DESCRIPTION OF THE PRONOMINAL SYSTEM
OF MODERN VILAMOVICEAN

Abstract:
The present paper is dedicated to the documentation of an underdocumented and nearly extinct Germanic language spoken in Poland, called Vilamovicean or Wymysiöeryś, and provides a detailed description of the pronominal morphology of this tongue. Employing the original evidence collected during their extensive field research, the authors present the declensional patterns of all the types of pronouns (personal, demonstrative, indefinite, anaphoric, relative, interrogative and possessive pronouns) and compare them with the pronominal system of Classical Vilamovicean, which was attested to at the beginning of the 20th century. The authors conclude that although a vast majority of the classical pronouns and their declensional forms are still well-maintained, several changes are likewise evident. Namely, the genitive case has been lost; some pronouns have vanished while others modified their usage; certain pronominal forms have suffered a Polish and/or German influence; original analytic pronominal expressions underwent a further grammaticalization process; and new case endings have emerged due to analogical adjustments.
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1. Introduction

The Vilamovicean language or Wymysiöeryś [vimiso:riɕ], as it is called by the native speakers, is an example of a silent linguistic drama. Ignored by politicians and administration, uninteresting to the flashes and microphones of the media, and – most sadly – excluded from mainstream interests of modern universities and research institutions, this local vernacular has gradually been dying a quiet and unnoticeable death.¹

¹ It should be noted that this year the situation has begun to change as two research projects in
Vilamovicean is most probably an East Central German (Ostmitteldeutsch) dialect, derived from Middle High German (cf. BESCH et al. 1983:911, WICHERKIEWICZ 2003 and RITCHIE 2012; for a discussion of the Flemish origin, see RYCKEBOER 1984 and MORCINIEC 1984 and 1995), spoken in the town of Wilamowice, in the westernmost part of Galicia in Southern Poland. Now, at the beginning of the 21st century, Vilamovicean is the smallest Germanic language in the world. It is understood by approximately two hundred persons although fluently spoken by no more than forty. Almost all of these fluent and active speakers are more than 80 years old. As the years rolled on, many of these speakers have passed away and with the loss of each one of them a part of the idiom has been vanishing. Almost every year, yet another “living treasure” of the Vilamovicean language is lost. As a result, if no drastic and immediate changes are made to encourage the usage of this vernacular in Wilamowice, the tongue – at least as a social phenomenon – will vanish within the next fifteen years.

Since 2004, facing this inevitable linguistic and cultural catastrophe, the authors of the present paper have been engaged in the documentation of the Vilamovicean language, recording all the speakers and noting all the words, expressions and grammatical constructions that have been used. Simultaneously with this immense documentary task, Alexander ANDRASON and Tymoteusz KRÓL have been engaged in two other, equally expensive projects. They have been working on a Vilamovicean lexicon (cf. ANDRASON and KRÓL 2013) and on identifying and explaining various aspects of Vilamovicean grammar (cf. ANDRASON 2010a, 2010b, 2011, 2013 and forthcoming; see also ANDRASON & KRÓL forthcoming).

The present article is dedicated to only one aspect of the grammar of Modern Vilamovicean: its pronominal system. Most particularly, based on the data collected in the first decade of the 21st century, the authors provide a meticulous description of the Vilamovicean pronouns as far as their morphology and semantics are concerned. To be exact, all the pronominal subtypes and their case forms (either regular and frequent or rare and even idiolectal) will be presented: personal, demonstrative, indefinite, anaphoric, relative, interrogative and possessive pronouns. Additionally, in appropriate cases, this contemporary situation, derived from the authors’ empirical research, will be compared to the

---

2 This number has increased over last 8 years as our research activities have been expanding, reaching a constantly wider scope of interviewed persons.

3 Tymoteusz KRÓL has also contributed to the renaissance of the Vilamovicean literature (cf. ANDRASON 2011). Additionally, he teaches the Vilamovicean language to children living in Wilamowice.
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state of affairs from the beginning of the 20th century, which was described by KLECZKOWSKI (1920 and 1921) and which may be viewed as a classical period or a golden age of the Vilamovicean language and literature. KLECZKOWSKI’S grammar – published in two parts in 1920 and 1921 – despite its brevity, is the most valuable publication that addresses the question of the Vilamovicean grammar in its totality. The part devoted to pronouns, although very concise, treats the most important morphological properties of the Vilamovicean pronouns (cf. KLECZKOWSKI 1920:137–141) and can be viewed as a trustworthy testimony of the pronominal system before the Second World War.4

As a result, it is evident that our aim is principally empirical, descriptive and synchronic, although important diachronic tendencies that have led to modifications in Modern Vilamovicean will also be discussed. Nevertheless, it must be emphasized that the elaboration of such a detailed description of the Vilamovicean pronominal system – apparently straightforward and uncomplicated – was not a simple task. It was based on extensive field research carried out by the authors since 2004, which involved approximately sixty persons.5 It goes also

4 Besides these two books, no other position can be viewed as casting some important light on the nominal system. The other four studies devoted to the Vilamovicean language fail to provide relevant information on the nominal system. The sections related to the grammar and nominal system in particular in books written by MŁYNEK (1907) and LATOSIŃSKI (1909 [1990]) are too sketchy and superficial. LASATOWICZ’S book from 1992 cannot be regarded as a trustful description of the Vilamovicean language. To be exact, the data presented by LASATOWICZ are highly suspicious: she fails to provide the source(s) of her examples and the Vilamovicean variety she describes is very suspicious displaying an almost unnatural Standard German character (see, especially pages 57–58). Various forms offered by LASATOWICZ are perceived by our informants as evident German borrowings. Observe, for instance, that LASATOWICZ consistently provides genitive forms of nouns, adjective and pronouns, forms which in fact have almost entirely disappeared from the language. The genitive (especially as far as nouns and adjective are concerned) ceased being a living category of the language already at the beginning of the 20th century (cf. KLECZKOWSKI 1920:127). Finally, without underlining the importance of study compiled by Tomasz WICHERKIEWICZ in 2003, his grammatical discussion is limited and superficial (see, especially pages 421–423). This stems from a non-grammatical orientation of the book. Namely, WICHERKIEWICZ focusses on the translation of Biesik’s poem and on several ethological and sociolinguistic issues.

without saying that this synchronic and mainly empirical portrayal is necessary in light of the inevitable disappearance of the tongue. This may, in fact, be the last testimony of the Vilamovicean pronouns.

2. Evidence

2.1 Personal pronoun

The Vilamovicean language offers a great number of alternative personal pronouns, spanning from forms that are less morphologically and phonetically downgraded to those that are profoundly reduced, as far as their phonetics and morphology are concerned (cf. the suffixed forms in section 2.1.3, below). To be precise, the language possesses three classes of personal pronouns: the accented independent pronouns (so-called “full” pronouns; 2.1.1) and two types of the weak and most commonly unaccented pronouns – independent (so-called “reduced” pronouns) and dependent pronouns (i.e. pronominal affixes).

6 In this paper, to the category of pronouns we will include not only forms that are employed as genuine pronouns (in this usage, they are independent, stand on their own and substitute nouns) but also morphologically analogical or very similar constructions that are used as determiners or adjectives (they qualify and modify a noun). To the former subclass we will refer as “employed in a pronominal function (i.e. as genuine pronouns)” while the latter will be labelled as “an adjectival usage”.

---

2.1.1 Full personal pronouns

The full personal pronouns – whose nominative forms are presented in Figure 1, below – typically appear in cases where the speaker wishes to add some emphasis or where a given pronominal form appears in isolation. The later situation is frequently found when someone employs a sole pronominal form as an answer to a question such as War maht dos? ‘Who did it?’. In this case, the regular response is, for example, Yhy ‘I’. The full pronouns also commonly appear in a predicative position: S’ej har ‘It’s he’ (for further examples, see 1.a–g).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>yhy</td>
<td>1 wjyr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>dü</td>
<td>2 jyr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3MS</td>
<td>har</td>
<td>3 zej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>zej</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>ejs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Full personal pronouns

(1) a. **Yhy** łaz s’bihła
   I read the-book
   ‘I read a book’

b. Wos mahst **dü**?
   what do you
   ‘What are you doing?’

c. **Har** koüft dan śtül
   he bought this chair
   ‘He bought this chair’

d. **Zej** hon dos ym fŷjsta feršankt
   they have this to-the prince given
   ‘They have given it to the prince’

e. **Ejs** ej old
   it is old
   ‘It is old’

f. **Wjyr** zājn y Wymysōü
   we are in Wilamowice
   ‘We are in Wilamowice’

---

All the relevant pronominal forms in the examples provided in this paper will be indicated in bold formatting. In this article, word-for-word glosses with contextually similar words/forms (rather than morpheme-by-morpheme glosses) will be used.
The above mentioned pronouns – as any nominal entity such as substantives and adjectives – may be declined in two further cases available in the Vilamovicean language: accusative and dative. Their forms are indicated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>mejh</td>
<td>me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>dejh</td>
<td>dejh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ms</td>
<td>ejn</td>
<td>ejn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fm</td>
<td>zej</td>
<td>yns/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nt</td>
<td>ejs</td>
<td>oüh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yns/c</td>
<td>oüh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ejn</td>
<td>ejn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Oblique cases of the full personal pronouns

The usage of the oblique forms is analogical to those described when analyzing the nominative forms with the distinction that the accusative and dative pronouns fail to appear in a predicative position.

(2) a. **Mejh** komsty byzhia
‘You came to visit me’
b. **Dejh** cy ryta
‘To save you’
c. Ga **yns**
‘Give us!’
d. Yh ho **zej** gyzan
‘I have seen them’
e. Yh ho myt **ejm** gyzasa
‘I have eaten with him’
f. Yh wa **jyr** dos gan
‘I will give this to her’
g. **Fjyr** **zej**
‘For them’
h. Fjyr **ejs**  
   for him  
   ‘For him’

i. Yh łaz à bihła wu dü **mjyr** gylejn höst  
   I read a book which you me lent have  
   ‘I am reading a book which you have lent me’

It is important to acknowledge that apart from referring to neuter nouns, the pronoun **ejs** may sometimes be used with feminine and plural referents, and, thus, instead of **zej**, especially if one talks about a female person whom he addresses by the informal pronoun dü ‘you’. On the contrary, **ejs** is never used when the referent is masculine. Some speakers also employ the form **ejs** instead of the dative feminine singular **jyr**:

(3) a. Yh ho **ejs** gyzan  
   I have her/them seen  
   ‘I have seen her’ and ‘I have seen them’

b. Yh ho myt **ejs** gygasa  
   I have with her eaten  
   ‘I have eaten with her’

The second person plural pronoun **jyr** (whose accusative and dative form is **oüh** ) may also be used in an honorific sense in order to show politeness. Additionally, the suffix **że/cie** – clearly borrowed from Polish **że** – is extensively employed as an emphatic form (4.a). Moreover, the demonstrative pronouns **dy** or **di** (cf. section 2.3) may replace the personal **zej** both in the singular feminine and in the plural (4.b):

(4) a. Skokumcie!  
   welcome  
   ‘Welcome!’

b. Dy ferśankta dos ym fiyśta  
   they offered this to-the prince  
   ‘They offered it to the prince’

According to KLECKOWSKI (1921:137), the Vilamovicean personal pronouns possessed the following genitive forms: 1sg. **mer** and **mājnc**, 2sg. **der** and **dājnc**, 3sg.ms/nt. **zer** and **zâj**, 3sg.fm **jyr**, **ar**, **er**, 1pl. **ynzer**, 2pl. **ojer** (and suffixed -**er**), and 3pl. **jyr**, **ar**, **er**. The forms of the 1st and 2nd person singular were already at that period only used as parts of the expressions such as **merholw** ‘because of me, as far as I am concerned’,
måjncwegen ‘because of me’, derholw ‘because of you, as far as you are concerned’, dâjncwegen ‘because of you’ and ynzer âner ‘one of us’. According to KLECZKOWSKI, the genitive forms of the third person were more independent and could occur on their own. Nowadays, however, the genitive forms of the pronouns – be they full, reduced and/or affixed – are entirely lost.

2.1.2 Reduced pronouns

The reduced pronouns are forms that are typically unaccented. It is an accompanying element in the sentence (most commonly, a preposition, a conjunction or a verb) that receives the stress. These pronominal forms are extremely common. De facto, they are the most neutral and/or unmarked pronominal forms. They may be found in almost all the syntactic environments and their only regular and necessary feature is the loss (or, at least, weakening) of their accentual force, by which they contrast with full forms. On the other hand, they maintain their morphological independence, being clearly distinguishable from affixed pronouns (cf. examples 5.a–e, below). The following chart presents the reduced pronouns that are available in the nominative case, in Modern Vilamovicean:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>yh</td>
<td>1 wer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>dy</td>
<td>2 der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3MS</td>
<td>å / är</td>
<td>3 zy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>zy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>(es)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Reduced personal pronouns

(5) a. Yh laz dy câjtung
I read the newspaper
‘I read the newspaper’

b. Wen der wjet yhta maha...
if you were something do
‘If you were to / would do something…’

---

8 This form is an intermediate variant between eis and the suffixed s, with a slightly audible vocalic e sound. Apart from LASATOWICZ (1992), it is normally not used in the Vilamovicean orthography and modern texts.
c. **Wer**  hon  dos  oüta
   we have this car
   ‘We have this car’

d. **Es**  ej  wiöem
   it is hot
   ‘It is hot’

e. Å  zioet…
   he says
   ‘He says…’

The oblique forms of the unstressed pronouns are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>singular</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>DAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1m</td>
<td>mih</td>
<td>mer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m</td>
<td>dih</td>
<td>der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ms</td>
<td>å</td>
<td>jum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fm</td>
<td>(es)²</td>
<td>jyn²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nt</td>
<td>zë</td>
<td>(j)üh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>(yns/c)²</td>
<td>(j)yn³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>jum²</td>
<td>(j)üh²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m</td>
<td>zë</td>
<td>(j)üh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Oblique cases of the reduced personal pronouns

(6) a. Yh  ho  å  gyzan
   I have him seen
   ‘I have seen him’

b. Å  hot  gykoüft  å  hin-la
   he has bought a chicken
   ‘He has bought a chicken’

c. Yh  wa  **jum**  dos  gan
   I will him this give
   ‘I will give it to him’

d. Yh  wa  **jyn**  dos  gan
   I will them this give
   ‘I will give it to them’

e. Yh  ho  myt  **jyr**  gygasa
   I have with her eaten
   ‘I have eaten with her’

---
² See footnote 4, above.
² These forms are similar to the full pronouns with the difference that they are unstressed.
³ The two forms (jüh and üh) are free variations.
² The form **jyr**, pronounced with a short y [i], is also possible.
³ As may be seen in this chart, certain pronominal forms (in particular, jüh and jün) may lose the initial consonant j yielding variant such as üh and yn. Additionally, one may infrequently find the form ina as an alternative to jyn and yn.
f. Yh ho myt jyn gygasa  
I have with them eaten  
‘I have eaten with them’

The contrast of the full and reduced personal pronouns may be illustrated by the following examples, in which the first sentence of the pair employs a full variety while the other uses an alternative, reduced, form.

(7) a. Yh ho zej gyzan  
I have her seen  
‘I have seen her (i.e. it is her I have seen)’

b. Yh ho zy gyzan  
I have her seen  
‘I have seen her’

This difference between the two classes of personal pronoun (i.e. full versus reduced) can also be observed in their usage in conjunction with prepositions. If a full pronominal form is employed, the preposition is unstressed and the accentual prominence is given to the pronoun. If a reduced variant is used, however, it is the preposition that bears the stress, while the pronoun is left unaccented: fu ´mjyr vs. ‘fön mer ‘for me’ and cy ´djyr vs. ´cün der ‘to you’, fjyr ejn vs. fjyr ´å ‘for him’. It should also be noted that the reduced pronouns (such as å, zy or es) are usually impossible when used alone in a sentence, for example, in order to answer the question War maht dos? ‘Who did it?’. As a response, only the pronoun Har! ‘He’ – and not Å! – is acceptable.¹⁴

As was the case with the full pronouns, certain neuter forms (e.g. jum in example 8, below) may be employed in order to refer to feminine substantives, especially to nouns that indicate female persons:

(8) Yh wa jum dos gan  
I will her this give  
‘I will give it to her’

2.1.3 Affixed pronouns

Affixed pronouns constitute the most downgraded variants of pronouns as far as their phonetics and morphology are concerned. Most commonly, they are suffixed to verbs (hjyh ‘I hear’), prepositions (wijh ‘as I’) and conjunctions (doh

¹⁴ However, as far as the lexeme jer is concerned, it is used in an independent position by some informants.
‘that I’ or wål’s ‘as/since they’). In the case of verbs, one also finds prefixed pronouns (syj ‘it is’). They are invariably unstressed and cannot be employed without a hosting entity (i.e. independently or in isolation). The nominative forms of this type of pronouns are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-h / h-</td>
<td>1 -wer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-y</td>
<td>2 -er</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3MS</td>
<td>-ä</td>
<td>3 -s / s-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>-s / s-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>-s / s-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Affixed personal pronouns

These forms are common in speech and the examples are highly abundant:

(9) a. Mahstå  dos?
   do-you  this
   ‘Do you do it?’

b. Fu mün  hower  ferja
   for  tomorrow  have-we holidays
   ‘Tomorrow we start the holidays’

c. Wos  wysty  maha
   what  will-you  do
   ‘What will you do?’

d. Ziöetå
   says-he
   ‘He says’

e. Skymt
   it-comes
   ‘It comes’

f. Sej  Bolesław
   it-is  Bolesław
   ‘This is Bolesław’

g. Cołts  dy  taksa
   paid-she  the  fees
   ‘She paid the fees’

h. Yh  kynt  ny  ziöen  wiöes  junk  wiöes  alt
   I  can  not  say  was-he  young  was-he  old
   ‘I could not say – was it young, was it old’
It should be observed that when the first person plural suffix is added to a verb in the Present Tense, the regular ending (either a or n) disappear. This means that the suffix -wer is added directly to the verbal root, yielding forms such as hower ‘we have’ (cf. wjyr hon) and gejwer ‘we go’ (cf. wjyr gejn).

The oblique – accusative and dative – forms of the affixed pronouns are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>plural</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3ms</td>
<td>fm</td>
<td>nt</td>
<td></td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} 2\textsuperscript{nd} 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>– – -\textsuperscript{15} /s-</td>
<td>-s / s\textsuperscript{16}</td>
<td>-ns</td>
<td>-\textsuperscript{17}</td>
<td>-s / s-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>– – -um /-m\textsuperscript{18}-er/-r</td>
<td>-um/-m</td>
<td>-ns</td>
<td>-\textsuperscript{19}</td>
<td>-n, -a, -na</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Oblique cases of the affixed personal pronouns

It must be emphasized that oblique affixed forms are extremely frequent with prepositions (e.g. cyns ‘to us’), although the full and separated forms may be used as well (e.g. myt ejm or myt ina):

(10) Nimyd kons mej ny ryta
nobody can-her more no save
‘Nobody can save her anymore’

In accordance with the phenomenon observed in the case of full and reduced pronouns, the form of the neuter singular dative -um is sometimes used for feminine referents: mytum ‘with him/it’ or ‘with her’ (i.e. instead of myt ejm/jym and myt jyr/jer) and fum ‘from him/it’ and ‘for her’ (i.e. instead of fu ejm/jum and fu jyr/jer).\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{15} The forms -jå, -m, -r appear after a vowel while the varieties -å, -um and -er are found after a consonant.
\textsuperscript{16} One should note that in cases where the pronoun -s follows the consonant r, the two sounds are pronounced as s [e].
\textsuperscript{17} As far as the pronouns of the feminine singular and 3\textsuperscript{rd} person plural are concerned, it seems that the reduced form zy is preferred. This most likely stems from the need to differentiate the aforementioned pronouns from the neuter singular (cf. however, example 10 below).
\textsuperscript{18} It should be noted that the dative of the third masculine and neuter singular is homonymous with a suffixed form of the article.
\textsuperscript{19} The distribution of these forms is as follows: -n and -na (an innovation, a type of a double marking -n + -a) are found after vowels and -a after consonant (myta ‘with them’).
\textsuperscript{20} The genuine feminine forms are myter and fur, respectively.
2.2 Demonstrative pronouns

The Modern Vilamovicean displays three series of demonstrative pronouns. Two of them concern the spatial deixis: proximal pronouns and distal pronouns, while the third is related to the idea of “qualitative” indication. The first – proximal – type of demonstrative pronouns expresses the idea of physical nearness, similar to the English pronouns ‘this, these’ and offers the following forms depending on the gender, case and number:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>masculine</th>
<th>feminine</th>
<th>neuter</th>
<th>plural of all genders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>dar</td>
<td>di</td>
<td>dos (dot)</td>
<td>di</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>dan</td>
<td>di</td>
<td>dos (dot)</td>
<td>di</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dam</td>
<td>dar</td>
<td>dam</td>
<td>dan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Declension of the demonstrative pronouns of proximity

(11) a. Myt **dan** büwa
with these boys
‘With these boys’
b. Uf **dar** wełt
in this world
‘In this world’

It should be noted that the unaccented and/or suffixed variant of the demonstrative pronouns of proximity are nowadays employed only as forms of the definite article:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>masculine</th>
<th>feminine</th>
<th>neuter</th>
<th>plural of all genders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td><em>der</em></td>
<td>dy</td>
<td><em>s</em></td>
<td><em>dy</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td><em>yn, -a, -n</em></td>
<td>dy</td>
<td><em>s</em></td>
<td><em>dy</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td><em>ym, -m</em></td>
<td><em>yr, -r</em></td>
<td><em>ym, -m</em></td>
<td><em>yn, -a, -n</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Declension of the definite article

(12) a. Yh **luź dy** câjtung
I read the newspaper
‘I read [past] the newspaper’

21 The form *dot* instead of *dos* is idiolectal being employed by one informant: *dot mākja* ‘this girl’.
b. Yh ho gykoüft s’bihla
   ‘I have bought the book’

c. Yh ho gyzan dy ki
   ‘I have seen the cows’

In an analogical manner to the personal pronouns, the singular neuter form dos may be employed when referring to females whom one would address by dũ (‘you’ [singular]). As far as the genitive forms are concerned (cf. dass, dar, dyr and yr in KLECZKOWSKI 1920:138 and das, dyr and dar in LASATOWICZ 1992:58), their usage has ceased to be available in the modern language.

The second class of demonstratives includes distal pronouns – jer, jeny, jes and je(na) – which indicate objects or persons located further way from the speaker of distance, corresponding to the meaning of the English words ‘that’ and ‘those’. Their declensional pattern is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>masculine</th>
<th>feminine</th>
<th>neuter</th>
<th>plural of all genders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>jer</td>
<td>jeny</td>
<td>jes</td>
<td>je / jena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>jen</td>
<td>jeny</td>
<td>jes</td>
<td>je / jena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>jem</td>
<td>jer</td>
<td>jem</td>
<td>jen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Declension of the demonstrative pronouns of distance

As may be observed above, the nominative and accusative plural forms display two varieties: je and jena. Je is used as an adjective (i.e. accompanying and qualifying a noun), while jena is employed as a genuine pronoun (i.e. independently without any accompanying noun or in a predicative position). The genitive forms (jess, jer, jess and jer; cf. KLECZKOWSKI 1920:139) are nowadays entirely lost.

The third set of demonstratives consists of three related but different types of pronouns – zyter, zytnikjer and zytikjer – that indicate not the physical location (either proximate or distant) but a determined type of thing or person. All of them have the meaning of ‘so, like this, of this sort’ (cf. German solcher). Below, we provide the declensional patterns of zyter and zytnikjer. The word zytikjer declines analogically to zytnikjer – the only difference is the assimilation of n to t. According to our data, zyter is the most common of the three varieties.

22 Some speakers use the form jena as an accented variant of je.
### Description of the Pronominal System of Modern Vilamovicean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
<th>Plural of All Genders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nom</strong></td>
<td>zyter</td>
<td>zyty</td>
<td>zyta / zytys</td>
<td>zyty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acc</strong></td>
<td>zyta</td>
<td>zyty</td>
<td>zyta / zytys</td>
<td>zyty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dat</strong></td>
<td>zyta</td>
<td>zyta / zytys</td>
<td>zyta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
<th>Plural of All Genders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nom</strong></td>
<td>zytnikjer</td>
<td>zytnikjy</td>
<td>zytnik / zytnikjys</td>
<td>zytnikjy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acc</strong></td>
<td>zytnikja</td>
<td>zytnikjy</td>
<td>zytnik / zytnikjys</td>
<td>zytnikjy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dat</strong></td>
<td>zytnikja</td>
<td>zytnikja / zytnikjy</td>
<td>zytnikja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure 10: Declension of zyter and zytnikjer

One should observe that zyter, zytnikjer and zyttikjer are regularly preceded by the indefinite article å. The nominative/accusative neuter displays two forms: the shorter (zyta and zytnik) is employed when preceding a noun (it qualifies the nominal head; 13.a), whereas the longer (zytys and zytnikjys) are used in apposition to a noun (13.b and 13.c).

(13) a. Å zyta kind
    a such child
    ‘Such a child’

b. Å kynd å zytys
    a child a such
    ‘Such a child’

c. Å måkja å zytnikjys
    a girl a such
    ‘Such a girl’

d. Å zyta (zyty) śejny câjt
    a such nice time
    ‘Such a nice time’

Following the general tendency, the genitive forms of this series of the demonstrative pronouns are lost in the modern language.

---

23 The forms in the dative singular feminine – i.e. zyta or zyty and zytnikja or zytnikjy are free variations (13.d).

24 Additionally, äncik ‘the only one, sole’ and änîk ‘taki sam’ may be included to the demonstratives of Modern Vilamovicean. However, they never appear independently (they are never used as genuine pronouns) but invariably accompany a noun functioning as an adjective. They are also indeclinable.
2.3 Indefinite pronouns

Modern Vilamovicean possesses numerous positive indefinite pronouns with the meaning of ‘someone, somebody, anyone, anybody’. The most frequent are indeclinable words such as imid, imyd, imåd and imanda. Apart from these lexemes, equally frequent is the use of the pronouns mon and mâ ‘one, someone’. Additionally, the pronoun of the third person plural zej (and its reduced variant zy) may be employed in order to convey an impersonal or general meaning. Some speakers alternatively prefer the pronoun of the third masculine singular har in the same function. There is also a depreciatory indefinite pronoun similar to ‘just any(one)’ målåjhtwar and its adverbial variety målåjhtwi ‘in any manner’. The indefinite pronoun for things is typically yhta ‘something, anything’ and, less commonly, yht ‘something, anything’. The pronoun jynt åner ‘anyone, someone’ – given by KLECZKOWSKI (1920:141) is rarely used as an indefinite pronoun anymore. It has survived more frequently in some negative and adverbial uses, such as: jynt and jyntwu ‘somewhere, anywhere’, njynt ‘nowhere’, jynta möl ‘sometimes’. A similar fate may be detected in the case of the pronouns miöehjer, miöehy and miöehys ‘some, several, many a’ that were still in use according to KLECZKOWSKI (1920:141) and mainly survived in the words nymiöeher, nymiöehy, nymiöehys with the same meaning. They are also found in the adverbial expression miöehysmöł ‘sometimes, anytime’. The pronoun nander ‘other’ is typically encountered in certain reciprocal locutions, such as undernander, funander or mytnander (see, section 2.4, below).

There are two main series of the negative indefinite pronouns. The first class includes words that are direct negative counterparts of the positive pronouns: nimid, nimyd, nimåd and nimånda ‘no one’. The word for negative pronouns referring to things is nist ‘nothing’. Just like their positive homologues, all of the aforementioned negative pronouns are indeclinable. However, apart from these indeclinable indefinite negative pronouns, the language likewise possesses the lexeme kâ ‘(no) any / none’ that varies according to number, gender and case, showing the following declensional pattern:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>masculine</th>
<th>feminine</th>
<th>neuter</th>
<th>plural of all genders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>kâ / kâner</td>
<td>kâ / kâny</td>
<td>kâ / kås</td>
<td>kâ / kåna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>kån</td>
<td>kâ / kâny</td>
<td>kâ / kås</td>
<td>kâ / kåna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>kâm</td>
<td>kår</td>
<td>kån</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11: Declension of the pronoun kâ
One should note that, in some cases (i.e. in the singular masculine nominative, neuter and feminine nominative-accusative and plural nominative-accusative), two types of *kå*-forms are found. The short variant appears if the word *kå* in used adjectively, i.e. when qualifying a given noun. On the contrary, the long varieties *kåner*, *kåny*, *kås* and *kåna* are employed in a pronominal function, i.e. when *kå* appears independently, without an accompanying noun. A frequently found alternative pronoun with the sense of ‘no one, nobody’ is *kå menć*, literally ‘no man’.

Besides the positive and negative indefinite pronouns presented above, scholars also include to the class of indefinites, the pronouns with the meaning of ‘every’: *ider* and *itłykjer*. Their declensional patterns are indicated below. One should observe that the variety *ida* is used adjectively, while the form *idys* is employed independently as a genuine pronoun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td><em>ider</em></td>
<td><em>idy</em></td>
<td><em>ida</em> / <em>idys</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td><em>ida</em></td>
<td><em>idy</em></td>
<td><em>ida</em> / <em>idys</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td><em>idum</em></td>
<td><em>ider</em></td>
<td><em>idum</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td><em>itłykjer</em></td>
<td><em>itłykjy</em></td>
<td><em>itłykjys</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td><em>itłykja</em></td>
<td><em>itłykjy</em></td>
<td><em>itłykjys</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td><em>itłykja</em></td>
<td><em>itłykjja</em></td>
<td><em>itłykjja</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12: Declension of the pronouns *ider* and *itłykjer*

In an analogical manner to the personal and demonstrative pronouns, the genitive case of the indefinite pronouns (e.g. *idas*, *ider* and *idar*; cf. Kleczkowski 1920:141) is lost in Modern Vilamovicean.

### 2.4 Anaphoric pronoun

The category of anaphoric pronouns consists of two subclasses: reflexive and reciprocal.

In the 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) person singular and plural, the reflexive pronouns – which indicate that the subject of the verb is also the patient of the action – are formally identical to the accusative of a respective personal pronoun (cf. section 2.1). In the 3\(^{rd}\) person of the singular and plural, the word *zejh* and its reduced variety *zih* are used:
Nowadays, the use of the form zejh – originally restricted to the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person singular and plural (cf. 14.a) – has been generalized for all the persons. Consequently, the form zejh may be employed with the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} persons instead of mejh, dejh, yns and oüh (14.b and 14.c). Nevertheless, the historically correct forms mejh, dejh, yns and oüh are also frequently met (14.d). It should be noted that the pronoun zejh may likewise be used in the imperative, which is a verbal form typically directed to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person singular (14.e). In addition, the pronoun zejh is regularly employed with the infinitive: liyn zih ‘to study, learn’ or zih cy wjen ‘to defend itself’. Vilamovicean also possesses an emphatic indeclinable anaphoric pronoun zoüwer, which is commonly added to a reflexive pronoun (14.f).

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{llll}
subject & reflexive & subject & reflexive \\
\hline
ih & mejh / mih & wjyr & yns \\
dü & dejh / dih & jyr & oüh / jüh \\
har & zejh / zih & zej & zejh / zih \\
zej & ejs & & \\
\end{tabular}
\caption{Reflexive pronouns}
\end{table}

(14) a. Fjeta \textit{zih} giöe ny  \
‘They do not fear at all’

b. Wjyr \textit{ljyn zih} Wymysiöeryś  \
‘We learn Vilamovicean’

c. Wjyr frājyn \textit{zih}  \
‘We rejoice’

d. Yh wyl \textit{mih} ljyn Wymysiöeryś  \
‘I want to learn Vilamovicean’

e. Łjy \textit{zih}!  \
‘Study!’

f. Å ziöet cy \textit{zejh} zoüwer  \
‘He said to himself’
The use of the anaphoric pronoun zejh in the sense of a *dativus benefici- ciaries* – which indicates that the subject is beneficiary of the action – is uncommon in the Vilamovicean language. Instead, Vilamoviceans prefer an appropriate personal pronoun in the dative case (15.a). In this usage, the pronoun may again be accompanied by the word zoüwer (15.b). The reflexive pronouns (especially zejh) may also be used after a preposition (15.c).

(15) a. Har köuft um å fad
   ‘He bought himself a horse’
   he bought himself a horse

b. Har köuft um zoüwer å oüta
   ‘He bought himself a car’
   he bought himself self a car

c. Göt cy zih höt byfola
   ‘God has called to himself’
   God to himself has called

The Vilamovicean reciprocal pronouns are derived from the word nander ‘other, another’ which is nowadays found only in compounds: *undernander* ‘among each other’, *funander* ‘for each other’ or *mytnander* ‘with each other’ (16.a). The idea of reciprocity may likewise be conveyed by the locution åner + preposition + ander, in which the two nominal entities (i.e. åner and ander) are declined in an appropriate case (16.b). However, the concept of reciprocity is most commonly expressed by adverbs derived from the entity -zoma, for instance cyzoma, byzoma or mytzoma (16.c):

(16) a. Zej kuza *undernander*
    they talk to each other
    ‘They talk to each other’

b. Zej kuza åner myt andum
    they talk one with another
    ‘They talk to each other’

c. Zej kuza *cyzoma*
    they talk together
    ‘They talk to each other’

2.5 Relative pronouns

There are two types of relative pronouns in Vilamovicean. The first one is homonymous with the interrogative adverb *wu* ‘where’ and the second is
identical to the demonstrative pronouns of proximity *dar*, *dos* and *di* (cf. section 2.2, above).

The lexeme *wu* is by far the most frequent relative pronoun in the Vilamovicean language. It is indeclinable and may be used with persons, animals and inanimate objects of any gender and number:

(17) a. Gat s’brut y dam *wu* hyngjyt
give the-bread to that one who is hungry
‘Give the bread to who is hungry’

b. Was ej dy jak *wu* dō lājt?
whose is the jacket that there lies
‘Whose is the jacket that lies there?’

The other way of introducing the relative clauses corresponds to the use of the demonstrative pronouns *dar*, *dos* and *di*. The declensional pattern of this set of relative pronouns is analogical to the declension offered by the demonstrative pronouns (cf. section 2.2).25 This usage is significantly less common than the previously mentioned word *wu* and is perceived by natives as a German influence.

(18) a. Di mājsta Doūća *di* hoūt grenn…
the most Germans who today cry
‘Most Germans who cry today…’

b. Å smok *dar* hot łoūt gyfrasa…
a dragon that has people eaten
‘A dragon that has eaten people…’

One should also observe that in contrast with the situation presented by KLECKZKOWSKI (1920) and (1921), in the modern Vilamovicean language, relative pronouns – both *wu* and *dar* and its varieties – may be omitted (19.a). In such cases, a resumptive personal pronoun (full, reduced or affixed), which specifies the referent of the omitted relative pronoun, typically appears in the subordinated clause in an adequate case, gender and number (19.b, 19.c and 19.d):

(19) a. Dar büw yh za
this boy I see
‘The boy whom I can see’

---

25 It should be noted that the singular masculine nominative form *dar* has two alternative variants: *der* and *dyr.*
b. Dar bűw yh å za
this boy I him see
‘The boy whom I can see’
c. Dar bűw yh ho å gyzon
this boy I have him seen
‘The boy whom I have seen’
d. Dos mākja yh mytum kuzt
this girl I with-her talked
‘The girl [that] I talked to’

2.6 Interrogative pronouns

The most common interrogative pronouns in the Vilamovicean language are war ‘who’ and wos ‘what’. They decline regularly, except for the fact that in the dative, apart from the regular wam, the pronoun wos shows an innovative form wos, developed by analogy to the nominative and accusative cases. As a result, at least for some speakers, the pronoun wos is nowadays indeclinable. One should note that there is also an exceptional genitive form of the pronoun war, i.e. was ‘whose’.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{NOM} & \text{war} & \text{wos} \\
\text{ACC} & \text{wan} & \text{wos} \\
\text{DAT} & \text{wam} & \text{wam} / \text{wos} \\
(\text{GEN} & \text{was}) & \\
\end{array}
\]

Figure 14: Declension of the interrogative pronouns war and wos

The pronoun wos ‘what’ may also be used in an adjectival sense, qualifying a noun – either a thing or a person – with which it stands together:

\[(20) \quad \text{Wos} \quad \text{tohter} \quad \text{ej} \quad \text{dos?} \]
what girl is this
‘What girl is this one?’

There are also three interrogative pronouns with the sense of ‘which(one)’: wyler, wyhjer and wylhjer whose declension is presented in Figure 15, below. Wylhjer declines like its more frequent counterpart wyhjer – the only difference consists in the preservation of the consonant l. Additionally, one may find the pronoun woswer ‘which(one)’, a fused form of the original expression wos fjyr åner (cf. German: was für ein). One should note that, according to KLECZKOWSKI (1920:141), this pronominal locution was
still understood as analytical. In the modern language, however, it is perceived as a fully fused and synthetic pronoun. Likewise in contrast with the situation described by KLECKOWSKI (1920), in the Modern Vilamov-icean, *woswer* is indeclinable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>wyłer</td>
<td>wyły</td>
<td>wyłys</td>
<td>wyla/ wyły</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>wyła</td>
<td>wyły</td>
<td>wyłys</td>
<td>wyla / wyły</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>wyłum</td>
<td>wyłer</td>
<td>wyłum</td>
<td>wyla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

masculine feminine neuter plural of all genders

NOM wyhjer wyhjy wyhjys wyhja / wyhy
ACC wyhja wyhjy wyhjys wyhja / wyhy
DAT wyhjum wyhjer wyhjum wyhja

Figure 15: Declension of the interrogative pronouns *wyłer* and *wyhjer*

(21) a. Y *wyhym* jür?
in which year
‘In which year?’

b. *Wyhjer* būw
which boy
‘Which boy?’

2.7 **Possessive pronouns**

Vilamovicean has the following possessive pronouns: *māj* ‘my’, *dāj* ‘your [singular]’, *zāj* ‘his, its’, *jyr* ‘her, their’, *ojer* ‘your [plural]’ and *ynzer* ‘our’. The possessive of the 1st person singular declines in the manner indicated below, although uninflected form *māj* may also be used in all the cases. As a result, *māj* displays two alternative paradigms: one preserve the classical situation (cf. KLECKOWSKI 1920:140) while the other corresponds to a modern analogical expansion of the form that historically was the most common one. It should also be noted that *māj* corresponds to the simplest shape (as far as the morphology is concerned) of the inflected pronoun of the 1st person singular (cf. Figure 16, below).

---

26 The plural forms *wyla* or *wyły* and *wyhra* or *wyhy* are free variations.
masculine feminine neuter plural of all genders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>masculine</th>
<th>feminine</th>
<th>neuter</th>
<th>plural of all genders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>måj</td>
<td>måj</td>
<td>måj</td>
<td>måj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>men</td>
<td>måj</td>
<td>måj</td>
<td>måj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>mem</td>
<td>mer</td>
<td>mem</td>
<td>men</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16: Declension of the possessive pronoun måj

(22) a. Måj câjgnis mü zâjn mytum rima
    my certificate must be with-the distinction
    ‘My certificate must be with the distinction’

b. Ślöf måj büwła fest
    sleep my boy deeply
    ‘Sleep my boy deeply!’

c. Måj baba
    my grandmother
    ‘My grandmother’

If the possessive lexeme is used predicatively (23.a) or independently as a genuine pronoun – and thus not as an adjective preceding and qualifying the noun – different “long” or, more properly speaking, pronominal, forms are employed (23.b). Additionally, these “long” varieties appear if the pronoun follows the substantive. In this usage, the possessive pronoun was originally used in apposition to the preceding noun. As it is evident from the quoted examples (see 23.c–f, below), in such instances, the substantive is invariably accompanied by a definite article.

masculine feminine neuter plural of all genders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>masculine</th>
<th>feminine</th>
<th>neuter</th>
<th>plural of all genders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>måjner</td>
<td>måjny</td>
<td>måjs</td>
<td>måjna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>måjna</td>
<td>måjny</td>
<td>måjs</td>
<td>måjna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>måjnum</td>
<td>måjner</td>
<td>måjnum</td>
<td>måjna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17: Declension of the possessive pronoun måj – “long” forms

(23) a. Har ej måjner
    he is mine
    ‘He is mine’

b. Dü kuzt myt dâj kłop. Yhy kuz myt måjnum
    you talk with your man I talk with mine
    ‘You talk to your husband. I talk to mine’
c. Der kłop mâjner
the man mine
‘My husband’

d. Dy müter mâjny
the mother yours
‘My mother’

e. S’ måkja mâjs
the girl mine
‘My girl’

f. Dy kyndyn mâjna
the children mine
‘My children’

The pronouns dâj and zâj are declined and employed in an analogical way to that displayed by mâj:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>masculine</th>
<th>feminine</th>
<th>neuter</th>
<th>plural of all genders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>dâj (dâjner)</td>
<td>dâj(ny)</td>
<td>dâj(s)</td>
<td>dâj(na)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>den (dâjna)</td>
<td>dâj(ny)</td>
<td>dâj(s)</td>
<td>dâj(na)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dem (dâjnum)</td>
<td>der (dâjner)</td>
<td>dem (dâjnum)</td>
<td>den (dâjna)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>masculine</th>
<th>feminine</th>
<th>neuter</th>
<th>plural of all genders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>zâj (zâjner)</td>
<td>zâj(ny)</td>
<td>zâj(s)</td>
<td>zâj(na)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>zen (zâjna)</td>
<td>zâj(ny)</td>
<td>zâj(s)</td>
<td>zâj(na)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>zem (zâjnum)</td>
<td>zer (zâjner)</td>
<td>zem (zâjnum)</td>
<td>zen (zâjna)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18: Declension of the possessive pronouns dâj and zâj

(24) a. Dâj noma, dâj kyngrâjë, dâj wyâ
Your name your kingdom your will
‘Your name, your kingdom, your will’

b. Wos maht dâj foter?
what does your father
‘What does your father do?’

c. Har blâ zâj frynd
he remained his friend
‘He remained his friend’

d. Tiöef zâj land!
Baptize his land
‘Baptize his country’
e. Y **zen** łandyñ
   in his countries
   ‘In his countries’

f. Zâj **besta kyndyn**
   his best children
   ‘His best children’

g. Y **zâj** hend
   into his hand
   ‘Into his hand’

h. Myt **zem** nama
   with his name
   ‘With his name’

The pronoun *ynzer* ‘our’ and *ojer* ‘your [plural]’ decline in the way indicated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>Plural of all genders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td><strong>ynzer</strong></td>
<td><strong>ynzer</strong></td>
<td><strong>ynzer</strong></td>
<td><strong>ynzer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td><strong>ynzer</strong></td>
<td><strong>ynzer</strong></td>
<td><strong>ynzer</strong></td>
<td><strong>ynzer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuter</td>
<td><strong>ynzer</strong></td>
<td><strong>ynzer</strong></td>
<td><strong>ynzer</strong></td>
<td><strong>ynzer</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19: Declension of the possessive pronouns *ynzer* and *ojer*

(25) a. **Ynzer** foter
   our father
   ‘Our father’

b. **Ynzer** śułda
   our sins
   ‘Our sins’

c. **Ynzer** familyj wōnt y Wymysoü
   our family lives in Wilamowice
   ‘Our family lives in Wilamowice’

---

27 The three forms *ynzum*, *ynzerum* and *ynzrum* are interchangeable free variants.
Additionally, there is a special predicative (genuine pronominal) form of all the persons (masculine, feminine and neuter) in the singular: \textit{ynzyś} (26.a) and \textit{ożyś} (26.b). Both forms were unnoticed by KLECZKOWSKI (1920).

\begin{itemize}
\item[(26) a.] Ejs ej \textit{ynzyś}
\hspace{1cm} it is ours
\hspace{1cm} ‘He (she, it) is ours’
\item[(26) b.] Har ej \textit{ożyś}
\hspace{1cm} he is yours
\hspace{1cm} ‘He is yours’
\end{itemize}

As in German, the possessive pronoun of the third singular feminine \textit{jyr} also refers to the third person plural of all the genders. Consequently, the expression \textit{jyr frynd} may signify ‘her friend’ and ‘their friend’. The declension of the pronoun \textit{jyr} follows the pattern indicated below and again, the lexeme possesses a particular predicative form \textit{jyś} for all the genders in the singular (27.f).

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{lllll}
\hline
& masculine & feminine & neuter & plural of all genders \\
\hline
NOM & \textit{jyr} & \textit{jyr} & \textit{jyr} & \textit{jyr} \\
ACC & \textit{jyn} & \textit{jyr} & \textit{jyr} & \textit{jyr} \\
DAT & \textit{jym} & \textit{jyr} & \textit{jym} & \textit{jyn} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Declension of the possessive pronoun \textit{jyr}}
\end{table}

\footnote{It should be noted that that according to KLECZKOWSKI (1920:140), there was no distinction between a predicative/pronominal and qualitative/adjectival form of the neuter \textit{jyr}. To be precise, \textit{jyś} was supposedly a nominative while \textit{jyr} an accusative form. This description however may have been inadequate, failing to represent the real state of affairs. It is significantly more plausible that the distribution of \textit{jyr} and \textit{jyś} at the beginning of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century was analogical to the situation observed nowadays. It is important to note that no other neuter forms (pronominal, adjectival or nominal) display in the accusative a shape that would differ from the nominative. In fact, in nominal entities of the neuter gender, the two cases are always identical.}
(27) a. Cy  jym  man  
to  her  husband  
‘For her husband’  
b. Uf  jyr  hyłf  
on  her  help  
‘With her help’  
c. Jyr  łand  
her  country  
‘Her country’  
d. Y  jym  ława  
in  their  lives  
‘In their lives’  
e. Y  jyn  łanda  
in  their  countries  
‘In their countries’  
f. Har  ej  jyś  
he  is  hers / theirs  
‘He is hers / theirs’

In accordance with the general loss of the genitive case in the Vilamovicean language, the genitive forms of the possessive pronouns have been lost. Only very infrequently and under the influence of German, do some speakers employ the genitive form of a given possessive pronoun:

(28) Dy  śü  mąż  foter  
the  shoe  my  father  
‘My father’s shoe’

Apart from the forms of the possessive pronouns introduced thus far, which are relatively stable and shared by a vast majority of our informants, one may encounter various irregular, rare and even idiolectal varieties that considerably differ from the formations presented above. For instance, besides the historically correct feminine dative form mer in fu mer mütêr ‘for my mother’ and the uninflected – nowadays quite common – form fu mât mütêr, one may find alternative constructions such as fu mem mütêr (borrowed from the masculine dative singular), fu memê mütêr (a form based upon the masculine variety although extended by the vowel e) and fu mąż ńer mütêr (a form borrowed from the genuinely pronominal inflection). Another example may be fu zâjn foter (a possible Germanism) instead of the expected construction fu zem foter.
Consequently, as far as the Modern Vilamovicean possessives are concerned, the following tendencies may be distinguished: i) preservation of the original “classical” declension; ii) use of indeclinable forms such as mâj, dâj, zâj, etc.; iii) confusion of case endings and, thus, the use of etymologically “inappropriate” forms (cf. feminine dative singular mem or mâjner; iv) innovative forms (cf. feminine dative singular meme); and in some instance v) reshaping of forms in accordance with the Standard German. It is thus evident that possessives are the subcategory of pronouns that displays the greatest modifications if compared with the situation from the beginning of the 20th century. They also offer the highest number of irregular, alternative and/or idiolectal by-forms. It seems that the language is undergoing a restructuration of the system of its possessive pronouns, at least as far as the morphology is concerned.

3. Conclusion

As explained at the beginning of the paper, our study was intended to provide a detailed description of the pronominal system of the Modern Vilamovicean language, as far as their morphology and semantics are concerned. However, the evidence provided in section 2 enables us to go beyond a straightforward descriptive task.

Given the data collected since 2004 and offered above, we may conclude that the pronominal system of Modern Vilamovicean in main lines preserves the situation which dates from the beginning of the 20th century. Namely, a vast majority of the classical pronouns and their declensional forms are nowadays well-maintained. In this manner, the language displays various features that have been typical of East German dialects (cf. KLECKOWSKI 1920).

However, several changes affecting the pronominal system are also evident. These – more or less stable – modifications are indicators of an incessantly dynamic nature of the language and its dissimilar development in new and distinct sociolinguistic environments: first, after the Second World War (a period where Vilamovicean was banned) and later, after the fall of the Communist regime (a period where one witnesses a revitalization of the interest concerning the tongue, on the one hand, and where, on the other, the group of fully competent speakers is limited to a few elderly persons). All the changes, detected in our database, may be divided into seven classes:

i) The genitive forms of the pronouns have been lost with a possible exception (although infrequently attested) of was ‘whose’ (a genitive of war ‘who’). Accordingly, the language intensified the tendency, already well
visible a hundred years ago as far as nouns and adjectives are concerned. In the 21st century, the loss of the genitive case has ultimately reached the pronominal system, the most resistant thus far;

ii) Another noticeable modification is the admissibility of certain neuter pronominal forms in referring to feminine (typically singular and, less commonly, plural) substantives. This is particularly frequent when the referent is a female whom the speaker may address by using the informal pronoun dü ‘you’;

iii) The use of certain pronouns has likewise changed. For example, the third person of the reflexive pronoun (zih) has been generalized for all the persons and the demonstrative pronouns of the third person singular and plural are nowadays commonly used in the function of personal pronouns;

iv) Traces of the Polish and/or German influence may be detected. For instance, the pronoun -cie (że/že) is common among certain speakers, while other informants (typically those who attended the German school during the Second World War) are likely to employ German pronominal forms;

v) Additionally, new pronouns have emerged either due to phonetic changes (zytikjer from zytnikjer) or as a result of a more profound grammaticalization of original analytical expressions (woswer from wos jjyr åner). In some cases, novel analytical locutions have been shaped and/or stabilized (åner + preposition + ander);

vi) On the other hand, some pronouns have entirely been lost: miöehjer, miöehy and miöehys ‘something, anything’;

vii) In various instances, new case forms of classical pronouns have emerged. Typically, the simplest (i.e. morphologically less complex) or the most common forms have analogically been extended to other cases (cf. māj) so that some pronouns may nowadays be uninflected. In addition, multiple by-forms appear (cf. the dative singular feminine of possessives in an adjectival use: mem [from masculine], mājner [from the predicative inflection] or meme [an innovation based upon the form mem]. The modification of case endings is the most prominent in the set of possessive pronouns.

Furthermore, certain case forms have been found that – although missing in KLECZKOWSKI (1920) – are genuine and typical Vilamovicean constructions that had most probably existed at the beginning of the 20th century (cf. ynzyś and ojyś). Our study also enables us to postulate a possible inadequacy in the data provided by KLECZKOWSKI who determined jyś as a neuter nominative form while jyr as its accusative form. The accurate distribution is indicated in section 2.7 and Figure 20.
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