrative *этая* and in example (29) the distal demonstrative *этія*. In example (28) she says that her youngest son speaks the Nenets language well and in example (29) she is talking about how everyone is drinking these days, but her husband didn't drink and neither does her youngest son.

(28)  DAKan'eva 25:39 – 25:43

DAK:  **Этая**[16]   код       меддзоля  пие,      Алёша,  милицияас
       DEM.PROX  who      SUPL.small  son.PX1SG Aljosha police.INE3SG

       рöбитэ      да    сыа      дзик яран    моз  сёрнитіс
       work.PRS.3SG and   DEM.DIST PART Nenets  like speak.PST.3SG

---

[16] Transcribed as *эта*, but I hear *этая*.

'This one who is my youngest son, Aljosha, works in the police and he just like a Nenets spoke (…)'

(29) DAKan'eva 01:01:52 - 01:01:55

DAK: *Менам*     **_этія_**     *меддзоля*     *пиэ*
      PRO.1SG.GEN    DEM.DIST     SUPL.small     son.PX1SG

      *оз*       *же*   *ю.*
      NEG.PRS.3SG    DP   drink.CN

'This youngest son of mine also doesn't drink.'

She also uses the same tactic when referring to her daughter-in-law and granddaughter – gesturing towards their presumed living space – but with them she only uses the proximal *t*-based stem.

In my analysis so far I have described *t*-based pronouns as the default exophoric pronouns. There were a few instances though where s-based pronouns were also used. In example (30) the speaker describes how he knows which fawn belongs to which reindeer. He illustrates it by actually pointing at the imagined reindeer and saying "this one's, this one's".

(30) APFilippov 12:40 – 12:46

APF: *Приметит-ан*     *и*     *бӧрвыы*   уже       *караляс,*
      notice(Ru.)-PRS.2SG   and    back     already(Ru.)   corral.INE3SG

      *аха,*   **_сы-лэн,_**     **_сы-лэн_**.
      aha   DEM.DIST-GEN     DEM.DIST-GEN

'You notice and already back in the corral, aha, this one's, this one's.'

Since we haven't so far had a clear example of distance contrast we can't rule out that *сыа* can be used exophorically to indicate just that. In this example it seems unlikely though, since nothing indicates the imagined reindeer being far away. The speaker makes two pointing gestures, one closer to him and other a bit further, but uses the same

pronoun for both of them. What might be the motivation here is that *сыа* also functions as a 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun. This possible motivation seems also possible in example (31), taken from an additional recording named *Манифа Ефимовна Вокуева*[17], where the speaker is describing how if some people knew each-other, they knew what was sewn by who. All the demonstratives are accompanied by a pointing gesture and while the *s*-based pronouns do get a gesture pointing more to the distance than the *t*-based ones, they also represent an animate entity, a human who has made the inanimate thing or things.

(31)  *Манифа Ефимовна Вокуева* 40:03–40:16

MJV:  Например,         код       ёрта-ёртныссэ           тödэныс
      for_example(Ru.)   PRO.Q    PRO.REFL.PX3PL.ACC3SG   know.PRS.3PL

      да    ная      даже   ылысянь   аддзеныс:      аха,   **этая=сэ**
      and   DEM.PL   even   far.EGR   see.PRS.3PL    aha    DEM.PROX=CNTR

      *сie,*            *сыа=сэ*            вурема      **этie**[18]
      (correction)     DEM.DIST=CNTR       sew.PERF    DEM.DIST.ACC

      *сыасэ*              вурема,      а     **этie**            точно.
      DEM.DIST=CNTR        sew.PERF     but   DEM.DIST.ACC        exactly(Ru.)

'For example, who know each other well, they even from far away see: ahaa, this one, sewn by her, that one sewn by her, but that one – exactly.'

This kind of motivation, if true, isn't very common though, in my data there are more examples where animate entities are exophorically referred to with a *t*-based pronoun, like examples (32) and (33) where the interviewees describe the times when they knew instantly where someone wanted to go and which bus they needed to take for that.

---

[17] The speaker is a woman from the Murmansk Oblast, born in 1944.

[18] Transcribed as <этiя> but I hear *этie*.

(32)  AEKan'eva & VIKan'ev 40:55–41:03

VIK:  *остановка*  *вылас*  *йӧзыс*  *неуна*  *сулалэны,*
      busstop      on.ILL.PX3SG  people.PX3SG  not.many  stand.PRS.3PL

      *видзедан,*  *мортыс*  *кыче,*  *аа,*  **тая**  *оз*
      see.PRS.3SG person.PX.3SG  where.ILL  aa  DEM.PROX  NEG.PRS.3SG

      *сэтче*  *мун,*  *он*  *сут*  *да*  *водзе*  *мунан* .
      there   go.CN  NEG.PRS.2SG  stop.CN  and  forward  go.PRS.2SG

      да и всё
      and_all(Ru.)

 '(…) some people are standing at the busstop, you see where a person wants to go, oh,
this one doesn't go there, you don't stop and go forward and that's it.'


(33)  AEKan'eva & VIKan'ev 41:14–41:18

AEK:  **Этая**  *номерыс*  **эта-лэн**,
      DEM.PROX  number.PX.3SG  DEM.PROX-GEN

      **эта**  **эта-лэн**,  *ставсэ*  *тӧдiм*.
      DEM.PROX  DEM.PROX-GEN  all.ACC3SG  know.PST.1PL

'This number to this one, this to this one, we knew everything.'


When it comes to number, in example (26) we can once again see a singular pronoun
used to modify a plural noun. The *n*-based plural forms can also be used for Deixis-am-
Phantasma. The following example is in its context clearly a case of just that – the
speaker, a former kindergarten teacher, is describing how some kids were not happy that
they were left out of a Komi only group.


(34)  AEKan'eva and VIKan'ev 33:29–33:37

AEK:  *Ӧстальнэйыс*  *ӧбижайтчены,*  *мый*  *вот*
      the_ones_left.PX3SG  take_offence.PRS.3PL  COMP  IP

      *Анна Ефимовна*  **энаес**  *босьтэ,*  **накед**
      Anna Efimovna  DEM.PL.ACC  take.PRS.3SG  DEM.PL.COM

| *коми* | песня-*яс* | *сьылэ,* | *а* | *миянтэ* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| komi | song(Ru.)-PL | sing.PRS.3SG | but | PRO.1PL.ACC |

| *оз* | *бось* |
|---|---|
| NEG.PRS.3SG | take.CN |

'The ones left get offended, that Anna Efimovna takes these, sings Komi songs with them, but doesn't take us.'

Another clear case of Deixis-am-Phantasma using plural pronouns can be seen in the recording with titled *Манифа Ефимовна Вокуева*. In this example she is describing the life in the chums. All the plural pronouns are also accompanied by gestures.

(35) *Манифа Ефимовна Вокуева* 36:26–36:35

| MFV: | Часть | *дежуритэныс.* | На со-, | **ная** | *дежуритэныс*, |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | a_part(Ru.) | be_on_duty.PRS.3SG | (correction) | DEM.PL | be_on_duty.PRS.3SG |

| *а* | **эна** | *бара мӧдасылас* | *мунэныс* | на | смену, |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| but | DEM.PROX.PL.SF | again tomorrow.INE3SG | go.PRS.3PL | to_shift(Ru.) | |

| **эная** | *локтэны* |
|---|---|
| DEM.PROX.PL | come.PRS.3PL |

'Some are on duty. They are on duty, but these go again on duty the other morning, these come back (…)'

The pronoun transcribed as <*ная*> sounds like it could also be *эная* and *эна* was originally transcribed <*эная*>. While the first and last pronoun refer to people who are supposed to be on duty, away from the chum, the speaker seems to be referring to them by pointing to their imagined sleeping places, as she has described before how people were sleeping on both sides from her imagined deictic centre. This could be the reason why all the demonstratives used were proximal.

When searching the corpus for more *n*-based forms with the *e*-prefix attached, we can also find it used for tracking though (see example (48) from subchapter 4.2.2.1).

4.2.2 Endophoric use

Demonstratives are used endophorically when to they refer to entities from the surrounding discourse – anaphorically if the entity is preceeding and cataphorically if it is following. As Fedjuneva pointed out, already in Proto Finno-Ugric the *s*-based demonstratives are thought to have been used anaphorically. In Komi the main endophoric demonstrative pronoun also seems to be the *s*-based *сыа* (*сія* for some speakers), used both anaphorically and cataphorically.

4.2.2.1   Tracking use

Tracking use is the most widely occurring deictic use in my data, making up 901 of all the uses. 808 of these uses are pronominal, 69 adnominal and 24 appear in a postpositional construction as a short form of the demonstrative. The following forms were used for tracking: *сы, сыа, сія ~ сіа, сійö, сіе, сіес, сылэн, сылöн, сылы, сыкэд, сыкöд, сылысь, сыысь, ны, на, ныа, ная, наа, найö, нае, ніе, наес, ные, нылэн, налэн, налöн, накед, наköд, нылы, налы, налысь, ныысь* and *тія\*, эта\** . In addition to demonstrative pronouns it is possible to track referents through verb endings and possessive suffixes. This means that pronouns are not actually necessary, making Komi a pro-drop language. In example (36) the interviewee is speaking about her and her friend, but no pronouns are used. It is still understandable who she is talking about since the verbs have a first plural (and in the case of the interviewer – second plural) ending.

(36)   DAKan'eva 09:42 – 09:46

DAK: *Быд    пöра,    и    первей  местэ  пыр    босьт-і-м.*
    every    time    and    first    place    always    take-PST-1PL

MSF: Передовикъ-*яс    вöл-і-нныд?*
    leader(Ru.)-PL        be-PST-2PL

'Every time, and we always took the first place.' 'You were leaders?'

Both pronominal forms and adnominal construction containing demonstratives can function as subjects (examples (37) (38)), objects (examples (39) (40)) and different adverbials (examples (41) (42)).


(37)   AFXozjainov 35:12 – 35:16

AFX:   *Тандзе Марьяыслэн*        *керкаыс*        ***сыа***        *энi*
       Tandze Mar'ja.PX3SG.GEN   house.PX3SG   DEM.DIST   now

       *миян*   *энi*     детскей сад
       PRO.1SG   now     kindergarten(Ru.)

'Tandze Mar'ja's house, that is now our kindergarten …'


(38)   MVFilippova 25:09-25:13

NTP:   *Сiйö*        *кытысь*        *вöлi?*
       DEM.DIST   where.ELA       be.PST.3SG

VPC:   *Сыа*        ***Ыджыдвидзысь.***
       DEM.DIST   Ydžydvidz.ELA

MVF:   *А*      *кытэн*   ***сыа***   ***Ыджыдвидз?***
       but    where   DEM.DIST   Ydžydvidz

'NTP: Where was he from? VPC: He was from Ydžydvidz. MVF: But where is that Ydžydvidz?'


(39)   AJTerent'ev 05:00 – 05:04

AJT:   *ми,*        *изьватасыс,*        *кöсъям*        *босьны*
       PRO.1PL   Iz'vatas.PX3SG   want.PRS.1PL   take.INF

       статус "коренного малочисленного народа Севера".
       status_native_minority_people_of_north(Ru.)

       *Миян*        ***сie***        *оз*        *сетны.*
       PRO.1PL.GEN   DEM.DIST.ACC   NEG.3SG   give.INF

'(…) we, the Iz'vatas, want to get the status of "Indigenous Minority People of the North". But they don't feel like qiving it us.'

(40) FTDavydova 05:28 – 05:31 … 06:32 – 06:35

FTD: *Кыксё*        *челядь*      *миян*        *велэдче,*      *даже*
     two_hundred   children   PRO.1PL.GEN   study.PRS.3SG   even

     *ундзык.*      *Ми*        *сідз*    *воспитывайтам,*   *сідз*   *велэдам*
     many.CMP     PRO.1PL    so       educate.PRS.1PL    so      teach.PRS.1PL

     ***сіе***           ***челядьяссэ.***
     DEM.DIST.ACC       children.PL.ACC3SG

'Two hundred children study here, even more (…) We educate, teach these children in
that way.'


(41) APFilippov 18:05 – 18:10

APF: *Иван Иваныч*     *вöлі,*        ***сыкед***          смена        .
     Ivan Ivanovič    be.PST.3SG   DEM.DIST.COM       shift(Ru.)

     *вылын*   *вöлім.*
     POST     be.PST.1PL

'There was Ivan Ivanovič, with him we were on the same shift.'å


(42) AEKan'eva & VIKan'ev 20:49–20:54, 21:08–21:14

MSF: *A*    ***Устеас***    *сэк*     *вööяссэ*        *разводитісны*
     but   Uste.INE3SG   then      horse.PL.ACC3SG   breed.PST.3PL

     *или*   *видзисны*      *бура,*        *из?*
     or     keep.PST.3PL   good.ADV      NEG.PRS.3SG

MSF: *зэй*   *удивительнэ,*   *мый*     *öні*   *вööяссэ*
     very   surprising     COMP     now    horse.PL.ACC3SG

     ***сыа***       ***местаас***    *зэй*    *заводитісны.*
     DEM.DIST     place.INE3SG   very    start_to_get.PST.3PL

'But in Uste at that time horses were bred or kept a lot, no? … very surprising that
horses are now so much bred in that place.'


Example (37) also illustrates a strategy mentioned by Diessel – following new topics
with a demonstrative right away, to signal the topicality of the entity.

Short forms mostly appear with postpositions and form an adverbial construction.

(43) FTDavydova 14:59–15:04

FTD: *Кык детина воисныс,* *зэй томесь.* *И* *ме* *оттони*
NUM  boy    come.PST.3PL  very  young.PL  and  PRO.1SG  constantly

*ны* *бöрын* *видеді …*
DEM.PL.SF  after.INE  look.PST.1SG

'Two boys come, they are very young. And I constantly kept an eye on them …'

There were a few instances where the short form was used adnominally. According to X this is to be expected in Ižma Komi, but looking at their occurrence rate, this does not seem like a productive tendancy.

(44) FTDavydova 04:35–04:39; 05:03–05:06

FTD: *И* *менэ* *сэтче* *пригласитісны* *сэтче* *центрас*
and  PRO.1SG.ACC  here.ILL  invite.PST.3PL  here.ILL  centre.INE3SG

*рöбитны.* *И* *рöбита* *це-,* *вот* *сы* *центрас*
work.INF  and  work  (correction)  IP  DEM.DIST.SF  centre.INE3SG''

'And I was invited here to work in the centre (…) And I work in this centre (…)'

So far we have mostly looked at examples with singular demonstratives, although the plural *n*-stem can be seen in example (43) where it is used as a short form in a postpositional construction. If we look at the prefixless forms *ныа* and *ная*, which in literature are already considered personal or demonstrative-personal pronouns, we can see they mostly appear pronominally.

(45) IGTerent'eva 05:00–05:05

VPC: *А* *тэ* *наес* *пöнимайтін?*
But  you  DEM.PL.ACC  understand.PST.2SG

IGT:  *Me*    ***nie***[19]    *пӧнимайта*    *мыляке,*    *но*    *мен*
PRO.1SG    DEM.PL.ACC    understand.PRS.1SG    somehow    DP    PRO.1SG.DAT

*зэй*    *кокни*    *вӧлiс*    ***нie***    *пӧймитны.*
very    easy    be.PST.3SG    DEM.PL.ACC    understand.INF

'But you understood them?' 'I somehow understand them, well it was very easy for me to understand them,'

Adnominally they only acted as possessors.

(46)   AJTerent'ev 03:10–03:18

AJT:  *Зэй*    *любита,*    *ӧ,*    *тӧдмасьны*    ***выль йӧзкед,***
very    love.PRS.1SG    INTERJ    become_aquainted_with.INF    new    people.COM

*тӧдмавны*    ***на-лэн***    ***культура*** *йылысь,*    *кытысь*    *ныа.*
find_out.INF    DEM.PL-GEN    culture    over.ELA    where.ELA    DEM.PL

'I very much love to, ee, get aquainted with new people, find out about their culture, where they are from.'

In my data there was one case though, where the *e*-prefixless *n*-based pronoun could have been used adnominally. In example (47) the interviewer is asking about the differences of Izhma Komi and Nenets traditional clothing. The interviewee confirms that they are different and goes on to describe a certain clothing object, asking, if the interviewer has seen such a thing. When the interviewer says that she has, the interviewee says the following:

(47)   DAKan'eva

DAK:  *Сэтшемес*    *вед*    ***ныа***[20]    *ненкаясыс*    *ноолэныс …*
that_kind.ACC1SG    DP    DEM.PL    Nenets.PL.PX3SG    wear.PRS.3PL

---

[19] Initially transcribed as <ны>, but the speaker shortens her vowels and otherwise uses *нie* accusative, so it is probably *нie*, but phonetically ambiguous.

[20] Originally transcribed as <ная>, but I hear *ныа* – the form that the speker mostly uses.

'Well that kind of thing these Nenets wear …'

The translation in the corpus considers this a case of pronominal use where the intended referent is repeated with a NP right after, but in my opinion the utterance lacks the necessary prosody for that explanation. Even if this is an adnominal *e*-prefixless *n*-based pronoun, though, it is an isolate case in my material.

Since *n*-based forms with the *e*-prefix also appeared rarely in my initial data and were all used exophorically, I searched the corpus for more such forms. In at least one instance such a form was used endophorically for tracking. In the recording titled *Мария Павловна Чупрова*[21] the interviewer wants to know when and why the interviewee's parents moved to the village she was born at.

(48)  *Мария Павловна Чупрова* 07:05–07:09

MSF:  *Но    сыа        артме,              мый      вӧйнаэдзыс        нин*
      DP    DEM.DIST    turn_out.PRS.3SG    COMP     war.TERM.PX3SG    already

      *ная*[22]  *локтісны.      Да?*
      DEM.PL    come.PST.3PL    yes

MPČ:  *Ну    да*,    наверно.
      DP    yes    probably(Ru.)

MSF:  *А  эна*[23]                *из              висьтоолыны,    мый*
      but    DEM.PROX.PL.SF    NEG.PRS.3PL    tell.INF         COMP

      *кодкеэс              сэн      раскулачитэмаась    или    мый*
      PRO.INDF.ACC1SG    there    make_a_kulak.PERF.PL    or    what

      *ли      локтэмаась*
      QPART    come.PERF.PL

---

[21] The interviewee is a woman born in 1939 in the Nenets Autonomous Region and currently living in Naryan Mar. The interviewer is Marina S. Fedina, who is also mentioned in the Appendix: Data.

[22] Transcribed as <ныа>, I hear something more towards *ная*. In other recordings the speaker also tends to use *ная*.

[23] Transcribed as <эная>, I hear the short form *эна*. This of course would mean that the pronominal use of the short form of a demonstrative is not only restricted to *эта*.

'MSF: So it turns out they already came before the war. Yes? MPČ: Well yes, probably. MSF: But they didn't tell you that someone there was made a kulak or why did they come?'

The *e*-prefix seems to signal some kind of emphasis here. One explanation for it would be to differentiate between the interviewee's parents and other people who moved to that village. In the beginning the interviewer inquires only about the parents but the topic then shifts to other villagers who had moved there from the same place. The interviewer asks about the amount of families who had moved, but the interviewee doesn't remember anymore. The interviewer then asks:

(49)  *Мария Павловна Чупрова* 06:51–06:53

MSF:  *А      кутшем  воын      нэ     наа       локтісны?*
      but    which    year.INE   DP     DEM.PL    come.PST.3PL

'But what year did they come?'

It is possible that example (49) was incorrectly transcribed and the question actually was:

MSF:  *А      кутшем  воын      эна                локтісны?*
      but    which    year.INE   DEM.PROX.PL.SF     come.PST.3PL

'But what year did THEY come?'

This would make sense for many reasons. Firstly – it does sound like it and the linguistic context of example (49) would make it easy to attribute the /n/ from the end of воын to the particle *нэ* and mistranscribe the utterance. The эна form the speaker uses in example (48) can be heard pretty clearly, making it sure that such a form belongs to the vocabulary of the speaker. Use of a marked form could be a strategy to move the topic back to specific entities. In example (48) it would also make sense if the form *эна* would refer to the interviewee's parents not the whole village people, since the parents are most likely to tell their kids about family and local history.

As a last remark on the *e*-prefix use in this subchapter I would like to add, that while the *n*-based forms with the prefix were not used often, no *s*-based forms with an *e*-prefix appeared in my initial data, but from the rest of the corpus we can find one instance. In the following example the interviewee is talking about her forefathers and foremothers, mentioning where they were from. Emphatic э- might be triggered by the contrast, because before she was telling about her grandmother who's heritage was different.


(50)    Irina Viktorovna Kan'eva 01:33–01:41

IVK:    В общем,        *Павел Васильевич*    *вӧлic*        *дед*            ...
        in_general(Ru.)    Pavel   Vasil'evič    be.PST.3SG    grandfathe

        *менам*          **Эсія**        *Бакурысь.*
        PRO.1SG.GEN      DEM.DIST    Bakur.ELA

'In general, Pavel Vasil'evič was my grandfather (…) He was from Bakur.'


In the chapter about exophoric use we saw that semantic plurality could also be expressed with singular pronouns. In endophoric use the same phenomena appears a few times in adnominal constructions (see also example (40)). This explains the lack of adnominal *n*-based forms a bit, but in general it seems that plural entities are mostly tracked with pronominal forms. When it comes to pronominal forms, Fedjuneva mentions that in Komi Permyak a singular demonstrative used as a 3rd person pronoun can also be used in a plural meaning, but she hasn't seen such a function in Komi. I did find some examples of it in my initial data and also the rest of the corpus.[24] In example (51) the use of a singular pronoun could be triggered by the fact that morphologically the coreferential noun *вокыс* isn't marked for plural, since it is modified by a number. It remains plural semantically though and the verb 'to drink', which the singular *сыа* is the subject of, appears with a 3rd person plural marking.

---

[24] I won't include here the instances that had more to do with part versus whole relationship, for example when reindeers were sometimes mentioned in plural, sometimes in singular, but the singular forms actually referred to the species in general.

(51) DAKan'eva 01:01:58–01.02.02

DAK:  *A*    *куим,*   **кык**   **вокыс**          *кӧрдорас=сэ*
      but    three    two       brother.px3sg      tundra.INE3SG=CNTR

      **сыа**     *юэныс.*
      DEM.DIST    drink.PRS.3PL

'But three, two brothers in tundra, they drink.'

Example (52) doesn't have the triggering singular morphology, the speaker, also featured in examples (48) and (49), is telling about how her parents moved to a new village. She first talks about her mother, then mentions her father and after that they make a plural unit referred to as *ния*. All the verbs also have a plural ending, including the one for which the subject is the singular form *сія*. This speaker uses this kind of semantically-plural-morphologically-singular form a few more times during her interview.

(52) Maria Pavlovna Čuprova 0:00:53–00:01:01

MPČ:  *воисныс*      **ния**[25]   *Смекаловкаа*      *Вот* **сія**        *во**исныс.***
      come.PST.3PL   DEM.PL       Smekalovka.INE    IP    DEM.DIST       come.PST.3PL

'(…) they came to Smekalovka (…) And so they came.'

As can be seen, the *s*-based forms are the most productive for tracking use. Cases where referents were tracked with *t*-based pronouns seem to fall under some type of Deixis-am-Phantasma, meaning that they were treated exophorically. There was one instance that caught my eye though. In example (53) the speaker uses a *t*-based pronoun to track a participant just mentioned.

---

[25] Transcribed as <ныа> but I hear *ния*. Some other istances by the same speaker instances are also transcribed as <ния> in the corpus.

(53) DAKan'eva 01:01:17–01:01:22

DAK:  *Вот* *эні* *вокыс*     *тай*   ***тія***     *гӧвно*
      IP   now   brother.PX3SG  DP     DEM.DIST   shit

      *татэн*          *шляйтче*
      here.INE loiter.   PRS.3SG ....

'Well now his brother, that shit, loiters around here …'


While I wouldn't rule out Deixis-am-Phantasma use here – the speaker is prone to it and doesn't hold eye-contact with the interviewer during the utterance – it is also possible that the motivation behind the *t*-based form was (negative) emotion, since it modifies a noun with very negative connotations. Looking at the chosen pronoun more closely, we can also see that it is a distal form of the *t*-based demonstratives. In the beginning of chapter 2 I briefly describe the affective use which plays a role in pronoun selection in many languages and distal demonstratives are often associated with less positive things.


4.2.2.2   Discourse deictic use


The discourse deictic use accounts for 238 of all uses. 191 of them are pronominal, 21 adnominal and 26 postpositional constructions with a short form of the pronoun. The following forms appeared in my data: *сы, сыа, сія, сіе, сіес, сіен, сыын, сыысь, та, тае, таысь, эта, это**.

Discourse deictics can be separated to anaphoric (example (54)) and cataphoric (example (55)). According to my data the anaphoric use is more prominent, accounting to 197 cases. In Komi the anaphoric and cataphoric use don't differ in form.


(54)   IGTerent'eva 05:05–05:15

IGT:   *А,*   *даже*   *ме,*    *навернэ,*  *тӧда*        *став*   *кыысэ,*
       and   even     pro.1SG  probably    know.PRS.1SG  all      word.ACC3SG

| *но* | *ме* | *ог* | *вермы* | *сіе* | *висьтооны,* |
|------|------|------|---------|-------|--------------|
| but | PRO.1SG | NEG.PRS.1SG | can.CN | DEM.DIST.ACC | say.INF |

| *ме* | всё равно | *ас* | *диалектнам* | *сёрнита.* |
|------|-----------|------|--------------|------------|
| PRO.1SG | anyway(Ru.) | own | dialect.INS1SG | speak.PRS.1SG |

| *И* | **сыа** | *зэй* | *тöдче.* |
|-----|---------|-------|---------|
| and | DEM.DIST | very | be_apparent.PRS.3SG |

'And I even, probably, know all the words, but I can't say them, I anyway speak in my own dialect. And that is very apparent.'


(55)  APFilippov 21:20–21:25

| MSF: | *Ме* | *и то* | **сіес** | *тöда,* | *мый* |
|------|------|--------|----------|---------|-------|
|      | PRO.1SG | DP | DEM.DIST.ACC | know.PRS.1SG | COMP |

| *кöчыс* | *абу* | *хищник.* |
|---------|-------|-----------|
| hare.PX3SG | NEG | predator(Ru.) |

'That even I know, that the hare isn't a predator.'


As with tracking use, short forms were usually used with postpositions (example (56)), but there were also a few instances were they appeared adnominally (example (57)).


(56)  DAKan'eva 43:00–43:09

| DAK: | *кор* | *дедколы* | *этае* | *квартира-сэ* |
|------|-------|-----------|--------|---------------|
|      | when | old_man.DAT | DEM.PROX.ACC | apartement(Ru.)-ACC3SG |

| *сетісныс,* | *ми* | **сы** | *бöрын* | *эстче* | *ооны=сэ* |
|-------------|------|--------|---------|---------|----------|
| give.PST.3PL | PRO.1PL | DEM.DIST.SF | after.INE | here.ILL | live.INF=CNTR |

| *лэччим.* |
|-----------|
| go_down.PST.1PL |

'When my husband was given this apartment, we after that came to live down here.'


(57)  FTDavydova 07:06–07:10

| FTD: | **сы** | *семьяын,* | *кöн* | *сёрнитэныс* | *ас* |
|------|--------|-----------|-------|-------------|------|
|      | DEM.DIST.SF | family.INE | where | speak.PRS.3PL | own |

 

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *кыы* | *вылынас* | |
| language | POST.INE3SG | |

'(…) in that family, where they speak their own language.'

No *n*-based plural forms appeared in my data, but there were a few cases where a singular adnominal pronoun modified a plural head, like in example (58).

(58) AJTerent'ev 03:54–04:00

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AJT: | *кутшем* | *кыыяс* | *ме* | *велэда* | *и* | *тӧда,* |
| | what_kind | language.PL | PRO.1SG | study.PRS.1SG | and | know.PRS.1S |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ***сыа*** | *местаясас* | бы | *ветлыны* … |
| | DEM.DIST | place.PL.INE3SG | COND(Ru.) | go.INF |

'(…) what languages I study and know, to these places [I] would go (…)

While *s*-based demonstratives are still the most productive choice in this category also, the *t*-based pronouns also make an appearance. One of the interviewers uses *t*-based discourse deictics four times. While the discourse deictic function in example (59) seems clear, it is possible that the use of a *t*-based pronoun was triggered by some kind of an exophoric, most likely Deixis-am-Phantasma related notion the speaker was sensing. As mentioned in subchapter 4.2.1.3 the amount of deictic projection differed between speakers, with some of them being affected by it constantly and some almost never.

(59) LPČuprova 00:49–00-58

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| VPC: | *Кутшем* | *тэнад* | *тундра* | *дорас,* | *кутшем* | *тэнад* |
| | what_kind | PRO.2SG.GEN | tundra | at.INE.PX3SG | what_kind | PRO.2SG.GE |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *казьтылэмъяс,* | воспоминание-*яс,* | *кутшем* | *тэнад* |
| | memory.PL | recollection.(Ru.)-PL | what_kind | PRO.2SG.GEN |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | отношение | *кӧр* | *видзем* | *дорас?* | *Мый* | *тэ* |
| | relationship(Ru.) | reindeer | herding | at.INE.PX3SG | what | PRO.2SG |

| | |
|---|---|
| *кыы* | *вылынас* |

65

| ***та*** | *йылысь* | *верман* | *висьтооны?* |
|---|---|---|---|
| DEM.PROX.SF | over.ELA | can.PRS.2SG | tell.INF |

'How do you feel about the Tundra, what are your memories, recollections, how is your relationship with reindeer herding? What can you tell about that?'

### 4.2.3 Recognitional use

Due to the nature of the material, the recognitional use is very scarce in my data., accounting only to four instances, some of which are probably not purely recognitional. In many cases the interviewers and interviewees don't seem to know each other beforehand and even if they do, the format of the interview keeps the communication more formal than a regular conversation between these people might be.

In subchapter 4.2.1.3 examples of Deixis-am-Phantasma use were compared to recognitional use, showing the possible similarities in these uses. In a way some of these examples could be considered a mixed strategy, especially if a part of the speaker's motive was the presumption that the referent is shared knowledge. Example (60) falls into the same category. The same interviewer and interviewee as in example (27) talk about airtransport in the area.

(60)  AFXozjainov 23:25–23:35

AFX:  *A* семесят,  семесят седьмой  или  семесят восьмой-*ын*
      and  seventy (Ru.)  seventy seventh (Ru.)  or (Ru.)  seventy eighth-INE

      *миян,*  ***эта***  ТУ-сто пейсят четыре-*ыс*  *код*
      PRO.1PL.GEN  DEM.PROXS.SF  TU hundred fifty four.PX3SG  PRO.Q

      *тай*[26] *пуксьыліс*  *ыджыдыс,*  *вот*  *сіе*  .
      PART  land.PST.3SG  big.PX3SG  IP  DEM.DIST.ACC

      *аэродромсэ*  *карисны*
      airport.ACC3SG  make.PST.3PL

---

[26] The discourse particle *тай* used in that sentence sounds to me like it could also be *тая*.

'And in seventy, seventy seven or seventy eight here this TU-154 landed, the big one, that airport was built.'

While the demonstrative *эта* is accompanied by a head nod in a certain direction, the referent – TU-154 – is also followed by a specification – something common to the recognitional use. The fact that the referent is of low topicality and isn't tracked further is also characteristic to recognitional use. It is questionable if the interviewee would mention this plane at all to people who he wouldn't think would know anything about it.

In example (61), again from the recording where the speakers are from the same village and know each other, the referent, professor Bušar, seems to be introduced with the help of a recognitional demonstrative. He has not been mentioned before and comes up as a way to illustrate that the interviewee's daughter is good at internet communication and keeping in touch.

(61)  AFXozjainov 37:42–37:53

AFX:  *Но*    *миян*         *Алёна,*   *например,*         **э타я**[27]    *Бушаркед*
      DP     PRO.1PL.GEN    Aljona     for_example(Ru.)   DEM.PROX     Bušar.COM

      *да*    *мый*    *да,*    **эта**             *профессор*   *Канадасьыс*        *да,*
      and    what     and     DEM.PROX.SF        professor     Canada.ELA.PX3SG   now

      *öнi*    на связь          *öнэдз*       *на*      *кутэ.*
      now     in_touch(Ru.)    now.TERM     still    keep.PRS.3SG

VPC:  *Ная*       *ветлалiсны*          *тшöтш*     *экспедицияэн,*
      DEM.PL     go_around.PST.3PL    also       expedition.INSTR

      *фольклорнэй,*    *да,*    *да*
      folklore.ADJ      yes     yes

'AFX: Well our Aljona, for example, with that Bušar or that, that professor from Canada, now is in touch, until now keeps in touch. VPC: They also went together on an expedition, a folkloristic one, yes yes.'

---

[27] Transcribed as <эта>, I hear the long form *этая*.

This low topicality of the referent, preceeding specifications about him (a professor from Canada) and the fact that the interviewer signals that he has recognized the referent make this the clearest case of recognitional use in my data. Unfortunately in the video part of this recording the scene has frozen, so we don't know if any gestural activity is happening in the speech situation and can't compare it to Deixis-Am-Phantasma use as we have done with other examples.

4.2.4  Using demonstratives as filler words

In Komi, like in many other languages, demonstratives can be used as filler words. Hayashi and Yoon focus on the demonstrative fillers used in case of word-formation trouble and separate them into two more specific categories. I did that only for some instances, where it seemed clear what the motivation behind the demonstrative was – to hold a place for an upcoming referent that the speaker already had in mind but for some reason couldn't produce (e.g. placeholders), or to signal general hesitation (e.g. interjectional hesitators). I will also describe other pragmatic functions of demonstrative fillers I encountered in my material.

In my data demonstrative fillers accounted for 93 uses and the following demonstratives were used: *эта, этая, этае, этiя, этiе, сыа* and *сiе*.

The most used demonstrative fillers were *t*-based demonstratives with an *e*-prefix. They could be used as both placeholders and interjectional hesitators and they also served the pragmatic function of signaling an upcoming speech act.

Example (62) contains two demonstrative fillers, both in the form of *эта*, but their pragmatic function is different. The first *эта* is used to signal a topic change or better yet – a return to the old topic. The interviewee is describing how she and her husband met and got together.

(62)   AEKan'eva and VIKan'ev 01:26–01:44

AEK: *познакомитчим*     *и*     *влюбитчим.*     *Хаха.*     *Миян*
get_aquainted.PST.1PL    and    fall_in_love.PST.1PL   haha    PRO.1PL.GEN

*первей любовь.*     *И*     ***эта,***     *помалім*     *сіе,*
first_love(Ru.)     and    DEM.PROX.SF   graduate.PST.1PL    DEM.DIST.ACC

*ся*     *Сыктывкарын*     *ме*     *велэдчи*     *помалі*     ***эта***
after    Syktyvkar.INE     PRO.1SG   study.PST.1SG   graduate.PST.1SG   DEM.PROX.SF

*воспитатель* *вылэ,*     *дошкольнэй*    педучилище.
educator(Ru.)    on.ILL    preschool     pedagocial_school(Ru.)

'(…) we got aquainted and fell in love. Haha. Our first love. So, we graduated it [the school], then I studied in Syktyvkar, graduated, umm, as an educator, a preschool pedagogy school.'

The phrase 'our first love' interrupts the narrative for a moment. She signals the return to the chronological narrative with the demonstrative *эта*. The second *эта* is elongated a bit and the motivation for its use seems to be either to signal that the speaker isn't sure how to exactly end the sentence or that she has trouble coming up with the wanted form. Either way, she seems to already have in mind what she want's to say, just not how she's going to say it. In my opinion this use falls somewhere beteen a placeholder and interjectional hesitator, but the hesitation part they both convey is definitely present.

In example (63) the topic is a healer who used to live in the village both the interviewer and interviewee are from. The interviewee talks about the healer and then comments on how people like this do exist, but nowadays there are less. The interviewer then brings the topic bask to the specific local healer they were talking about before.

(63)    AFXozjainov 07:43–07:47

VPC:   *A*     ***этія,***     *нук-нучкаясыс*        *Тандзе Марьялэн*
a    DEM.DIST    grandson-granddaughter.PL.PX3SG   Tandze   Mar'ja.GEN

*выйымесь*     *на?*
exist.PL      still

'So, are there still grandchildren of Tandze Marja left?'

Hayashi and Yoon (2010: 54) make is clear that they don't consider demonstratives used during word-formation trouble to fit into any of the traditionally described use types of demonstratives (as are exophoric, endophoric and recognitional here), but I see a clear link between some of the instances where the speaker has trouble with word formation and exophoric use, more specifically the Deixis-Am-Phantasma use. In example (64) the speaker has trouble with remembering the name of a specific person. The interviewer asks if there are any farmers in the woman's home village and she says there are, but then has trouble with coming up with the specific name. She looks to her husband to help her out, but the name that her husband suggests is not the one she meant, so she continues trying to remember the right name, using placeholders in the process.

(64)    AEKan'eva and VIKan'ev 24:07–24:15

AEK:    *Абу, абу,* **эта**,       *Маша  нима*     **эта**,         *выйым*
        NEG   NEG  DEM.PROX.SF  Maša    name.ADJ   DEM.PROX.SF  exist

        **эта**,         *сылэн*          *мӧсъяс.*
        DEM.PROX.SF   DEM.DIST.GEN      cow.PL

'No, no, this one, the one called Maša, this one is, she has cows.'


While searching for the correct word, she looks away from her conversation partners, a feature common for the Deixis-Am-Phantasma use in my data. It seems that she is able to see the referent in her imagination, but has trouble with naming them, prompting the placeholder / Deixis-Am-Phantasma use of the demonstrative. In the end she seems to have established the referent well enough to go on with the sentence, the last *эта* seems to be more confirming than searching, but still directed towards the imagination. Having established the referent she comes out of the state of deictic projection and tracks the referent with an *s*-based pronoun. The fact that the intended referent is somehow activated in the speaker's imagination would make sense. In example S we see the speaker looking up when searching for the word 'rocket'.

(65)   AEKan'ev and VIKan'ev 55:11–55:18

VIK:   *Но,*   *но,*   **эта***,*       *ракетаыс*       *кор*       *кыпедче*
         DP    DP    DEM.PROX.SF  rocket.PX3SG  when    launch.PRS.3SG

'Yes, yes, what-do-you-call-it, rocket when launches (…)'

As Hayashi and Yoon mention, demonstratives can also be a part of constructions that function as placeholders. In chapter 3.2 *тайми* and *сы мый* were mentioned as placeholders in Komi. The first one is already a grammaticalized particle and while it did appear in my material, not much attention was given to it. The construction *сы мый* did not appear in my data. What did appear was a set of constructions that could be gathered under the general meaning of "how to say it". All of them were formed with *s-*based pronouns. In example (66) two constructions of this type can be seen. Shorter versions like *кудз сыа / сіе* that leave out the verb were also used.

(66)   AEKan'eva and VIKan'ev 22:34–22:47

MSF:   *кудз*   **сіе**          *висьтооны,*   *кудз*   **сыа**
       how    DEM.DIST.ACC    say.INF      how    DEM.DIST

       *шусе,*              *вӧлыс*       *кор*   *уж, а*   *мӧдыс?*
       be_called.PRS.3SG    horse.PX3SG  when  už  but  other.PX3SG

'(…) how is it said, how to call it, if a (male) horse is *už*, then the other one?'

## 4.2.5 Additional observations

In this subchapter I will present two demonstrative pronoun related observations that didn't fit to be described elsewhere.

In some of the instances where demonstratives were used they were actually a part of a lexicalized construction. Some of these constructions were already described in the previous chapter where they functioned as placeholders. In addition demonstratives could be seen in lexicalized constructions such as *сыа и выйым тая* ('that is it'), *öті и сіе же* ('one and the same'), *сіе же* ('the same'), *сы мыйта* ('so many') and *тае тай* (a discourse particle).

Secondly I would like to mention a use not discussed in this work before – a demonstrative as a pseudo-article. The only occurrence of it in my data was example (67), where the interviewees are a married couple who have been together since the age of 15. The interviewer expresses her admiration:

(67)   AEKan'eva and VIKan'ev 58:16–58:23

MSF:   *вот*   *колэ*        *пример*   *тіянсьыныд*   *босьны,*
       IP     need.PRS.3SG   example    PRO.ELA2PL     take.INF

       *кудз*   **сыа**       *семьясэ*        *кутны.*
       how     DEM.DIST      family.ACC3SG    keep.INF

'(…) people have to set you as an example, how to keep the family.'

The demonstrative *сыа* in this example doesn't refer to a certain family but rather the concept of family in general.

## 5.  CONCLUSIONS

The Ižma Komi corpus offers a valuable material for studying spoken Ižma Komi dialect and its demonstrative use – the speakers are of various ages and backgrounds, both socially and geographically, and most of the recordings are equipped with a video, which is necessary to study the deictic use of demonstratives. It offers a great starting place for an exploratory study which can then identify tendencies to study more in depth. In my research I hope to have done just that – while the data available wasn't big enough for drawing certain conclusions about some phenomena, it definitely set a frame for further research. In this conclusive and final chapter I will describe all the tendencies I observed in the empirical part of my work, addressing them by the pronoun type in connection to what they came up.

From the expected Ižma Komi *t*-based demonstratives the following appeared in my data: *тая, та, этая, эта* and *этiя*. In addition to them and their traditional declinational forms nominal *тае, тайö* and *тiя* and accusative *таес* and *этаес* were used. From the short forms *ma* was only used with postpositions, but *эта* was used both ad- and pronominally. A possible convergence with similar sounding Russian demonstrative *это* would be interesting to look into, since all the speakers are bilingual in these two languages and Russian figures heavily in the everyday life of most Ižma Komis. The *t*-based pronouns which are formally singular could be used as semantically plural, especially in adnominal constructions.The *t*-based demonstrative pronouns were mostly used to refer to entities that are located in the surroundings of the speaker, be it in real life or imagination. This means they are mostly used exophorically. When *e*-prefixed forms are used, it seems to signal some kind of contrast or general emphasis. When an *e*-prefixed *t*-based form is used for the first mention, the same entity can, atleast in some cases, later be referred to with a prefixless *t*-based form. After first mention tracking with an *s*-based demonstrative also seems possible. The opposition between the *t*-based forms with different stem vowels would need some more research and maybe a different material, collected with that exact study question in mind. Based on my material it seems that the selection of and between *t*-based pronouns could also

signal the speaker's attitude towards the referent, with the distal demonstrative carrying a more negative connotation. Both this and the spatial opposition of these pronouns should definitely be studied more in depth. In addition to exophorical reference the t-based pronouns with an *e*-prefix were also used as demonstrative fillers. They could act as placeholders or signal general hesitation. They could also act as discourse markers and signal returning back to an interrupted topic. The *t*-based pronouns also seem to be the pronouns of choice for recognitional use, although additional inquiry with less formal data would be needed to confirm that.

In addition to the expected *сы*, *сыа* and its case forms the following *s*-based demonstratives appeared in my data: nominal *сія ~ сіа, сіе* and *сійö*, accusative *сіес*, genitive *сылöн* and comitative *сыкöд*. No *s*-based demonstratives with an *e*-prefix appeared in my initial data. The variation between the nominal forms seems to be related to the speaker's background, both geographical and sociolinguistical. The short form *сы* appeared mostly in postpositional constructions, but a few times adnominally also. Usually the pronouns would appear in their full form adnominally and agree with the head in nominative and accusative case. For other case forms the adnominal demonstratives would stay in nominative. The formally singular *s*-based demonstratives could also be semantically plural, usually when they were adnominal, but such instances could also be seen in pronominal use. The motivations for it in pronominal use offer another interesting research question that can't be answered by this work, since the occurrence them in my data was very low. The main function of *s*-based demonstratives was endophoric reference – tracking and discourse deictic use. They also appeared a few times in exophoric context. I would speculate that their use as 3ʳᵈ person pronouns plays a role here and instances of exophoric use could be possible signs of an ongoing grammaticalization process. As they also represent a distal demonstrative in the spatial opposition of demonstratives, their possible use in representing a distance contrast should be also studied. In addition to endophoric use the *s*-based pronouns acted as constituents of lexizalized placeholder constructions, all fitting to the general category of "how do you say/call it" questions. As an isolated instance the use of the *s*-based demonstrative *сыа* as a pseudo-article was also noted.

The *n*-based plural demonstratives offered the greatest variety in form: both *ныа*, *ны* and *ная*, *на* and their respective case forms and also the *e*-prefixed forms *эна* and *эная* were used, in addition the following forms also appeared in my data: nominative *нае* and *найö*, accusative forms *наес, найöс, ніес, ныес* and *энаес*, genitive *налöн*, comitative *накöд*. Based on my data the variety between the *ны-* and *на-* stems seems to be speaker specific. Still both forms are used and sometimes even by the same speaker. This suggests that the variation of these pronouns is still something to research, preferably just with a bigger database. The *n*-based plural pronouns are the only ones that are divided into personal and demonstrative pronouns. This distinction still raises many questions though and in my work I don't consider them as fully separated categories. In my material one case of adnominal *e*-prefixless *n*-pronoun seemed to appear – a use outside of the possessor function only possible for demonstraties. The *n*-based *e*-prefixless pronouns are mostly used for pronominal tracking and the *e*-prefixed pronouns for exophoric use.

When it comes to the deictic use of Ižma Komi demonstrative pronouns in general, we can see that while most of the uses fit to universally attested classes, the boarders between these classes aren't always clear. Both the placeholder and recognitional use show some overlapping with the exophoric Deixis-am-Phantasma use. In my opinion this kind of complex and mixed strategies are only to be expected when it comes to spoken language, especially if we consider all of these categories to typically represent the first mentions of entities. Deixis-am-Phantasma seems to play an overall important and interesting role in the deictic use of Ižma Komi pronouns, with some people being more prone to it than others. If Ižma Komi speakers really do separate their pronouns based on notions that have been described under the exophoric vs endophoric use in this work, the use of Deixis am Phantasma by different speakers and its role in sensing the referent could serve a really interesting research topic for the future. As for other more specific research topics I would suggest studying the spatial notions of Ižma Komi demonstrative pronouns with a material where the contrasts are bound to come out. Data collection with specifically designed experiments could provide good material for that. Same goes for the recognitional use – a material where the speakers know each other well and aren't bound by the structure of an interview would provide a very good

research material for that. The variation in used forms also offers many further research questions, some of which could maybe be answered with the help of a bigger database.

APPENDIX: DATA

The appendix contains background information on all the recordings used in my initial data, like the full name of the recording by which it can be found from the corpus, the length of the recording, and the names, origins and current locations of the participants.

1) **Code in examples:** AEKan'eva, VIKan'ev

   **Name of the recording:** Анна Ефимовна Канева и Василий Ипполитович Канев

   **Length**: 58 min 37 s

   **Participants:**

   **Interviewer**:

   **Name**: Marina Sergeevna Fedina

   **Date of birth:** 1968

   **Place of origin**: Vertep, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

   **Currently living**: Syktyvkar, Komi Republic

   **Interviewee:**

   **Name:** Anna Efimovna Kan'eva

   **Date of birth:** 1955-06-01

   **Place of origin:** Ust-Ižma, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

   **Currently living:** Naryan-Mar, Nenets Autonomous Okrug

   **Interviewee:**

   **Name:** Vasili Ippolitovich Kan'ev

   **Date of birth:** 1956-03-02

   **Place of origin:** Lasta, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

   **Currently living:** Naryan-Mar, Nenets Autonomous Okrug

2) **Code in examples:** AFXozjainov

   **Name of the recording:** Алексей Филиппович Хозяинов

   **Length**: 38 min 51 s

   **Participants:**

**Interviewer**:

   **Name**: Vasili Panteleimonovich Čuprov

   **Date of birth**: 1993

   **Place of origin**: Gam, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

   **Currently living**: Syktyvkar, Komi Republic

    **Interviewer**:

   **Name:** Niko Tapio Partanen

   **Date of birth:** 1986

   **Place of origin:** Finland

**Interviewee:**

   **Name:** Aleksei Filippovič Xozjainov

   **Date of birth:** 1958-10-17

   **Place of origin:** Gam, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

   **Currently living:** Gam, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

3) **Code in examples:** AJTerent'ev

   **Name of the recording:** Александр Юрьевич Терентьев

   **Length**: 16 min 59 s

   **Participants:**

  **Interviewer**:

   **Name**: Vasili Panteleimonovič Čuprov

   **Date of birth**: 1993

   **Place of origin**: Gam, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

   **Currently living**: Syktyvkar, Komi Republic

    **Interviewer**:

   **Name:** Niko Tapio Partanen

   **Date of birth:** 1986

   **Place of origin:** Finland

    **Interviewee:**

   **Name:** Aleksandr Jurevič Terent'ev

   **Date of birth:** 1992-06-06

**Place of origin:** Pustynja, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

**Currently living:** Syktyvkar, Komi Republic

4) **Code in examples:** AKXozjainova

**Name of the recording:** Агафья Константиновна Хозяинова

**Length**: 15 min 05 s

**Participants:**

**Interviewer**:

**Name**: Vasili Panteleimonovič Čuprov

**Date of birth**: 1993

**Place of origin**: Gam, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

**Currently living**: Syktyvkar, Komi Republic

**Interviewer**:

**Name:** Niko Tapio Partanen

**Date of birth:** 1986

**Place of origin:** Finland

**Interviewee:**

**Name:** Agafja Konstantinovna Xozjainova

**Date of birth:** 1932-02-14

**Place of origin:** Odesdino, Sosnogorsk District, Komi Republic

**Currently living:** Požnja, Sosnogorsk District, Komi Republic

**Notes:** Interviewee marked as a Ižma / Upper-Vyčegda Dialect speaker, because Odesdino boarders the two dialect areas.

5) **Code in examples:** APFilippov

**Name of the recording:** Александр Петрович Филиппов

**Length**: 25 min 11 s

**Participants:**

**Interviewer**:

**Name**: Marina Sergeevna Fedina

**Date of birth:** 1968

**Place of origin**: Vertep, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

**Currently living**: Syktyvkar, Komi Republic

**Interviewee:**

**Name:** Aleksandr Petrovič Filippov

**Date of birth:** 1960-05-11

**Place of origin:** Lovozero, Murmansk Oblast

**Currently living:** Lovozero, Murmansk Oblast

6) **Code in examples:** DAKan'eva

**Name of the recording:** Дарья Алексеевна Канева

**Length**: 1 h 12 min 14 s

**Participants:**

**Interviewer**:

**Name**: Marina Sergeevna Fedina

**Date of birth:** 1968

**Place of origin**: Vertep, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

**Currently living**: Syktyvkar, Komi Republic

**Interviewee:**

**Name:** Darja Alekseevna Kan'eva

**Date of birth:** 1929-04-02

**Place of origin:** Vertep, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

**Currently living:** Naryan-Mar, Nenets Autonomous Okrug

7) **Code in examples:** FTDavydova

**Name of the recording:** Фаина Тимофеевна Давыдова

**Length**: 16 min 35 s

**Participants:**

**Interviewer**:

**Name**: Vasili Panteleimonovič Čuprov

**Date of birth**: 1993

**Place of origin**: Gam, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

**Currently living**: Syktyvkar, Komi Republic

   **Interviewer**:

**Name:** Niko Tapio Partanen

**Date of birth:** 1986

**Place of origin:** Finland

   **Interviewee:**

**Name:** Faina Timofeevna Davydova

**Date of birth:** 1962-05-11

**Place of origin:** Saranpaul, Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug

**Currently living:** Khanty-Mansiysk, Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug

8) **Code in examples:** IGTerent'eva

**Name of the recording:** Терентьева Ирина Гавриловна

**Length**: 06 min 54 s

**Participants:**

  **Interviewer**:

   **Name**: Vasili Panteleimonovič Čuprov

   **Date of birth**: 1993

   **Place of origin**: Gam, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

   **Currently living**: Syktyvkar, Komi Republic

    **Interviewee:**

   **Name:** Irina Gavrilovna Terent'eva

   **Date of birth:** 1996-02-27

   **Place of origin:** Salekhard, Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Okrug

   **Currently living:** Salekhard, Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Okrug

9) **Code in examples:** EAIgušev

**Name of the recording:** Евгений Александрович Игушев

**Length**: 46 min 31 s

**Participants:**

   **Interviewer**:

**Name:** Niko Tapio Partanen

**Date of birth:** 1986

**Place of origin:** Finland

   **Interviewee:**

**Name:** Evgeni Aleksandrovič Igušev

**Date of birth:** 1939-03-11

**Place of origin:** Pozhnya, Sosnogorsk District, Komi Republic

**Currently living:** Syktyvkar, Komi Republic


10) **Code in examples:** KVKoinova

   **Name of the recording:** Клавдия Васильевна Койнова

   **Length**: 10 min 45 s

   **Participants:**

   **Interviewer**:

   **Name**: Marina Sergeevna Fedina

   **Date of birth:** 1968

   **Place of origin**: Vertep, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

   **Currently living**: Syktyvkar, Komi Republic

      **Interviewee:**

   **Name:** Klavdija Vasil'evna Kojnova

   **Date of birth:** 1944-01-21

   **Place of origin:** Njaksimvol, Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug

   **Currently living:** Berjozovo, Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug


11) **Code in examples:** LPČuprova

   **Name of the recording: Людмила Прокопьевна Чупрова**

   **Length**: 05 min 35 s

   **Participants:**

   **Interviewer**:

   **Name**: Vasili Panteleimonovič Čuprov

   **Date of birth**: 1993

**Place of origin**: Gam, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

**Currently living**: Syktyvkar, Komi Republic

    **Interviewee:**

**Name:** Ljudmila Prokopjevna Čuprova

**Date of birth:** 1994-08-31

**Place of origin:** Khorey-Ver, Nenets Autonomous Okrug

**Currently living:** Khorey-Ver, Nenets Autonomous Okrug


12) **Code in examples:** MVFilippova

    **Name of the recording:** Мария Владимировна Филиппова

    **Length**: 26 min 28 s

    **Participants:**

    **Interviewer**:

      **Name**: Vasili Panteleimonovič Čuprov

      **Date of birth**: 1993

      **Place of origin**: Gam, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

      **Currently living**: Syktyvkar, Komi Republic

        **Interviewer**:

      **Name:** Niko Tapio Partanen

      **Date of birth:** 1986

      **Place of origin:** Finland

        **Interviewee:**

      **Name:** Maria Vladimirovna Filippova

      **Date of birth:** 1984-03-31

      **Place of origin:** Ižma, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

      **Currently living:** Ižma, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic


13) **Code in examples:** NNČuprov

    **Name of the recording:** Николай Никитич Чупров

    **Length**: 45 min 42

    **Participants:**

**Interviewer**:

    **Name**: Marina Sergeevna Fedina

    **Date of birth:** 1968

    **Place of origin**: Vertep, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

    **Currently living**: Syktyvkar, Komi Republic

      **Interviewee:**

    **Name:** Nikolai Nikitič Čuprov

    **Date of birth:** 1941-07-13

    **Place of origin:** Krasnoshchele, Murmansk Oblast

    **Currently living:** Lovozero, Murmansk Oblast

14) **Code in examples:** SAArtiev

    **Name of the recording:** Семён Алексеевич Артиев

    **Length**: 03 min 56 s

    **Participants:**

    **Interviewer**:

      **Name**: Vasili Panteleimonovič Čuprov

      **Date of birth**: 1993

      **Place of origin**: Gam, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

      **Currently living**: Syktyvkar, Komi Republic

        **Interviewee:**

      **Name:** Semjon Alekseevič Artiev

      **Date of birth:** 1992-04-12

      **Place of origin:** Krasnoshchele, Murmansk Oblast

      **Currently living:** Krasnoshchele, Murmansk Oblast

  **Notes:** The interviewee speaks very little komi, the value of this recording is more in the forms used by the interviewer.

15) **Code in examples:** VAFilippov

    **Name of the recording:** Виктор Алексеевич Филиппов

    **Length**: 02 min 58 s

**Participants:**

**Interviewer**:

**Name**: Vasili Panteleimonovič Čuprov

**Date of birth**: 1993

**Place of origin**: Gam, Izhemsky District, Komi Republic

**Currently living**: Syktyvkar, Komi Republic

**Interviewee:**

**Name:** Viktor Aleksejevič Filippov

**Date of birth:** 1997-06-29

**Place of origin:** Kharsaim**,** Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Okrug

**Currently living:** Salekhard, Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Okrug

# REFERENCES

**Auer**, J. C. P. 1984. *Referential Problems in Conversation*. Journal of Pragmatics 8: 627–648.

**Averintseva-Klisch**, Maria. 2016. Pejorative demonstratives. In Rita Finkbeiner, Jörg Meibauer & Heike Wiese (eds.). *Pejoration*. (Series Linguistics Today). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 119–142.

**Bartens**, Raija. 2000. *Permiläisten kielten rakenne ja kehitys*. (Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 238.) Helsinki: Suomalais Ugrilainen Seura.

**Bubrix** 1949 = Бубрих, Д. В. 1949. *Грамматика литературного коми языка.* Ленинград: Изд-во Ленинградского государственного университета.

**Bühler**, Karl. 1934/1990. *Theory of language: the representational function of language.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Černyx 1952** = Черных, П.Я. 1952. Историческая грамматика русского языка. Москва: Учпедгиз.

**Diessel**, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives: Form, Function, and Grammaticalization*. (Typological Studies in Language 42.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

**Fedjuneva 2008** = Федюнева, Г.В. 2008. *Первичные местоимения в пермских языках.* Екатеринбург: УрО РАН

**Fillmore**, C. J. 1997. *Lectures on Deixis*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

**Halliday**, M. A. K. and **Hasan**, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

**Hayashi**, Makoto and **Yoon**, Kyung-Eun. 2006. A cross-linguistic exploration of demonstratives in interaction: With particular reference to the context of word-formulation trouble. *Studies in Language* 30: 485–540.

**Hayashi**, Makoto and **Yoon**, Kyung-eun. 2010. A cross-linguistic exploration of demonstratives in interaction: With particular reference to the context of word-formulation trouble. In: Amiridze, Nino, Boyd Davis & Margaret Maclagan (eds). *Fillers, Pauses and Placeholders*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 33–66.

**Himmelmann,** Nikolaus P. 1996. Demonstratives in Narrative Discourse: a taxonomy of universal uses. In Barbara Fox (ed.), *Studies in Anaphora.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 205–254.

**Istomin**, Kirill V. and Juri P. Šabaev. 2016. *Ižma Komi and Komi-Permiak: Linguistic Barriers to Geographic and Ethnic Identity.* Okrug, vol. 5, no. 1, 2016, pp. 53–74. Bloomington: Slavica Publishers.

**Jarbou**, Samir Omar. 2010. *Accessibility vs. physical proximity: an analysis of exophoric demonstrative practice in Spoken Jordanian Arabic.* Journal of Pragmatics 42, 11, 3078–3097

**Klumpp**, Gerson (in preparation). Contrast clitics in Komi.

**Lakoff**, Robin. 1974. Remarks on this and that. *Papers from the Tenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (CLS) 10: 345– 356.

**Lyons**, John. 1977. *Semantics.* 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Majtinskaja 1967** = Майтинская, К.Е. *Семантика указательных местоимений в финно-угорских языках /Вопросы финно-угорского языкознания*. Вып. IV. Ижевск.

**Majtinskaja 1969 =** Майтинская, К.Е. *Местоимения в языках разных систем.* Москва.

**Ponarjadov 2000** = Понарядов, В.В. 2000. Коми аффиксы -тö, -сö в неаккузативном употреблении. *Коми слово в грамматике и словаре*. Труды Института языка, литературы и истории ; 62. Сыктывкар, 52–57.

**Popova and Sažina 2014** = Попова Р.П., Сажина С.А. 2014. *Фонетические и морфологические особенности коми диалектов (сравнительный аспект исследования).* Сыктывкар.

**Saxarova and Sel'kov 1976** = Сахарова М.А., Сельков Н.Н. *Ижемский диалект коми языка.* Сыктывкар.

**Serebrennikov 1963** = Серебренников, Б.А. *Историческая морфология пермских языков.* Москва: Изд. АН СССР

**VPN** = Всероссийская перепись населения.

http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/perepis_itogi1612.htm

# RESÜMEE

 Käesoleva magistritöö eesmärk on uurida komi keele Ižma murde demonstratiivpronoomeneid ja nende pragmaatilist kasutust, kuna viimast ei ole komi pronoomeneid käsitlevas teaduskirjanduses siiani eriti puudutatud.

Töö algab sissejuhatusega, kus kirjeldan lühidalt demonstratiivpronoomenite olemust ja komi pronoomenite arengut soome-ugri keelte kontekstis. Kuna komi keeles ei ole kolmanda isiku pronoomenid demonstratiivpronoomenitest täielikult eraldunud, käsitlen neid antud töös ühtselt demonstratiivpronoomenitena, millest osadel on ka kolmanda isiku pronoomeni funktsioon.

Üldisele sissejuhatusele järgneb esimene teoreetiline peatükk, mis tutvustab demonstratiivpronoomenite võimalikke deiktilisi ja pragmaatilisi funktsioone. Eksofoorselt kasutatakse pronoomeneid selleks, et viidata millelegi, mis on kõneleja tajutavas ümbruses. Endofoorne on aga see, kui neid kasutatakse diskursuses sidususe loomiseks – viidatakse tagasi juba mainitud entiteetidele (mis tahes, mis on olemas) või võetakse nende abil kokku laiemaid diskursuses esinenud mõtteid. Kolmanda kasutusliigi all kirjeldan seda, kui demonstratiivpronoomenitega viidatake millelegi, mis ei eksisteeri ei kõneleja tajutavas ümbruses ega ümbritsevas diskursuses, vaid ühistes teadmistes, mida ta kellegagi jagab. Entiteedi esmamainimisel viidatakse eestäiendiks oleva pronoomeniga sellele, et suhtluspartnerile peaks viidatav olema tuttav. Viimase suurema demonstratiivpronoomenite kasutamise kategooriana käsitlen nende rolli kohatäitjana – nimelt kasutatakse paljudes keeltes ununenud või muudel põhjustel kättesaamatute sõnade asendamiseks demonstratiivpronoomeneid. Samuti kasutatakse neid väljendamaks üldist viivitust kõneaktis. Viimasest on omakorda välja arenenud demonstratiivpronoomenite kasutus diskursuse markeritena, mille abil signaliseeritakse kõneakti eesmärke ja suunda.

Töö teine teoreetiline peatükk on pühendatud Ižma murde ja selle demonstratiivpronoomenite tutvustamisele. Ižma murdes esineb kolm demonstratiivpronoomeni tüve – ainsuslikud *t*- ja *s*-tüvi ning mitmuslik *n*-tüvi. Demonstratiivpronoomenitele omast ruumiliste parameetrite (tavaliselt viidatava objekti kaugus) kontrasti märgib nii *t*- ja *s*-tüve vastandumine, kui *t*- ja *n*-tüveliste

pronoomenite tüvevokaalidel põhinev vastandumine. Lisaks võib kõigile demonstratiivpronoomenitele liituda *e*-prefiks, mille rolli on siiani kirjeldatud emfaatilisena.

Kahele teoreetilisele peatükile järgnebki empiiriline, töö mahukaim osa. Uurimismaterjalina kasutasin lindistusi Ižma murde suulist keelt sisaldavast videokorpusest (videocorpora.ru), mis koosneb välitöödel Ižma dialekti kõnelejatega tehtud intervjuudest ja muudest ülesvõtetest. Valitud lindistuste põhjal koostasin esmase korpuse, kuhu koondasin kokku kõik korrad, kui kõnelejad kasutasid demonstratiivpronoomeneid. Kokku saadud 1610-st pronoomenikasutusest valisin analüüsiks 1349. Analüüs keskendus nii pronoomenite vormilisele varieerumisele kui nende kasutuse pragmaatilistele külgedele. Selgus, et demonstratiivide vormiline varieeruvus on suurem, kui siiani kirjeldatud. Nii *s*- kui *n*-tüvelistel pronoomenitel esineb mitmeid variante ning nende varieeruvuse põhjus ei ole selge. Töö põhjal võib aga eeldata, et nende kasutamine on suuresti seotud konkreetsete kõnelejatega ja vormilise varieeruvuse põhjused võivad olla nii geograafilised kui sotsiolingvistilised. Demonstratiivpronoomenite deiktilises ehk osutavas/viitavas funktsioonis eristub selge vahe eksofoorse ja endofoorse kasutuse vahel, esimese jaoks kasutati üldiselt *t*-tüvelisi pronoomeneid ning teise jaoks *s*-tüvelisi. Mitmuslike *n*-tüvede puhul eristatakse kirjanduses tavaliselt personaalpronoomeneid ja demonstratiivpronoomeneid, viimasteks loetakse *e*-prefiksiga vorme. Selline jaotus ei pruugi olla aga kivisse raiutud ja *n*-tüveliste vormide kasutus nõuaks veel eraldi uurimist. Selle töö uurimismaterjalis kasutati *n*-tüvelisi *e*-prefiksita pronoomeneid tavaliselt endofoorselt, viitamaks juba mainitud entiteetidele, ning *e*-prefiksilisi variante eksofoorselt. Mõlemas kasutuses võis neid aga asendada ka vormiliselt ainsuslik *t*- või *s*-tüveline pronoomen. Kaks ülejäänud kategooriat – demonstratiivpronoomen viidatava tuttavuse märkijana ja demonstratiivpronoomen kohatäitjana – tundusid kohati kattuvat eksofoorse viitamisega, eriti selle eriliigiga, mis lubab nii kõneleja enda kui asjade, millele ta viitab, deiktilist projektsiooni. See tähendab, et ümbritsevana võidakse tajuda ka entiteete, mis on seda vaid kõneleja kujutelmas. Sellist deiktilist projektsiooni esineb mõnel kõnelejal tunduvalt rohkem kui teistel. Kui Ižma murde pronoomenikasutus

jagunebki suuresti eksofoorsete ja endofoorsete tunnuste põhjal, võib selline „fantaasiamaailma“ kasutus pakkuda väga huvitavat uurimisainet.

Töö eesmärk on kaardistada üsna laia teemat, mida varem palju puudutatud ei ole. Seetõttu võib seda tööd käsitleda ka pilootprojektina, mille eesmärk on selgitada välja sügavamat uurimist vajavaid tendentse. Iga käsitletud kasutusliik vääriks tegelikult eraldi põhjalikumat uurimist selleks kohandatud materjaliga. Eksofoorse viitamise ruumiliste suhete uurimiseks oleks näitaks hea koguda ja kasutada materjali, kus kõnelejad on pandud olukorda, kus selline viitamistaktika enim avaldub. Viidatava tuttavusele osutavate demonstratiivpronoomenite uurimiseks oleks jällegi vajalik materjal, kus kõnelejad üksteist hästi tunnevad. Loodan, et antud töös esitatud tähelepanekud pakuvad kasvupinda edasistele uurimustele, mis käsitlevad mainitud teemasid juba sügavamalt.