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DISCUSSION UND KRIITIK
Internal development and borrowing
of pragmatic particles: Estonian vaata/vat ‘look’,
nääd ‘you see’, and vot

Leelo Keerulik (Uppsala)

1. Introduction
Anybody who attempts to transcribe Estonian colloquial conversation soon finds that they have written down a number of the following items: nääd, vata, vot, vat, vaata, nä, and probably also a rare vaat or nä. Even though some of them look and sound similar to common verb forms (vaata, näde), they are generally not used in their literary meaning but as pragmatic particles. Rather than functioning as predicates, they have become syntactically independent linguistic items. Based on evidence from literary language, it has been customary to describe the functions of parenthetical vaata, vaat and nä as intensifying the confirmation or disconfirmation of a statement, or as a meaningless fulfillment (EKG I:39, ii: 102–103). However, their actual meaning potential can only be discovered in interaction and within an analytic framework that does not start from a well-formed self-sufficient written sentence.

The focus of this study is on the pragmatic analysis of these particles and their variants in conversational sequences, which makes the disclosure of the subtle communicative differences between the items possible. In order to do this, the methods and terminology of conversation analysis will be applied throughout the study (for an introduction, see for example Goodwin – Heritage 1990; Heritage 1984a: 233–239; Sacks 1992; Sacks – Schegloff – Jefferson 1974). The aim of this paper is to demonstrate that these pragmatic particles have two different origins: vaata and nääd result from language-internal grammaticalization and vot is a borrowing from Russian.

These three items and their variants have been chosen for this study because intuitively they seem to be used in similar functions. This judgment is also

1 The research has been partly supported by grant No 6510 from East Teadafoad.
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expressed in the comprehensive dictionary of Estonian, which recommends the use of vaar instead of vor (EKSR). Vor is extremely frequent in spoken language, in fact outnumbering all the other items combined, but it is not even mentioned in the grammar (EKG) and it is officially demonized. The current paper clarifies the functions of all the above items in current Estonian usage and argues, among other things, that the above recommendation to replace vor with vaar is not adequate.

The data for this study primarily comes from 324 naturally occurring telephone conversations of two types: telemarketing calls made by three telemarketers selling one of the biggest daily newspapers in Estonia during one night each (109 conversations), and everyday calls between family members, relatives, friends, and colleagues. The latter have been recorded in three different places involving a total of seven primary informants. All in all, there is more than ten hours of conversational language and about 103,000 words in the corpus (henceforth: the LK corpus). While the telemarketers talk to a different client every time they pick up the telephone, everyday calls sometimes involve the same interactants. A rough estimate is that 300 different speakers are represented in the corpus. The great majority of the informants speak Common Estonian, which is the oral variety closest to the written standard. The frequency counts given below of the occurrence of the items have been carried out in this particular corpus, as it is relatively homogeneous and has been thoroughly described from a sociolinguistic perspective (Koivistik 2003:42-52). The drawback is that the speech of the ten primary informants is probably over-represented.

Additional examples will be presented from the publicly available Tartu corpus of Spoken Estonian, especially in the case of nädä, and the Russian examples are taken from the Olga Genasimenko corpus of Russian telephone calls at a medical centre (henceforth: the OG corpus). Each example is provided with a code identifying its origin (LK, T, and OG respectively).

The paper first provides examples of the usage patterns of particles that have developed from verbs of seeing and looking, starting with more literal usage and gradually moving towards the more particle-like variants, and then goes on to describe the functions of the loanword vor. This enables the mutual foregrounding ability of the particles to be revealed, and the specific functions of each and every item individually to be displayed.

2. The development of an evidential particle: nädä ‘you see’

Particularized forms of the verb ‘see’ occur in many languages, such as the English (you) see (Ezenn 1987). In contemporary Estonian, two different verb forms derived from näge: ‘see’ are used as particles: nede/nääd is the second person singular imperative, nädä/nädad/nääd is the second person singular indicative. Since nädä is the most frequent variant in the LK corpus and since the functions of nädäd, näded, näd and näd are coincident, they are all referred to below as ‘the particle nädad’. The plural form of the imperative nädrräät is relatively frequent in current face-to-face usage but not in telephone calls. The reason for this is that its functions are quite literal, which is to say that it has not become a particle.

The frequencies of all the relevant items in the LK corpus are given in Table 1. Only three cases of näded and one of nädad can be analyzed as and predicates, because they are used together with grammatical arguments. For example in nädad na seis keedašid val ‘do you see anywhere there? ’ (LK). The rest functions more or less as particles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nädad</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>näded</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>näd</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>näd</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>näd</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Frequencies of the relevant forms of näd- ‘see’ in the LK corpus.

2.1 Pointing out something visible

In their literal meaning, items like nädä/nädäd, nädä/nädä and nädä/nädädä may be used to accompany or introduce visual demonstrations. This is not at all surprising, as ‘Näe!’ is an order to see something and ‘Näe? ’ is a question about the ability to see. The following examples (1–3) come from a travel agency, where C is the client, and TA the travel agent.

(1) C: ja mina päevana see on.
   TA: ei sobi no nätte stiin (en ...) kolme päevased.
   'Well, NAETE? here are three days-trip.' (T)

(2) TA: ja meel on olemas stiin Hind.<br>
   C: 'And we have everything here'<br>
   C: 'mmh'<br>
   'Uhhh'<br>

3 As the items in this study cannot always easily be translated into a single particle in English, and their syntactic placement is also not identical in the two languages, they have consistently been rendered in Estonian and in capital letters in the translations.
Although video recordings were not available during the analysis of the above three examples, it is clear that the travel agent is pointing out something in the brochure. The form nāde is repeatedly used to underline the availability of the relevant visual information for the participants and it may also precede or accompany a pointing gesture. Similarly, in a study of the English you see, Mowad (2003) has shown that you see is regularly used as a reference introducer in surgical videoconferences, where the teaching surgeons make different organs clear to the students by coordinating you see with pointing.

From the syntactic point of view, it is crucial to notice that in example (3), the form nāde occurs parenthetically in the middle of an ongoing syntactic construction. It is produced after the locative phrase tin teisel leheküljel "here on the second page" and the predicate on 'is', and before the subject kõik eksoonutilised maad "all the exotic countries". Therefore it cannot possibly be analyzed as a predicate. However, nāde occurs immediately before the referential expression in the sentence, just like in (1) and (2), where it is used before the decitic sin 'here'. This suggests that nāde is a kind of reference introducer. More specifically, the reference should be to something that is available for visual inspection.

In these referential cases, nāde and the particle nādī virtually never take argument or complement clauses. An example (4) of the form nādī in an interactional event with physically co-present participants follows.

(4) EP: *(reads from a newspaper)* nādī arvatud mānu. (6.0) nādī kalm–kahat kroom. (1.0)
    *NAAD computers on sale (6.0) NAAD three thousand kroms (1.0)*

Again, the form nādī precedes the information that is apparently available in the newspaper, thereby functioning as a kind of a pointer to the source of information. The particle nādī makes it clear to other participants that the upcoming information has a visible source. My recent video recordings, which are not a part of the corpus used in this study, include examples of somebody lifting up an extra piece of cucumber with nādī veel üks tähek sin 'NAAD one more piece here', and pointing me out with nādī fotograaf ka kohal 'NAAD the photographer is here too'. In brief, the particle nādī could be analyzed as an evidential that points out a visible source of information for co-present participants.

It is also possible to spot similar locative usage on the telephone, but only in the cases that the interlocutors have access to identical visual sources. The following example (5) comes from a telemarketing call in which a customer comments on something he sees in the current issue of the very same paper that the telemarketer is trying to sell. His comment is preceded by an explicit reference to the source — the current issue of the newspaper — and this reference is preceded in turn by the evidential nādī. The use of nādī here together with the description that follows potentially achieves a common visual focus for the telemarketer and customer.

(5) L: no no oormulikas. Is nādī, sin on sõnumest Liivi Limantele, see neljaapal
    aheetsündid oleksid kasvanud kas sõnum on polest poistud suhkrust juba, mis nāde sin
    tekeš.
    *Of course NAAD here is today's Liivi Limantele or Thursday the ninth of
    October, where boys are up to their knees in water again, what are they doing
    here? (LK)*

While the indicative forms nādī/nādī and nāde/nāde are easily imaginable in literal meaning and combined with a direct object (as in sa nādī nõu ona elu sõnul nõukhänna 'you see your life as if it were a whole' (LK)), it is harder, if not impossible, to find or even conjecture examples in which nādī/nādī might occur with an object. As seeing is not a deliberate activity, it is probably not possible to literally give somebody an order to see something. 25 out of the total of 28 relevant cases in the LK corpus occur without any arguments. In the face-to-face encounters, they rather precede locative adverbial phrases in combinations such as nāde seal 'NAAD there', nādī sin 'NAAD from here', or nominal phrases such as nādī arvatud 'NAAD the computers', nādī fotograaf 'NAAD the photographer'. Therefore, they should instead be analyzed as focalizing or foregrounding " pointers".

2.2 Evidential epistemic

As original questions or assertions of seeing (reciting) something, most of the above variants seem to be useful for foregrounding an event in the discourse. It is plausible that the more literal pattern of pointing out something in the visual

---

1 The phonologically similar item nāh seems to function as a pointer too, for example in nah Plõõdina Lõuna and 'NAH Plõõdina Lõuna there' (7), but there are altogether too few such items available to enable definitive conclusions to be drawn about whether nāh is actually a variant of the particle nādī. According to Hempstone (2000: 1995), nāh is an item of offering (Est. pakkumine) and warning (Est. peatusme).
sources has given rise to the less literal usage in which nāžāiītād, nātāiītād and nādāiītād precede a description of an event which could be visualized.
In example (6), which comes from a phone call, P is talking about the recording equipment that I have installed on her telephone and her possible confrontation with her landlady on this issue.

(6) P: Jaa? jā mēngi jālēvēndar maas jā, hā mēngi telefon tījātā sīn vēränd, jā teixe kōta sīsante jānēndatā. jānt et mina vēnsa jā teñe lōkore, et et jānē:
‘a tangled bunch of cables on the floor and the telephone is disconnected here and plugged into another place, I may know (why it is like that), right’
E: <0 jāh 0>
‘Yeah’
P: aşā tēna vaatāb et, nātē meina tēfōmēna, tāna bēgānata [ex].
‘But she’ll see that, NĀDE my phone without asking, right’
E: <0 [fājii] 0> jā
‘Yeah yeah’ (LK)

P first describes the physical situation in her apartment, so that her present listener can visualize what the landlady will be faced with on her arrival. In the imagined confrontation, the landlady foregrounds a disturbing aspect of the situation, initiating her complaint with the evidential nātē. Probably even more crucially, the present speaker, P, points out this aspect for the present listener, E, also making use of the pointing potential of nāte. Nāte provides evidence of the visual source of the upcoming statement.
In a number of cases, however, the evidentiality expressed with the particle nātē no longer has to do with visualized visualization. Nātē may merely underline the truthfulness of the statement by implying that there is some kind of source that the speaker is relying on. By presenting some statement or fact as ‘seenable’, the speaker enhances its reliability. In the examples which follow, nāte and nādā are used as epistemic means. In example (7) the speaker uses nāte to underline the truthfulness of her statement about having wanted to write to a friend, and in example (8), using nādā makes the information about a drinking bout a checkable fact.

(7) P: wā jīs hā ma mālē ilkā ījīsin et, et et īkka miṣsa jīmud aśed, jā nāte <Q tābrin ilke jābūndii Q>, jā bāa bāa hāa, a sā naga: tālā miṣsi nātēgal jīles aśa, jā
‘but when I asked him “what have you done” and “NĀDE I wanted to write you” and blah blah thus he kind of melted but’ (LK)

(8) E: pājādī me aqāsā sīn tēlēji, e kaad - nādāiī kavē fīsama on jōtā jējīma
akmēnd, jābānd hās: a jēn et ma saan sēle jē e ha mēlālā sīn (korda) tēhā.
‘I’m driving the ear right now, I couldn’t - NĀAD bloody Pram has started drinking again, I mean, I think I can fix it myself sometimes’ (LK)

In addition, the particle nādā often foregrounds (as a facet of) something talked about thus far or something that is treated as common knowledge. Even in these cases the visual component of nādā has faded, and the evidence for the statement which follows can be found in the earlier text or context. In example (9), P complains about the way students are treated when they defend their graduation theses. She finishes her story with a negative evaluation by referring to a situation in which she and her friend had been sitting at the back of the class, expressing their disapproval by shaking their heads. E reacts to the story by using it as proof of what life is like, initiating this conclusion with nādā. The particle here serves as an evidential pointer to the story rather than to a visual source.

(9) P: jāh, nādā ḍhā en sēlēnī.
‘Yeah, NĀAD that’s life’ (LK)

Assessments are also a type of conclusion or a way of foregrounding the main point in what was just said. In this particular function, the particle nādā is interchangeable with vaatā, var and yot, which will be described in detail below. In example (10), nādā initiates an emotional evaluation of the information given in the previous turn.

(10) E: n h. (.) tābīn su sūlī jākūndā:
‘I wanted to hear your voice’
P: pājīh, nādā hā tērē. h
‘Oh NĀAD how nice’ (LK)

It is crucial to notice that in the course of becoming an evidential particle, the number of morphophonological forms of nādā has shrunk. All of the possible forms occur in situations where a visible information source is available, such as that of the travel brochure. Examples include nāte seal ‘NĀE there’, nāde sīn ‘NĀÉTE here’, nātē see ‘NĀÉTE this’, nādā sīkūhēt ‘NĀ from here’
At the same time, the plural nädad/näid/ occurs only once in a context in which literal seeing is out of question and the item should therefore be analyzed as an epistemic evidential: nädad millise ala nótkoga sistem kurat ‘NÄTE: what the Soviet system was like, damned’ (T). In evidential usage, singular forms prevail.

It could thus be argued that a grammaticalization process has occurred whereby specific verb forms have been singled out for a certain communicative function, developing into a pragmatic particle (similar developments have been described in Aijen 1996; Hokulinen – Seppäläinen 1992; Keeverallik 2003; Metsulang 2000). In accordance with what the grammaticalization theory claims, these verb forms have undergone phonological assimilation and shortening: näd > näd; ñaded > ñädad > näd and possibly even ñah.

Since pragmatic particles implement social actions, they tend to occur in certain sequential positions in interaction as well as in certain positions within the turn. The grammaticalized evidential epistemic näd generally occurs in turn-initial positions, sometimes after another particle (examples 9, 10). In turn-final positions, it precedes the syntactic unit that it is attached to (examples 6–8). There are only two turn-final cases in the LK corpus. Example (11) in which a mother and a daughter have praised the same music, and the daughter eventually draws a conclusion, is one of them.

The particle nädad is thus somewhat mobile within the turn but it is not being used in the position of a sentence predicate.

2.3 News receipt
As pointers to a visual focus, various forms of näd/– see’ may be used in reactive turns. My video recordings include an episode in which somebody takes out a bottle of mulled wine and another person reacts to this with a happy näd ‘NÄE’. Possibly as an extension of this pattern and the backwards pointing function described in the assessment cases above (9, 10), the particle nädad can be implemented as a news receipt. It occurs in the typical sequential positions of a news receipt token, such as in the conversational sequence question-answer-news receipt (Heritage 1984b). As compared to the most neutral news receipt item abah (Keeverallik 1999), nädad may imply more of a surprise. In example (13), the speaker K has been telling his father about his search for suitable wallpaper. However, when the father asks whether they found one, K says no. The father receives this answer with nädad.

The particle nädad is thus somewhat mobile within the turn but it is not being used in the position of a sentence predicate.

(13) D: näd sair la sita ve=
   ‘Well, did you find (suitable wallpaper)’
   ‘No we didn’t’
O: nädad.
   ‘NÄED’ (LK)

News recipency can be carried out with different variants of the particle nädad as well as the formulaic no nädad (siks) ‘you see (then)’ and kas sa nädad ‘do you see’ or even with the second person imperfect form nágad. The choice seems to be idiolectal rather than functional or stylistic. An example with a different variant is presented in (14).

(14) E: <8 vaberrik ed kohal=ja, () lehte pandi=ja (.) 67>
   The republic was present and (it was) written about in the paper
Kx: no nädad (.) nh
   ‘NÄE’ (T)

At the same time, the variant näd as a news receipt seems to imply discontent and thereby elicit more talk from the previous speaker (example 15). In this way, näd rather resembles the particles mh and al. However, since there is only one example of this kind, it is not possible to draw any definitive conclusions about the functioning of näd.

(15) L: aagi- me ei lagad kahke raamant, misa ma tekk, seejärel et Tiiu õite et
ta anuub aint õhlede - siks lai Pohl õhlab onju,
   ‘But we didn’t get the two books I wanted because Tiina said that she would only
give it with Pohl’s permission’
M: aas,
   ‘NAH’
L: näh tähendab, Pohl – Pohl omamitu, kas ta naic ainaab völ ei aina onju,
   ‘I mean, Pohl decides whether she gives them or not’ (LK)

To summarize, näded and näd, originally verb forms, have become particles in present-day colloquial Estonian. Being useful means of pointing out a visible source, they have also developed into evidentials enhancing the truthfulness of the statements. In addition, they are used as news receipts.

* No is a very common turn-initial particle with clause-like functions.

The usage of the imperative form of ‘look’ for interactional or textual functions is not idiosyncratic in Estonian. The Finnish käy (Hakulinen – Seppänen 1992), and the English look (Sindell 2007), could for example be compared, although the functions of these items do not quite coalesce. Furthermore, the Icelandic particle sko ‘look’ seems to have an altogether different usage pattern of hedging, initiating digressions and repairs in turn-initial positions, and marking common ground in turn-final positions (Hilmsdóttir – Wide 2000: 111, 115–116).

In present-day Estonian, the second person imperative of the verb vaata ‘look’ is used for explaining, focalizing and disaligning. It occurs in several morpho-phonological forms, including the singular vaata, sometimes shortened into vaat, vaat, and vat, as well as the plural vaadake. In singular, the vowel length of the forms is often what would be analyzed as the second quantity: not the third quantity of the dictionary entry but not quite as short as the variant with a short vowel vaa. The variant frequencies are given in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vat</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaata</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaata</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaadake</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaat</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Frequencies of the relevant forms of vaata ‘look’ in the LK corpus.

The most frequent form is vat, and we should therefore call the particle vat from now on. However, although all the above variants occur in similar functions, it is not quite clear that they actually represent the same particle. In order not to gloss over this uncertainty, the item will henceforth be called the particle vaatavat.

As for the different phonological variants, it should be mentioned that there is an interesting tendency in the Tartu corpus to transcribe the positive-final form quite regularly as vaat. Furthermore, the variant vaat occurs often in spontaneous comments, blogs and chat on the internet, where it seems to be twice as frequent as vat. However, the frequency of vaat diminishes spectacularly to

3. According to the conversation analysis tradition, the terms aligning and disaligning are used in a very general sense to differentiate between actions that follow, or do not follow, the previously projected trajectory of actions. Sometimes, the terms affulative and disaffulative are used in the same sense.

when combined searches are done with very colloquial items such as not: In such cases vat occurs thirteen times more frequently (these results have been calculated with the help of advanced searches on Google). This shows that the shorter variant is much more common in the more colloquial writing, where written language rules are often ignored. It is plausible that the persistent recommendations over a long period of time in the dictionaries and the resulting vaat-convention in literary language has had an impact on conversation and chatters as well as the transcribing novice students of the Tartu corpus. As the particle overwhelmingly occurs in an unmarked and periodically non-prominent manner, I am inclined to believe that the share of vat-variants is actually bigger than indicated in the transcriptions of the Tartu corpus.

3.1 Shifting the focus

The imperative form vaata urges the interlocutor to look at or for something, or in other words to change her focus of attention. In face-to-face situations, the speaker most probably tries to achieve a change in the addressee’s visual focus by using vaata. Occasionally, this may be her aim even in telephone conversations. Those interacting on the telephone may have access to identical objects, such as the address list in example (16). Here, the item vaata could still be analyzed as occurring in its literal meaning.

In this example, V is looking for a telephone number, and E advises him to look at the very last name on the list. She refers to the list as seal nimerekister ‘there are the lists’, and especially because seal ‘there’ also marks definiteness in spoken Estonian (Pajusalli 1997: 166–171), we can see that she assumes that V too has access to the very same list. E directs V’s gaze to the right place by directing him to look (vaata) and adding the information about the exact location, which renders the unit an explanatory connotation.

(16) V: vaata see vaat. b- k- ma vaata - otlas maal ta number on.
   ‘Wait (‘it) check whether I have his number’

   E: vaata see seal nimerekister vitmaine. 1--1
   ‘VAATA be is the last one there on the list’ (LK)

There is a subtle difference between the visual guiding of nidad and that of vaata. The first one tends to point out something that is already in the visual space of the interlocutor, while the latter asks her to change the focus. This can be illustrated by two video-recorded examples from family interaction in a kitchen. Nidad is used to point out a bottle of wine beside the sink where the addressee is peeling potatoes (Nid see on kaalurak un ‘NAD this is also a wine’), while vaata is addressed to the addressee who has her back turned to

...
the pointed object and who has to turn around to achieve the necessary visual focus (Vaatia maatte sada kappast 'VAATA taste this cabboge').

Naturally, the possibilities of this kind of coordinated looking are limited on the telephone and if the usage of vaata did not extend beyond the co-present domain, there would only be a few examples of the form in the LK corpus. However, one of the connotations of vaata is that it urges the interlocutor to change the focus of attention since she has probably not been looking at whatever she is now being urged to look at. This feature has made possible a less confined usage of the form, so that vaata may now not merely urge the addressee to look but to shift the focus of attention in a wider non-visual sense (a similar claim has been made about the Finnish kato, Hakulinen - Seppänen 1992). This wider usage involves items that can be looked at as well as those that cannot.

In example (17), speaker E asks her interlocutor to "look" at something that can be looked at in a less concrete sense — namely the clothing of the people who lived at the time of the events described in the Bible. While urging her interlocutor to "look" at their clothes, E relies upon their common cultural knowledge about these matters. As vaata here refers to common knowledge, it can also be analyzed as an evidential.

"Yeah but you know (we) could somehow get something like VAATA like they have these toga or (0.2) as if a kind of a sheet would be (tipped) over" (LK)

The meaning of vaata/var becomes more abstract when it points at an event, and not at something which can at least potentially be physically looked at. The meaning component of vaata that seems to be preserved on the path of grammaticalization from verb to particle is a kind of directing of the attention of the interlocutor. In example (18), vaata is used to point at an event that, according to P, the interactants have experienced together. P insists that T has asked her where she recorded a certain piece of music. She explicitly urges T to "look" at the situation of asking. However, the interlocutor, T, does not seem to remember the event, since he asks what kind of music P is talking about. P's subsequent explanation is again initiated by vaata. As vaata here seems to direct the interlocutors' attention to an earlier event, it may also be analyzed as having an evidential connotation.

"Oh listen, you asked VAATA where I had recorded (.) this music right*" (LK)

In the first case in this example, vaata is used in the middle of an ongoing syntactic unit after the verb form kisaid 'you asked' and before the complementizer et 'that'. In the second case, it is turn-initial. Generally, the particle vaata/var occurs in turn-initial and clause-initial positions. For exceptions and closer discussion, see Keevilik (2003: 205-207).

In addition to the above patterns, all the particle variants, but especially var, can be used as a means of textual focalizing, being in this function a synonym of the loanword vat (see below, section 4.1). As an original command to look at something, var is suitable for focalizing a noun phrase, adjective phrase or adverb phrase (22 cases in the LK corpus). The main difference between this focalizing pattern and the above pattern is that the content of the following stretch of talk, the focus, does not have to be something that can be looked at or have anything to do with common ground. The meaning of var here is thus even more abstract and textual. Examples follow:

vaata Pidapaaevad "VAAT Pidapaaevad" (NP)
var sun "VAR you" (NP)
var sutine "VAR this kind" (Adjp) (LK)

In addition, the particle may be used for emphasis in strong agreements such as var ongi til "VAR (it) is exactly like this", and var ei tee jah "VAAT (I) don't know either". In these cases, the verb that follows var is the focalized item.

It is not uncommon for vaata/var to occur with what could strictly be analyzed as a complement clause, especially in the case of assessments of some preceding piece of information. In example (19), the speaker, T, has been complaining about a book retailing company that wanted to get exclusive rights to sell a book that T had published. S reacts with an aligning negative assessment, initiated by var. This assessment-initiating function of var is identical to nida, as exemplified in (10) above.

"The ones who wanted to get exclusive rights at the bookstore" (LK)

"Really"
3.2 Disaligning and initiating an explanation

The particle vaana/var also implements disalignments with the previous turn (for argumentation, see Keesalik 2003:214–217). In the following example (20), the potential subscriber (K) questions the offer that the telemarketer is making. The telemarketer claims that it is true, but the potential subscriber disagrees. His argument is that he does not know the telemarketer. This disalignment is among other things carried out by vaana, which also initiates the account of why the client is suspicious.

(20) K: Jaa, mit see on kadun.[add]
M: [kor] nii... - sitten eige jaa.
   'The story (is) completely correct'
K: vaana, ma tein sed nee end vaana.
   'How, VAADA (don’t really know you)'</K>

One of the features of vaana/var is that it may project a somewhat longer disaligning unit and initiate an explanation (the explaining function has also been mentioned by Hennoste 2000:1801). The explanatory nature of the vaana/var-initiated units was already evident in examples (17, 20) and in the second case of example (18). It can therefore be argued that the original imperative form vaana has developed paronymically in two directions: towards the more clear-cut focalizing function and towards the initiator of explanations. Sometimes the two coincide. Both of these activities imply metaphorical pointing — vaana/var either points out the focus or directs the interlocutor’s attention towards the following argument, explanation, fact, assessment, and so on (Keesalik 2003:214–217). The original feature of the imperative vaana, achieving a shift in the interlocutor’s focus of attention, is thus preserved in many particularized cases. So, also, the syntactically initial position of the imperative vaana has been preserved. At the same time, the particle vaana/var has become a focalizing means and an initiator of explanatory units in conversation. However, in contrast to the Finnish kaus (Hakulinen – Seppänen 1992), it has not yet (yet) developed into a clear explanatory conjunction.

3.3 Initiating and terminating a sequence

Changing the focus of attention may involve initiating a new sequence. Consider example (21). The telemarketer informs the subscriber of the way the newspaper agency is going to handle the practical matters. The subscriber reacts with jaa ‘yes’ and aga ‘but’, which typically expresses contrast, followed by a var-initiated statement. One possible analysis of var here is that it focalizes the adverb veel ‘more’. Another possibility is that it helps to initiate a new conversational sequence.

(21) M: jaa, siis ei sita avata, vaan veel apukset tuosta kauemmas.
   'Fine, it’ll be open for the form and we’ll send you the bill and the paper should
   thus continue to arrive without a break'
K: [aga] vaan veel lisää [vaan] siis veel:
   'Yeah but VAT one more question, is it possible'
M: [aga]
   'Yeah go ahead'
   'to get it' again in the middle of January with a discount like that'
M: [aga]
   'Yeah sure' (LK)

Interestingly, identical sequence-initiating usage occurs in the OG corpus with the Russian речь: с ним еще один вопрос о том, что происходит 'but VOT one more question, where does she receive (the patients)’ (for other Russian examples, see Grenoble – Riley 1996:831–832). This usage of var is also conceivable in Estonian, but it does not occur in the available corpora and it is definitely not frequent. Nevertheless, here the functions of var and veel seem to coincide, which could indicate a merger. On the other hand, imperative forms of verbs of looking may initiate longer sequences in other languages as well, such as the Swedish hoppa ‘look’, which is used in narrative introductions (Eriksson 1997:82). Therefore this usage pattern of var may also be the result of an independent internal development of the verb form vaana, while var can implement a sequence-initiation due to its nature as a focalizer or a presenta-

In contrast to the initiating function, var as a turn on its own may be im-

plemeted in terminating news deliveries, similarly to var (cf. section 4.2.1). A

The crucial thing is that the pointing and attention-shifting ability of the verb form vaana seems to be preserved in these frequent cases of foregrounding and focalizing — with the help of vaana/var attention is explicitly shifted to the assessment or another focalized unit.
asked what R was doing at that moment. The answer is given in the first lines of the example: R has put on his new clothes and cannot bring himself to take them off again. After a burst of laughter and the receipt token oks 'okay' by P, R terminates this news delivery with the turn-skipping vart and P continues with another topic elision.

(22): kuumat ongud tõlgid: ei sa - ei saa kuihagi: toost (0.3) kirjast gra väenud ja.

P: 'I'm wearing my clothes, (I) cannot make (myself) take them off'

R: 'VAT...'

P: 'All mis muudis?'

R: 'Vee' [Right]

P: 'Osi mayna?'

Finally, vaata may be used for a surprised news receipt similarly to the particle see, but this is not particularly frequent in the LK corpus. Formulaic expressions for the receipt of news include (noh) vaata slis 'well VAATA then' and vaata aga vaata slis 'VAATA but VAATA then'. Another common format is vaata + complement clause expressing the reason for the surprise, vaata kust ma zu käire suur 'VAATA where I find you' (LK).

The particle vaata/vor has preserved its original meaning component of pointing at a new focus of attention, which may be a physical object, a common memory or general knowledge, or even a conversational entity, such as an upcoming question. Vaata/vor seems to be able to point both backward and forwards. It either focalizes something from the preceding discourse and foregrounds assessments and dispositions, or points at an upcoming explanation based on shared or not shared information. It also initiates new sequences. This is a diverse group of functions which seem to cluster more around explanatory uses in the case of the items vaata and vao (possibly also vaadale), and more around plain focalizing in the case of vor and possibly also the standard vaat.

However, only the variant vor is used in the topic-closing function. To summarize, the original imperative vaata/vaadale that urges the interlocutors to change their visual focus has developed into a general focus-shifting means that is applied in abstract ways in conversation.

4. Borrowing a topic closer: vor

The Russian loanword vor is definitely one of the most frequent particles in conversational Estonian, occurring 174 times in the LK corpus. Nevertheless, if the major Estonian dictionaries have not completely ignored it, then they have recommended that it be replaced with vaat (EKSR). Apart from the general tendency to discard spoken language data, the reason for ignoring vor is its elusive meaning, as witnessed by many Russian dictionaries. They often list a number of specific expressions such as eom saax ‘so, really?’, eom uno da ‘now, that’s something’ but never propose a simple lexical counterpart or a coherent functional description. Eom can be used discursively as ‘here (is), there (is), this (is)’ (ORER), as an intensifier or enhancer, it may express surprise, or underline the main point (www.slovare.com, my translation — LK).

However, on the basis of the tiny OG corpus alone, it is beyond any doubt that eom has several frequent interaction-based functions in Russian that have not been captured in any dictionary at my disposal. In interaction, eom is widely used as a proximal preservative and as a bracket for the topical organization of the discourse (Grenoble — Riley 1996, Grenoble 1998: 69–72, 178–185). The Estonian vor is not used as a preservative but the bracketing function has clearly been borrowed from Russian eom.

Bilingual dictionaries claim that Russian eom corresponds to Estonian keida ‘listen’, när, vaat (e.g. VESR). The early lexicographer Wiedemann (1889) claims that this Russian verb was used instead of saal/j which in present-day Estonian accompanies manual offerings. As the dialogic survey data in Most (2000) and especially in the dialect dictionary (Pall 1989) demonstrate, the loanword vor is not only used in the dialects that are spoken close to the Russian border. It has been recorded most consistently in the North-Eastern and South-Eastern parts of Estonia, but it has also spread sporadically to dialects all over the Estonian mainland and has even been recorded on one of the Western islands. This suggests that vor must have been in common use for a long time. As for variation, the Russian phonological variant jom, which is common in the OG corpus, has probably given rise to the slightly diphthongized variant vor in the neighbouring Estonian dialects. In current spoken Estonian, as well as dialectally, the item may occasionally be produced without the initial fricative, resulting in or. Unfortunately, the available spoken language corpora do not reflect this phonetic fact.

In terms of pragmatic patterns, the similarities between the two languages go much further than what has been shown in the bilingual dictionaries. To start with, the lexical meaning ‘exactly, precisely’ occurs with the reduplicated Estonian variant vor vor, which is exactly what happens in Russian — several
dictionaries list nom nom as an entry on its own with the lexical meaning of
'accurately, precisely' and 'any minute' (the latter meaning does not occur in
Estonian). In example (23), two friends are discussing the price for a job that
O is going to do for H’s friend. H encourages O to ask for a good price. Now
O jokingly promises to add thirty percent to the bill.

(23) O: jaa, kolgend proovimelt peale. {@ @ @ @ @}
   ‘And plus thirty percent’
H: {napels, vou must,} see on õige, sis on õige (.)
   ‘Exactly VOT VOT then (i)’s correct, then
   number is correct’ (LK)

The vou-usage in this example may be analyzed as synonymous with napels
‘exactly’, but vou may also function as a focalizer of sis ‘then’. Focalizing is
one of the most frequent functions of vou.

4.1 Textual focalizing

In contrast to naid which points at a visual focus (section 2.1.) and vauata/vat
which is a focus shifter with an occasional explanatory connotation (section
3.1.), vou is more purely a focalizer within the textual domain. In 33 cases in
the present corpus, vou is used in a non-adverbial or non-adverb phrase, and
may even be analyzed as part of these. Examples include:

vot Pärdekiire: ‘VOT Pärdekiire’ (NP)
vot see: ‘VOT this one’ (NP)
vot siidke (laga): ‘VOT this kind (of a story)’ (AdjP)
vot niitinnimodi: ‘VOT like that’ (AP)
vot just crate: ‘VOT precisely yesterday’ (AP)

Occasionally, vou may focalize a verb together with the intensifying suffix -gi,
for example in vo oenig ‘VOT is GI’. In the list above and in many other cases,
the relevant analytical domain for vou is a single phrase.

Vou may also help to foreground some aspect of the previous turn of talk and
initiate an evaluation of it. In example (24), E announces that the reason for her
call is a Christmas performance called Jõulumus and the recipient of the call
finds this “lovely”. This assessment is initiated by vou. Here, vou could easily
be replaced with either naid or vauata/vat (cf. examples 10 and 19 respectively),
which are also focalizing means in this sequential position and help the speaker
to align with the previous speaker’s turn.

   ‘Oh, yeah, listen, I’m calling because of Jõulumass, you promised (to come)’
J: {no mng ki agraal.
   ‘NO VOT bow lovely’ (LK)

As an initiator of assessments, vou points to what has been signaled immediately
before. It cannot therefore be used in the regularly upcoming second assess-
ments by the next speaker that agree or disagree with the first ones (Goodwin
– Goodwin 1992). A somewhat similar backward-referencing and summariz-
ing function has been registered for the Russian noun in literary language
(CCP/25). In Russian, this original deictic has furthermore developed into a
downright anaphoric connector referring to a previously mentioned entity, as
in Bratamayvence sere. – aot namd ne. ‘Everybody’s welfare – BOT (=this
is) our goal.’ (TCPL, Grenoble 1998:85). This pattern does not occur in the
available spoken language corpora in Estonian.

Focalizing a particular element from prior talk may be useful when im-
plementing a disattested answer. The focalizing vou may help to enhance the
necessary contrast. In example (25), vou initiates a denial of knowledge, at the
same time underlining the fact that it is specifically the existence of snow in
Otepää that the speaker does not have a clue about.

(25) P: {k ule, see in nag, see seal õdripel on nagu land voi.
   ‘Listen do you know whether there is snow at Otepää?’
T: {kall: õdripel =
   ‘Where, at Otepää?’
P: {:joked,
   ‘Yeah, you.’
T: {kiinat, see seal ei ne.
   ‘Dame VOT that (I) don’t know’ (LK)

Vou recurrently initiates disaligning turns that deny the knowledge or the availability
of something that was asked for, thereby again displaying its capacity to refer backward in the text. In example (26), speaker K
wants to find out the telephone number for the dentist they both go to. After searching for
her dentist’s card during the long pause, M claims that she does not have it. This
disclaimer is initiated by vou.

(26) K: {kuule õna koj. see j-i-m see amhaanrist see kootsee seal kod kiispptrast.
   see kileks miiate selle telefonsumb, mii seal peal on.
   ‘Listen, tell (me) do you have this card for the dentist somewhere there avail-
   able, could you tell me the telephone number that’s on it’ (3.0 (rustik))
Disalignment accounts for eighteen cases in the LK corpus, often, strikingly, in negating collocations such as vot ei see "VOT (I) don't know", vot ei oska arvata "VOT (I) don't have a clue", vot seda ma ei oska ütlema "VOT I can't say". According to the OG corpus, denial of knowledge with a non-initiated turn also seems to be common in Russian conversations. Example (27) is very similar to Estonian example (36). The disaligning example, (28), is outright confrontational as it explicitly points out the caller’s shortcoming in terms of necessary information.

(27) a: (i) a kusda ona võlde?
   'But when will she be (at work)'
   'nu vot ei see 'saind pomindada na sõltuva keele'
   'ni! VOT we don’t know, call back next week’ (OG)

(28) a: (i) x naks, ma 'kõrnet lisame y [una na derjat]?
   'So, do they have a code lock on the door?'
   '[(ei a dace] na] 'hmm,
   'Oh, I have no idea'
   'vot (you) definitely have to know that’ (OG)

To continue on confrontational disalignments, a fascinating pattern of conflict-escalation can be implemented with vot. In the telephone call from which the following excerpt is taken (example 29), P starts to tell her mother something but the mother interrupts her with a different story. In the first lines of the excerpt, the daughter, obviously feeling insulted, finally tells her mother what she had initially wanted to say and then continues to accuse her mother of interrupting her. All of this is carried out in a childish and offensive tone of voice. After the mother calmly asks what she is going to perform, the daughter obstinately refuses to answer with two vot-initiated clauses. Vot is here recurrently implemented in a conflict-creating, conflict-escalating disaligning turn.

(29) P: (ei) midsagi, (0.2) no, see organisovaa hall niidet loobis, noh, ja sis mun - ma eitsema la selal noh, (0.4) saa akasid madde rikkama poole pall oopis ningeid
   'Nothing (0.2) There'll be an anniversary ball at the school and I'll also be performing there. You start telling me some other story when I'm half way through (my story)'

E: 'millega,
What are you going to perform?'
P: no vot guzen, vo ei itse, teavata oma tekkivi sõna
   'NO VOT I’ll be performing VOT (I) won’t say watch your TV’ (LK)

Focalizing and the occasionally accompanying disaligning account for sixty cases of vot in the LK corpus. In the OG corpus and according to various Russian dictionaries, focalizing is also the most common function of vot. In Estonian, vot and var are synonymous in this domain.

4.2 Topic closure
An even more frequent and very coherent function of vot has to do with conversational structure and turn-taking, namely topic closure. This is also a common function of non in Russian (Grenoble–Riley 1996: 833–837, 1996: 182–183). In a total of 121 cases in the LK corpus, vot is implemented to indicate that the speaker is finished with her topic, thereby opening up the possibility that the conversational sequence will be closed.

In example (27), the potential subscriber K complains about the amount of advertisements in the newspaper. Finally, she inhales twice, which provides a space for the telemarketer to take the turn. When the telemarketer skips her chance, the subscriber adds vot nimoodi ‘VOT this way’. After that the telemarketer takes the turn.

(27) K: (i) sise see eitlaan uug. ah see mis itka šeevol peab. ega noh mitjasooks see ei ole ohe?amini. shen minnes todes need leheves kashe läbi. nil et naid
   'It’s the advertisements that keep (the newspaper) going but for me this is not important. I skip these pages at once, I don’t look at them at all. VOT this way'

M: ega sise midsagi, ilma siisist trite la.
   'Okay then, have a nice autumn and!’ (LK)

The above example is typical in many ways. It is well known that turns can be explicitly terminated with relatively content-empty units as a kind of signal that the speaker does not have any more to say. Vo initiates many formulaic units of this kind. Turn-terminating content-empty examples from the LK corpus include:

vot sii
'VOT this way'
no vot yline exi 'NO VOT this kind of thing'

* Actually, it is much less common for vot to occur in a formal than in an informal call in the LK corpus and four cases occur in formal conversations.
It is also typical that these units follow a space where turn-change could have occurred, such as the breathing in example (27), or even an acknowledgement by another speaker. By using vor or a vor-initial formulative expression, the speaker makes it explicit that she is finished with her topic and offers her interlocutor the opportunity to initiate something new. A typical vor-sequence is thus as follows.

1. (informing) turn by A.
2. pause/acknowledgement by B.
3. vor or vor-initial unit by A.

As can be seen in the schema, vor may occur alone in the third position, and in fact it most often does. A characteristic case is presented in example (28) in which speaker A is explaining how she has been trying to get a grip on a steep and slippery driveway. During her subsequent laughter, the interlocutor also acknowledges the story with laughter, after which A terminates her telling with vor. M’s subsequent evaluating comment displays her understanding that the story is finished.

(28) A: ja sis ma < @ mingi repp지요t < līme, ja ēhēhe ašo jūs, na vežė vain. @>  
                   f @ @ @ @ vor. =
     ‘And then I threw some sand and smashed the ice but (1) got out @ @ VOT’
M: / @ @ @ @
M: < @ @ Jov nok. @ @  
     ‘Oh my!’ (LK)

A somewhat different pattern involves a pause after the particle vor, as in example (32). Here, speaker H is talking about what he had been doing the day before. O responds with a recapitulated māko māka ‘uh uh uh’ (the story has been somewhat lengthy). After this relatively strong acknowledgement token suggesting that the information has been sufficient, H closes the story with vor. Thus the floor is open for the interlocutor and/or new topics. Accordingly, O takes the turn and initiates a new topic.

(29) H: =lapo piežūguma, ja mėn k- tavoime līme peal, ja ēhēhe kūtimo stis kālas ja.  
(We bought) pajamas for the child and wandered around the town and in the evening we visited (somebody) and’
count with vor, which at the same time allows her to initiate a new sequence by asking M what she is doing.

\[\text{(31) K: sildarad tingga baskil.} \]
\[\text{"They’re driving around somewhere"} \]
\[\text{M: noo?} \]
\[\text{"Uuuhh"} \]
\[\text{K: vor misgek.} \]
\[\text{"VOT what are you doing"} (LK) \]

Here, vor is used as a transfer item from one topic to the next, terminating one and enabling the initiation of a new one. This can be useful within an ongoing narrative where some subsidiary information may be terminated with vor, after which the narrative continues. In example (32), speaker T is recounting his internship experiences. In the first lines, he answers P’s question about some character in his narrative. P receives the answer with the news receipt item aa, after which the narrator T continues with the main line of the story. The subsidiary information is terminated with vor, which at the same time implements the transfer back to the main line of the story.

\[\text{(32) T: m ikañadah, sàisiym om selles et, lik ñepeeñad on nags seal: kohalik ñøyam.} \]
\[\text{"You see, the thing is that one Peda lecturer is a local teacher there"} \]
\[\text{P: caa,} \]
\[\text{"Okay"} \]
\[\text{(0.6) T: Aañh vor, ja jin nags w: noon n-o me: aindat aldakwadeg, ñkk argi.} \]
\[\text{\text{"VOT and we only communicated directly without the other directors"} (LK) \]

A similar example can be presented from Russian. After the medical receptionist has received introductory information, among other things about the family doctor, the caller goes on to present the reason for the call. The turn-initial transfer from the necessary background information to the reason for the call is carried out by noom.

\[\text{(33) B: nau doonarp y(i) xocedow Kopoñali,} \]
\[\text{"Our family doctor (is) Korolev"} \]
\[\text{O: noom.} \]
\[\text{"Uuuhh"} \]
\[\text{(.)} \]
3. น้าม น้าม ไป หา บ้าน อยู่ ข้าง บ้าน
"VOT and we would need to leave (him) home" (OG)

In summary, the predominant function of var is topic-closing, and the frequency of var in the LK corpus may to some extent reflect the necessity of explicit closures in a telephone call. Vot may also work as a focalizer in different kinds of phrases, and in the rephrasal form it has the lexical meaning of 'exactly, precisely'. It is able to point both backwards and forwards, either focalizing something in prior discourse, foregrounding assessments, disaligning or terminating the topic, or it may point at the subsequent phrase, putting it in focus. Naturally, the functions may overlap, which is also the reason why the numbers of different functions presented above do not add up to the exact overall sum of the cases in the corpus. Vot generally occurs in turn-initial positions, where it is very often used directly after the most common turn-initial particle น้าม (45 cases in the LK corpus). As a topic and sequence terminator, it most frequently forms a turn completely on its own and somewhat less frequently the rest of the turn consists only of other particles.

5. Conclusion
At first sight, the pragmatic particles น้าด, น้าด/วต and var are used with similar functions. On a closer look, it appears that the only conversational action where they are truly interchangeably is in carrying out assessments. The reasons why they can carry out assessments, however, are considerably different from one another. While the original verb forms น้า and น้า/วต urge the participants metaphorically to see or look at something which has just been said, the loaned var can carry out the same function because it is a means of textual focalizing.

Quantitative results illustrate the functional distinctness of each and every item. At the same time, they help to outline their pragmatic similarities. Table 3 presents the occurrences of the major items in different functions in the LK corpus and reveals that น้า (น้า/วต) is predominantly evidential, while น้า/วต is equally frequent as an evidential and as an initiator of explanatory units. Crucially, textual focalizing is a major function of var. Vot can also be used as a focalizer but it most often implements a topic closure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle</th>
<th>News Receipt</th>
<th>Evidential</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Explanatory</th>
<th>Disalignment</th>
<th>Textual Focalizing</th>
<th>Topic Closure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>น้าด/วต</td>
<td>6 (25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 (45%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>น้า/วต</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>น้า/วต</td>
<td>25 (36%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>26 (38%)</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>18 (26%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
<td>13 (37%)</td>
<td>18 (29%)</td>
<td>27 (44%)</td>
<td>12 (19%)</td>
<td>121 (70%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Recurrent non-lexical functions of the particles and their variants in the LK corpus. The most frequent function of every item is boldfaced. Percentages are calculated out of the total occurrence of this particular item or items. As the functions overlap, the sums of the numbers in the rows is not the actual number of occurrences. Neither is the sum of percentages necessarily 100.

The table does not reflect all the existing pragmatic differences. While evidentiality in the case of the particle น้าด may relate to new information, the evidentiality in the case of น้า/วต has to do with referring to common knowledge, be it common cultural background or an earlier event. When initiating assessments, all the particles can possess some evidential qualities but, for the sake of clarity, these cases have not been included under evidentials in Table 3. As to focalizing, น้า is used for literal visual focalizing and not for focalizing in the text, while var is used less amenable.

One major question that was raised at the beginning of section 3 is whether น้า/วต/วต in one hand, and var on the other, are actually different particles. As we can see in Table 3, these items cluster around different functions. However, I would like to argue that this degree of overlap in function would be very unlikely with two completely different items – both are used extensively for focalizing and initiation of explanations. Furthermore, the phonological shortening from น้าต (quantity 3, overlong monophthong + geminate) to น้าต (quantity 2, full-long monophthong + short geminate) to วต or var to var, is completely plausible.

At the same time, in more than half of the cases in the present corpus, the variant var appears to be synonymous with var. It can terminate a news delivery; it can focalize, and achieve a disalignment exactly as var does. An alternative analysis might claim that var is a variant of the particle var. However, the phonological plausibility of this version is much smaller than in the above line of development from the imperative น้าต. The vowel qualities of var and var are clearly different. Furthermore, when disaligning, var seems to be projecting longer units than var, often with a more explanatory connotation. I would therefore like to argue that, due to their phonological similarity and functional closeness, the two different items น้า/วต and var have simply
merged in some functions (this has also been suggested by Pajaru 1999:70), which may have enhanced the frequency of the variant vo. This is somewhat corroborated by the diachronic spread of vo according to the Estonian Dialect Archive. It dominates in the North-East, just like vo, and the variant vo is not found in these subdialects. However, it is also well spread on the islands where vo was recorded in a single subdialect.

On the other hand, the spread of vo all over the Estonian mainland may have been possible due to its phonological similarity with vo as well as due to the fact that it covered the same functions in Russian as vo and vo did in Estonian. The Russian soom is furthermore deictic, meaning “this one, here’s”. In fact, it can be used in most of the functions described in this study, such as pointing at a visual focus (which corresponds to the function of nida) and initiating a new topic or explanation (the function of votsa) (Grenoble – Riley 1996:825–827, 829–833). Grenoble 1998:69–73, 178–180). Russian examples of soom in the OG corpus indicate that it like nida it can be used evidentially, and like votsa it can point to common experience. The workings of soom exceed the limits of the current article. What is important to notice though, is that Estonian has not borrowed the presentative, anaphoric and the explanatory usage of the particle. Estonian has copied the characteristic topic-closing function of soom, which does not occur with the particle variants votsa, vo, and vo. One obvious and very concrete result of the above analysis should be to stop recommending the usage of vo instead of vo, as whatever this literary term vo is doing, it is probably not identical to what vo or even vo for that matter, can achieve in interaction.

The above study has demonstrated that the functions of the Russian loanword vo and the internally developed nide(na)/nida(na) and vota/vota overlap but do not quite coincide. All the forms have deictic qualities from the start, which enable their usage as foregrounding or focalizing means in contemporary spoken Estonian. However, they all have their ingenious areas of specialty.

Transcription conventions

| Underlining, before the syllable | – emphasis |
| Underlining, after the syllable | – truncation |
| [ ] | – overlap |
| = | – pitch of words pronounced together |
| (0.5) | – pause length |
| (1) | – short pause |
| : | – lengthening |
| (l): | – transcriber’s comments |
| <Q> | – word(s) pronounced with ingressive airflow |
| <@> | – marked voice quality |
| <@> | – laughing voice |
| @ | – laughter syllable |
| /h/ | – breathing in with closed mouth |
| /h/ | – breathing out |
| /h/ | – click of the tongue |
| /h/ | – nasal hearing |
| (XXX) | – not hearable, X corresponds to a syllable |
| bold | – the focused item in the excerpt |
| ? | – pitch fall |
| . | – pitch rise |
| ; | – level pitch |
| --- | – truncated intonation unit |
| | – part of the turn has been left out of the example |

**Capital letters**

Abbreviations


* This information has been retrieved by Heli Viisberg.
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Internal development and borrowing of pragmatic particles


Резюме

В статье сопоставляются эстонские прагматические частицы nõid (en-dus), vaata/vat (smotra) и wot. Две первых частицы сформировались в процессе внутреннего развития языка: использование конкретной глагольной формы в определенной разговорной функции позволяет применение этимологизации, закрепление ее в виде частиц. Nõid – прямая эмоциональная частица, vaata/vat – попыточно-формула. Формы, закрепившиеся как частицы, могут подвергаться фонологической ассимиляции или сокращению и более не выступать в функции синтаксического предиката, к ним не применимы аргументы, они также выполняют новые функции, ориентированные скорее на структуру текста и взаимодействие собеседников. Русское заимствование wot долгое время было в области языковых языков, и, несмотря на это, рекомендуется использовать распространенное в литературном языке форму vaat. Настоящая статья показывает, почему так произошло несоответствие, но в ней и есть и вполне специфические функции в общении, например, выражение темы или иерархии собеседникам права речи, как для начала новой темы, так и для завершения разговора. Природа этих частиц проявляется лишь в диалогической последовательности, поэтому для их адекватного анализа необходимо исследовать динамику разговора.
**Summary**

The paper compares the pragmatic usage patterns of the Estonian particles *vaata/vat* 'look', *näed* 'you see' and *vot* in interaction. The first two of these have most probably developed language-externally — the frequent usage of a particular verb form in a specific function has resulted in its grammaticalization as a particle. *Näed* is predominantly an evidential particle and *vaata/vat* an explanatory and focusing particle. The particularized forms may be phonologically assimilated or shortened and they do not behave as predicates. No arguments can be attached to them and they have acquired new functions that instead concern text structure and interaction. The Russian *loovus* *vot*, on the other hand, has been stigmatized in Estonian linguistics and instead, the literary form *vaat* has been officially promoted. The present article shows why this is a mistake. The particle *vot* may occasionally fulfill the same functions as *näed* and *vaata/vat* but it also displays completely idiosyncratic interactional functions, such as topic closure and handing over the turn to the interlocutor, who can then introduce a new topic or alternatively a closure of the conversation. The nature of these efficacious particles can only be revealed in conversational sequences and for their adequate analysis one has to account for the dynamics of interaction.

**1. Introduction**

This paper describes the basic characteristics of coordination in Tundra Nenets. I discuss the formal possibilities of coordination, and rules of concord in connection with these, and investigate what kind of grammatical categories can be coordinated in Tundra Nenets. This way, I attempt to provide insight into the main characteristics of Tundra Nenets coordination that can be used also in typological comparison.

**1.1 Terms, definitions and data**

In this paper I use the term coordinator to refer to all those elements that can connect two coordinated structures. The grammatical category of coordinators will be dealt with here only to an extent which is necessary to give an insight into the nature of the Tundra Nenets coordinating constructions, i.e., the complete list and grammatical analysis of all coordinators of the language is out of the scope of this paper.

Coordinate structures are syntactic structures which contain two or more elements of equal rank and of the same type. Languages differ in what grammatical conditions have to be met by such elements, but they generally have to be used in the same semantic function to be coordinated. Words, phrases and clauses usually can be coordinated in all languages.

Recent typological research suggests that coordination can be considered a universal phenomenon, for the expression of which several linguistic strategies can be used. Many languages use two or three different types of coordination each.

The linguistic data used in this paper are from the Tundra Nenets folk poetry collection published in Lehtsaloo (1947). In addition to this, I also use some examples from Tereshchenko (1956, 1973) and one example sentence from data collected by myself during consultations with a native speaker of Tundra Nenets, Roza Laptev, in 2002.