

A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF HEIKKI OJANSUU’S PHONOGRAPH RECORDINGS OF KRAASNA

Tobias Weber

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, DE

weber.tobias@campus.lmu.de

Abstract. The South Estonian Kraasna subdialect was spoken until the first half of the 20th century by a now vanished community in Krasnogorodsk, Russia. All linguistic descriptions to date are based on textual sources, mostly manuscripts from Heikki Ojansuu’s 1911/12 and 1914 fieldwork. Ojansuu’s phonograph recordings were thought to be lost by previous researchers and remained unused. The rediscovery of these recordings allows for the first analysis of Kraasna based on spoken language data, closing gaps in the description and enabling further research. This description follows a theory-neutral and framework-free approach, while respecting traditions in Estonian linguistics and linking the results to research in Estonian dialectology. It provides key information on the Kraasna subdialect based on the corpus – phonology, morphology, syntax – despite being restricted to the phonograph recordings. Future research can expand on these points and build on the present description.

Keywords: linguistic enclaves, historical sociolinguistics, Estonian dialectology, documentary linguistics, phonograph recordings, South Estonian, Kraasna

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2021.12.2.13>

1. Introduction

The extinct variety historically spoken by the Kraasna community is traditionally seen as a South Estonian variety and is either grouped with the linguistically similar (Võro-)Seto subdialects (Kask 1956, Iva 2015, Pajusalu et al. 2020) or geographically with the other two South Estonian linguistic enclaves in Latvia (Pajusalu 2007, Mets et al. 2014). In either case, Kraasna is part of the extreme periphery and thus less relevant to (contemporary) developments and contact phenomena among Estonian dialects (cf. Pajusalu 1997), while providing important insights into historical developments and contact phenomena with other languages (e.g., Pajusalu & Muižniece 1997, Krikmann & Pajusalu

2000, Pajusalu 2005). However, these descriptions are based on a relatively small corpus, as there were only two researchers who managed to gather texts and authentic speech from native speakers – Oskar Kallas in 1901 and Heikki Ojansuu in 1911/12 and 1914. Paulopriit Voolaine collected some words from rememberers in the 1950s and 1960s after the death of the last competent speakers in the 1930s; Adolph Johann Brandt collected some folk songs in 1849 (cf. Ernits 2012, 2018, Neus 1850) before the Kraasna community had been defined and introduced to the scholarly community (Kallas 1901, 1903).

As a result, the description of the Kraasna variety is still less accurate (Pajusalu et al. 2020: 200) or based upon different sources. The manuscripts from Kallas and Ojansuu's fieldwork are kept in various archives in Tartu, Tallinn, and Helsinki. They show differences depending on their source, as well as differences between these sources and published versions which were introduced during copying and transcription. The first step of the project was the collection, digitisation, and comparison of artefacts (cf. Weber 2016, 2019, forthcoming), which will be briefly summarised in the following section. During the recovery of the original sources, phonograph recordings resurfaced which had been unknown to linguists working on Kraasna (cf. Mets et al. 2014: 7) and, subsequently, not used for the description of the variety thus far. The main body of this paper aims to supply a description of these highly valuable sources with an emphasis on linking them to existing linguistic descriptions. This is not a full phonetic analysis or comprehensive morphological reconstruction but fills gaps in the description and provides observations from a different dataset to deliver further proof or falsify claims in the literature. Hopefully, this will inspire more specialist research on Kraasna, drawing from all available sources.

2. The data

This section gives an overview of the sources which make up the dataset on which this analysis is based. We can consider this dataset to be a corpus even though it is not published and not prepared for use in corpus linguistic analysis. For this reason, the initial discussion of the provenance, contents, and representation of the data is essential for this corpus-based study (cf. Woodbury 2011). It must be stressed that this corpus is not balanced or otherwise strategically compiled –

it contains my transcriptions of these phonograph recordings (in the Uralic Phonetic Alphabet) and, therefore, not the entire bulk of Kraasna material. This restricts the amount of data to the intelligible parts of the recordings which means that certain words or phrases may be excluded or missing in comparison to the manuscripts due to later damage to the wax cylinders or unclear words. The exclusion of data from manuscripts and publication is justified under the premise that the transcriptions in textual sources exhibit several differences compared to the recordings (see also Weber 2016 and Weber, forthcoming). This issue is addressed at the end of this section after a description of the phonograph recordings.

2.1. Ojansuu's recordings

Finnish linguist Heikki Ojansuu recorded the central and most comprehensive collection of Kraasna language material between 1911–1914. Unfortunately, his journal and travel logs are not preserved, which limits the amount of retrievable metadata. Therefore, some information on his expeditions needs to be inferred from his field notes: Ojansuu visited Kraasna for the first time in 1911/12 on a trip to southern Estonia where he recorded about 2,000 pages of dialect language in 27 dialects (*Estonica*). It is unclear whether the manuscripts were created in the field or copied from earlier scratch notes; they contain almost exclusively linguistic data with occasional translations into Finnish or grammatical annotation. Metadata are only given in the headline, indicating the place of recording and, occasionally, personal names, likely of consultants (see Weber 2021). The research objective was likely related to Ojansuu's interest in phonetics, which can be seen in a very detailed use of Finno-Ugric transcription, and the subsequent publication of an article on South Estonian phonology based on these data (Ojansuu 1912).

In July 1914, Ojansuu visited Kraasna again, this time with his wife. The collected material included longer coherent narratives – different from the short phrases, single words, and song texts collected in 1911/12 – about the lives of the consultants. Ojansuu took a phonograph with him to make what became the only surviving audio recordings of coherent Kraasna, including some monologues and structured elicitation (significant phrases or words were each repeated three times). Eight wax cylinders with roughly twenty minutes of recordings survived the journey (see Appendix 1); as Mrs Ojansuu reports in 1938 (ES MT 224),

some additional cylinders were destroyed at the request of a consultant. The surviving recordings were initially given to the Kalevala Society but are now kept in the archives of the Finnish Literature Society. They were thought to be lost by 1938 and subsequently forgotten but resurfaced during my archival work. Three of the cylinders bear Ojansuu's name, the others are filed under the name of Armas Otto Väisänen (who never visited the Kraasna community) but are labelled as Kraasna data. With the exception of one cylinder, these are clearly recordings of the transcribed data of the *Estonica* collection and can be linked to pages in the manuscript. As the quality of the recordings, which were copied in 1963 (and again in the 1980s), does not allow for a new transcription from scratch, I have resorted to using Ojansuu's notes as a basis for an edited transcription (see following section). However, it appears that the notes and the recordings stem from the same communicative event, either as notes taken simultaneously or later from listening to the recordings.

Some of the recordings bear Väisänen's name, therefore, I assume that he received the recordings from Ojansuu, as two recordings contain song and musical performances (no. 299 and 301; note that these numbers refer to the archive numbers of the phonograph recording rather than the numbers of the tape copies, see Appendix 1 for further information). These two recordings, along with a recording (no. 300), exhibit more wear and, as a result, more distortions and less clear sound. This may be due to repeated playing by the researchers. If they were given to Väisänen, it would appear plausible that he listened to the musical performances more often than the narratives, given his interest in ethnomusicology. Recording 299 also contains men and women talking, which may be the researcher himself – possibly in a test recording or instructions to the consultants, as the languages spoken are Finnish (a song contains the word *suomalainen*) or Standard Estonian. The digitisation of recording 300 is distorted at the beginning and contains shorter sentences and portions of elicitation. Furthermore, a female can be heard counting before providing example sentences and target words in particular phonological environments. Recording 301 contains three narratives following a song; one narrative is about harvesting cereal crops and another on processing dairy. The remaining recordings bear Väisänen's name. Recording 81 contains structured elicitation of words and phrases; recording 82 contains a narrative on wedding traditions

and a partial one on baptisms as well as phrases not recorded in the transcripts, while recording 83 includes a full narrative on burial customs and a partial one on processing crops. Recording 84 contains the full narrative on weekend routines, a part of a story about a theft, and some sentences about Easter, with recording 86 consisting of elicitation exclusively. Most of the narratives were transcribed and can be linked to parts of the manuscripts (see Appendix 1).

These transcriptions from the 1914 trip were kept in an archive at the University of Tartu, where they are marked as lost; however, a copy bearing the same name is kept at the Institute of the Estonian Language in Tallinn alongside an excerpt prepared by an unknown author. The manuscripts were also copied by typewriting with the transcript kept as part one of the *Estonica* collection at the Finnish Literature Society. These transcripts are, at times, divergent (for more information see Weber 2016). Various scientific treatments cite Ojansuu's materials from these different sources, including a publication of Kraasna, Lutsi, and Leivu dialect texts (Mets et al. 2014). The relationship between the audio recordings and the manuscripts can be seen in Appendix 1.

Unfortunately, there is no information on Ojansuu's consultants. His main consultants were likely known to Kallas, as his monograph contains a list of first names including several reminiscent of those in Ojansuu's manuscripts, but only *Ullá* [Vasiljevna] is mentioned in both authors' works. The speakers on the recordings are likely *Ullá* and Matrëna Rodionovna [Kuznecova] who is identified as one of the last fluent speakers until her passing aged 96 in the mid-1930s (Voolaine collected information about the last speakers in the 1950s and 1960s, which includes information obtained from Matrëna's descendants). A major issue arising from the uncertainty around the consultants' identity is the lack of biographical data. While we assume that Matrëna, as the main consultant, was originally from the Kraasna-speaking regions, Kallas notes that landlords resettled single men and women of a marriageable age from Seto-speaking regions to the Kraasna region (cf. Kallas 1903). Furthermore, we learn from Voolaine's manuscripts that the Kraasna community was visiting Seto-speaking regions, likely for religious reasons. Familial ties and frequent exchanges with other South Estonian communities might have influenced the language use of the last speakers – an important factor to consider when evaluating the reliability of Ojansuu's sources.

2.2. Reliability of sources

Apart from the aforementioned issues with the speaker biographies, we must consider a range of factors pertaining to the artefacts themselves when working with Kraasna data. The most prevalent issue throughout all Kraasna textual artefacts is the intertextual links among them. While it is possible to reconstruct relationships between manuscripts or transcriptions and the recordings, we do not know about their connections precisely. The recordings may have been made at the same time as the transcripts, which may have been further edited and revised using the recorded versions; it might also be the case that the transcriptions were based solely on the recordings after the sessions. They are clearly related to the recorded speech events and were revised (insertions, deletions, commentary) as if the transcriber listened to a recording repeatedly (Note: due to the nature of the phonograph cylinders, the quality of the recording deteriorates every time it is played allowing for fewer repetitions). However, though unlikely given the number of similarities, it cannot be ruled out that the recordings were made on a different occasion before or after the transcribed speech event (e.g., recording a version after practising, recording the transcribed version, transcribing a dictated version with the stimulus of the recording).

As the sound quality of the digitised recordings did not allow for entirely new transcriptions, I used the existing manuscripts as a basis for a revised transcription. In this instance, I only altered the transcription if I could ascertain a clear difference between the recorded and transcribed versions. This does not mean that the transcriptions contained in the manuscripts are obsolete, as instances of omission may be a result of jumps in the recording or cracks in the phonograph cylinder. Consequently, the linguistic analysis in the following sections is exclusively based on the materials contained in the recordings as transcribed by me, using the existing transcriptions for guidance. Differing conclusions about the Kraasna subdialect are possible for any of the above-mentioned reasons, as different speakers, different stages of language shift, different speech events, or different datasets may result in divergent interpretations of the language material (cf. Weber & Klee 2020).

I would like to conclude this section with some comments about the transcription process. The approach chosen for creating a new transcription was born out of necessity. While it is, nowadays, possible to scan and refurbish mechanically stored recordings (Fadeyev et al.

2005, Cornell et al. 2007), these technologies are not widely available. I hope that, in the future, it will be possible to digitise and restore the Kraasna recordings in a form that allows for phonetic analysis and supports reliable accounts of the Kraasna materials. Until then, the solution lies in the construction of the transcription. Due to their interpretative nature, transcriptions are representations of the author's understanding filtered through professional craftsmanship, personal preferences, and biases. They contain as much information on the transcriber's world view as on their transcribing skills – and basing the new transcriptions on Ojansuu's manuscripts ensures that the transcription is constructed on three researchers' opinions (in addition to Ojansuu's and my own interpretation, Jüvä Sullõv checked the transcriptions; I bear full responsibility for any errors), so biases and preferences may be reduced. Therefore, I recommend working with all original sources by the various authors simultaneously (Weber 2016) to avoid the “positivist trap of establishing an authoritative version of a text” (Seidel 2016: 31).

Although it could be argued that it is less interesting to know who authored a change in a set of data than to know under which assumptions and for which objectives it was changed (in addition to the fact that the author or editor acts on the level of the artefact and is not ascribed to the level of particular words or sentences), recording reasons for changes is more difficult and requires a high level of self-reflection. To give an example from the Kraasna transcriptions: In the manuscripts (Estonica I, 25), Ojansuu writes *šiiippi* ('soap'), which I have changed to *šîppi*, under the assumptions that a) I believe I hear a palatalised alveolar and not a palato-alveolar sibilant in the recording, b) *š* is an innovation under contact influence, c) both *š* and *ś* would be considered allophones of /s/ in Finnish, and d) it would fit my own interpretations of Kraasna phonology. Information on these reasons would have to be linked to the minimal change in one diacritic, which is difficult to present in plain text. I changed the manuscript transcriptions only for instances where I am (a) certain about the difference or (b) can justify the claim, while changes due to my (c & d) personal preferences and interpretations may occasionally arise. The readers are advised to consult the original sources for comparison and be aware of claiming an objective truth which interpretative transcription methods do not permit. Despite these caveats in working with the recordings, the contained material is insightful for describing the Kraasna variety.

3. Methodology

Presenting a linguistic analysis requires decisions to be made about the representation and interpretation of results. The challenge is to align the description with the traditions in Estonian linguistics and dialectology, on the one hand, while keeping the text accessible to as broad an audience as possible, on the other. I opted for a framework-free presentation of data as the guiding principle (Haspelmath 2010), while highlighting points for further enquiry in Estonian dialectology. As a reference, I used publications drawing from Ojansuu's manuscripts, allowing for a verification and re-evaluation of these findings. Firstly, there are short grammatical sketches in the Mets et al. 2014 collection of dialect texts, which list the same points as the handbook on Estonian dialects by Pajusalu et al. 2020. For the phonological description, a table of phonological peculiarities of South Estonian is given in the introduction to a volume on South Estonian sounds (Pajusalu et al. 2003). In addition, there are two important collections of maps for (South) Estonian dialectology, showing geographic spread, dialect boundaries and isoglosses: Andrus Saareste's dialect atlas (1955) covers all Estonian varieties, including Kraasna, while the maps prepared by Mihkel Toomse, edited and published posthumously by Karl Pajusalu (1998), cover South Estonian varieties only. Both sources contain occasional blanks on Kraasna data points, while other results can be re-examined using the audio recordings. A comparison to a modern South Estonian language form was facilitated by a grammar (Iva 2007) and a dictionary (Faster et al. 2014) of the literary standard of the related South Estonian Võro variety. I have indexed points of enquiry if they are linked to information found in the literature: Toomse's work is indexed by T followed by the page number, Saareste's work (1955) with Saa and a page number, information from the South Estonian comparative table (Pajusalu et al. 2003: 10–11) by LEH, and points from the dialectological handbook (Pajusalu et al. 2020: 200–201) with EMK.

The present description is data-based; however, the corpus exclusively contains transcriptions of the audio recordings (see Appendix 2). Consequently, the analysis covers only the language use of Ojansuu's 1914 consultants, which may differ from the language use of his consultants two years prior and the language use recorded by Kallas (1903) or earlier scholars (see Ernits 2018 for an analysis). A thorough description

of the Kraasna subdialect would need to take these different layers of language into account as well as possible adstrata of other Seto varieties due to an increasing degree of mobility as the language began to shift under Russian influence. This comparative grammatical description based on all sources is left for future research. As the recordings are the main source for this work, three points are important to consider. First, the discussion is based on my transcriptions, i.e., my understanding of the recordings filtered through my own view on the Kraasna variety and South Estonian in general. I open the chance for discussion of these findings and interpretations, as anyone may contest or debate my transcriptions by accessing the recordings to falsify my claims. Second, larger entities like sentences or words are easier to transcribe and analyse, while subtle notions on the phonemic level may be obscured by the noise of the recording. I present what I believe can be heard in the recordings and flag parts which are less clearly interpretable. Lastly, I would like to remind the reader that this is a small-corpus survey with an unbalanced dataset. Thus, forms which we would expect from a stereotypical grammar may not have been recorded at all, or at least not contained in the twenty minutes of the recordings. I start with some general impressions on the language of the recordings before discussing phonological, morphological, and syntactic issues in detail.

4. Introductory remarks about the recordings

The language which can be heard in the recordings is clearly South Estonian and akin to varieties of Seto and shows a noticeable influence from Russian on its phonology (with a few loanwords in between). The speakers – all women, possibly the same consultant(s) – have a strong command of the language, as they can produce a narrative without longer breaks. Occasionally, the speakers self-correct or start a sentence over – this does, however, not impede the flow of speech.

There are two types of recordings. The first contains what seems to be structured elicitation of words and word forms which were important to Ojansuu's research. In these the consultant repeats words or phrases several times, occasionally in a particular context (to trigger changes or make the task appear more natural).

The remaining recordings contain coherent narratives, ranging from a few sentences to a full story. These are told in a lively fashion,

noticeable in the use of voice and intonation. Some texts appear procedural in nature, resulting in a sequence of parallel sentence structures. Sadly, these sentences usually start with *vaija* ‘necessary’ or *nakka* ‘I begin’, which both require the use of a non-finite verb form (the infinitive and supine, respectively), leading to ample evidence on non-finite forms at the cost of finite verb forms.

In some situations, it appears that the consultant is facing away from the phonograph, addressing a bystander or making a comment to themselves. The quality of the recording does not provide for an analysis of these exchanges. As a follow-up topic for research which is not covered here, I suggest an analysis of the pragmatics of the recordings, including the use of intonation and voice for reporting a dialogue in the narrative.

5. Phonological structure

The Kraasna phoneme inventory contains all the phonemes we expect to find in a South Estonian variety with length (in three phonological grades) and palatalisation of consonants being distinctive. The glottal stop is preserved (LEH), even if it is not prominently uttered in every context. It appears that all consonants can be palatalised except for the glottal stop and the weak affricate. While the glottal stop is never palatalised in South Estonian, the lack of palatalised weak affricates, which we can find in data from other Võro-Seto varieties, is likely due to the size of the corpus. Occasionally, this palatalisation can lead to a post-alveolar pronunciation of alveolar sibilants (LEH) which should, however, be seen as a free allophone or occasional variation rather than a regular shift, as it is attested only once in the recordings, i.e., *košjoḷe* ‘to the proposal (pl.)’. The affricates appear both voiced and unvoiced (LEH) – *malts* ‘*Atriplex*’, *maḷdza*’ ‘*Atriplex* (pl.)’ – with the unvoiced affricate clearly voiced and appearing to regressively velarise the preceding *l* in the example. This so-called “Russian L” (LEH) – transcribed as <ɺ> – is the velarised allophone of *l* and is occasionally more velarised than in other instances, making it impossible to decide whether it is more similar to the corresponding Latvian or Russian phoneme (T43). However, its existence and use are confirmed (T26). The voiced *z* (LEH) appears as an allophone of *s* and may also be palatalised. This palatalisation can trigger the same retraction to *ž* (e.g., *vīž* ~ *vīž* ‘five’) as observed for *š*. Voiced consonants, while not generally as voiced

as in Russian may be a result of Russian influence, and result in weak grade plosives appearing in non-devoiced form (T28). Foreign sounds are rare. There are no instances of *f* and *x* appears as an allophone of *h* once in *xàmbit* ‘teeth (PL.PART)’.

5.1. Palatalisation

Palatalisation is one of the topics extensively covered in Toomse’s maps and is an interesting point for examination, as palatalisation type not only distinguishes South Estonian from Standard Estonian, but with Russian as a contact language, we expect Kraasna to differ from varieties of South Estonian with no linguistic contact with Russian. This likely contact phenomenon can be observed in Kraasna, with the front vowels *ä ö ü i e* triggering palatalisation regressively in the preceding consonant. This palatalisation could not be confirmed for every front vowel context, yet appears to be a common phonological process, e.g., *íegemà* ‘to do’, *íéé* ‘hello’, *nühktamà* ‘to scrub’, *pèrrà* ‘after’, *pā́t* ‘on top’. Palatalisation is most frequently observed for *i* and *e*, rarely for *ü*, and with inconclusive results for *ö*, due to the relative scarcity of this phoneme. This type of palatalisation in front vowel contexts can occasionally be progressive (LEH), although instances reminiscent of progressive palatalisation can generally be explained with phonotactics, e.g., the elision of a front vowel following the palatalised consonant.

There are a number of contexts which are especially prone to triggering palatalisation in South Estonian, for example, the palatalisation of an alveolar nasal (T23) or lateral approximant (T27) in #CV_i contexts. While the palatalisation of the nasal appears in *pañi* ‘I put (PST)’, there are conflicting data on the palatalisation of *l* in this context. It can be assumed that this type of palatalisation is regular, e.g., *ñéli* ~ *ñélli* ‘four’, but is not always clearly audible in the recordings, e.g., *tulli* ‘I came’. There are no data points for the alveolar plosive in this context (T29), but we can find both palatalised and unpalatalised variants before *i*, e.g., *rattitē* ‘onto a cart (pl.)’ but *puhtist* ‘for the funeral (pl.)’. This palatalisation of the geminated alveolar plosive in words with a contraction (T64), e.g., a short illative, can be attested for other forms as well, e.g., *tatti* ‘to the *Leccinum*’.

One of the most curious phenomena is the palatalisation of liquids, namely the alveolar nasal (T53) and the semivowel *v* (T59) in #CVi_V,

#CVi_, #C \bar{V} _i contexts, which can be extended to the lateral approximant. Here, *grade* plays an important role. In forms of the second – or long – grade, the consonant is palatalised and the triggering vowel *i* disappears, e.g., *hā́naʔ* ‘hay (pl.)’, *révas* ‘piece of clothing’, *tḗle* ‘to you (pl.)’, while appearing as the full vowel *i* in the diphthong before an unpalatalised consonant in the third – or overlong – grade, e.g., *haina* ‘hay (PART)’, *teil* ‘at you (pl.)’.

Other contexts of enquiry for palatalisation include clusters of liquids and plosives. The palatalisation of a secondary cluster with an alveolar plosive (*tl*, *tr*, *tv*) as a result of syncope (T61) cannot be precisely analysed with the present dataset, as the only suitable example is located right at a jump in the recording, i.e., *túl jezā košjotē tütri-* ‘the father came to propose [to a girl]’. It appears to me that the *t* is slightly palatalised but not as much as in other contexts. Another cluster is *lk* in the second syllable before *i* (T80), which we find in *pélksi* ‘I feared’, while it is possible that an unpalatalised *?kolki* ‘I broke [flax]’ occurs in one of the heavily distorted parts of the recordings, providing an inconclusive image. For the cluster *rk* in the same context (T84), we find a palatalised form in *sárkki* ‘shirt (PART)’. The cluster *ts* deriving from a historical **kc* or **pc* cluster appears palatalised in word-final position due to the apocope of *i* (T88/89), i.e., *ʔüts* < **ükci* ‘one’ and *lats* < **lapci* ‘child’. The same palatalisation can be assumed for forms with third syllable contraction (T90), which are unattested in the corpus.

Finally, a view on the position of palatalised consonants within a word. Palatalisation can occur in the onset and coda of syllables, thus palatalised consonants appear word-initially, -medially, and -finally. In the latter case, they may carry morphologically distinctive information, e.g., the past tense marking on verbs. Furthermore, word-final palatalisation can appear on a final alveolar nasal in nominative singular nouns after third syllable apocope (T98), as evidenced by the word *hopēñ* ‘horse’. Additionally, the apocope of *i* may lead to the palatalisation of word-final consonants, such as the velar plosive (T70), e.g., *keik* ‘all’, *pink* ‘bench’.

5.2. Assimilatory phenomena

We can observe assimilatory phenomena connected to harmony in the Kraasna data. Although the existence of vowel harmony can be

ascertained to a certain degree, there is no clear consonant harmony. While South Estonian is not known for having consonant harmony, this type of assimilatory process can be a secondary development of vowel harmony, namely when vowels lead to a consistent change in the surrounding consonants, e.g., palatalisation (as can be seen in Erzya Mordvin). The lack of consonant harmony proves that the palatalisation in a front vocalic context is not consistently applied. Despite this, we can observe an occasional syllable harmony (LEH), i.e., the fronting of vowels after a palatal consonant, as in *praśśattāmmā* ‘to bid farewell’. In *praśśattāmmā*, the suffixal vowels are slightly fronted following the palatalised geminate sibilant, despite the stem being back vocalic. This example shows that the vowel harmony itself is not as steadfast as one might expect, especially when Russian loanwords are not fully adapted to vowel harmony (e.g., *pra-ṽēdattāmma* ‘to visit’). Generally, *a u o e i* appear in the same context (dubbed “back vowels” here), while *ä ö ü e (i)* form the opposite group (“front vowels”). There are instances where *e* and *i* are retracted, usually noted as *ɛ* and *ɨ* – they may then act as back vowels or just an allophone of *e* and *i*. Especially *i* may appear in all contexts, *o* in certain words in final position, e.g., *nāgo* ‘face’; both are frequently encountered phenomena in South Estonian varieties. There are different types of harmonic pairs which are especially interesting to Estonian dialectology (LEH), namely the harmonic pairs *e-ɛ u-ü* and *o-ö*. In Kraasna, we find a clear *e-ɛ* harmony, the expected *u-ü* harmony cannot be found in the data (likely due to the limited nature of the data), while the *o-ö* is very unlikely. A final observation on harmony: It was surprising to hear words with palatalised consonants and front vowels end in the velarised *n~l* which can be observed several times in words like *pāl* ‘on top’ or *šāl* ‘there’. In both words, the final *l* is clearly velarised, which is another argument against consonant harmony.

5.3. Stress

Primary stress occurs regularly on the first syllable with odd-numbered syllables as potential candidates for secondary stress, which is common in the Finnic languages. There are only a few exceptions in the recordings: In the numerals 11–17, the ‘teen’ element *-tei-st-* receives primary stress instead of the expected word-initial primary stress and secondary stressed ‘teen’, e.g., *kaśtei-stkümmend* ‘twelve’. This may be

Russian influence, where the ‘teen’ element is stressed for all numerals in the range of 12–19. Other examples of unexpected primary stress in non-initial syllables can be found in *mī jelā̄·gi* ‘we live’, *huṃmēñ om pühā̄pāi·v* ‘tomorrow is Sunday’, and *hittā ɛdaguh magāmmā·* ‘I go to sleep in the evening’. Other instances are due to Russian influence, e.g., in the loanwords *pravādi·í* ‘to escort (in a procession)’ (<*проводить* ‘to guide’) and *kata·tka* ‘barrow’. Importantly, clitics may be stressed (LEH), for example the negation particle in *ma' _ tījā _ ei·?* ‘I do not know’.

As seen in the example above, *mī jelā̄·gi* ‘we live’, there appears to be a conflation of stress and length, where the stressed syllable is lengthened. This seems to occur occasionally even in monosyllabic words, e.g., *nācɫ* (~ *nācɫ̄*) ‘nail’. In word forms of the third (overlong) grade, which includes all monosyllabic words, this mixture of stress and secondary lengthening can exhibit an additional diphthongisation. These diphthongised forms had not fully developed into a VV vowel sequence (as in Finnish) and were in the opposite direction to the diphthongisation in Leivu (LEH), i.e., the Kraasna diphthongised forms are opening rather than closing. It may be that the initial position of the vowel is further closed and with the contour of length and stress, the position of the jaw is lowering naturally, yet, we observe this in several contexts, e.g., *kʷòrv* ‘basket’, *kʷorgēh* ‘high (INE)’, *rʷoittu* ‘swiftly’, *ʷol̄* ‘was (3SG)’, *ʷostā?* ‘to buy’, *ʷol̄nu?* ‘been (PTCP.PST)’, *ʷom* ‘is (3SG)’, *kʷotn?* ‘passed away (PTCP.PST)’, *k̄ēdettās* ‘is cooked (IPS)’, *mʷel* ‘at us’.

5.4. Syllable structure

Some interesting observations can be made about syllable structure and word form creation. In non-initial syllables, researchers have highlighted the frequent vowel elision (EMK), which is visible but not as strong as implied, e.g., *kołktsɛmma* ‘to break (flax)’, *kořvkkane* ‘basket (DIM)’, *tāłttāmmā* ‘to pay [as a wedding present]’, *sermst* ‘ring (PART)’, *pābtsɛmma* ‘to practise midwifery’, *kuotn?* ‘passed away (PTCP.PST)’, *rařtsɛmma* ‘to feed, entertain’. Palatalisation often occurs in the contexts of an apocope of *i*, which can also be found in other South Estonian varieties. The elided vowel may be still audible in an extremely reduced form, as the speakers in the recordings break complex clusters with a pause or schwa, which is difficult to hear in the recordings but

noticeable. This could be transcribed as a syllable break *kol̥k.tsem̥ma* or a schwa vowel *rah^vvast* ‘people (PART)’. Retracted *j*, as well as *o*, may also occur in non-initial syllables (LEH, see above). Occasionally, we can find diphthongs in non-initial syllables (LEH), e.g., *tivvakkaižde* ‘into small bowls’.

The initial syllable is mostly interesting due to the widely-reported iotation of the front vowels *i* and *e* (EMK), i.e., *e i* → *je ji* / #₋. There are forms in the manuscripts, which are not iotated but turned out to be iotated in the recordings, e.g., *jikmà* ‘to cry’, and there are at least twice as many iotated as un-iotated forms in the recordings. Not only can the data confirm this trend, but it appears that some words show a similar change *ü* → *jü* / #₋. It is not quite as widespread, e.g., *jütte* ‘together’, *jüldäs* ‘is said (IPS)’, *jüts* ‘one’, but may be a first sign of the change which can be heard in recordings fifty years later. Interestingly, this iotation cannot be observed for *ä*. We also find consonant clusters word-initially (LEH), for which only two examples can be found in the corpus, i.e., *praśśattämmä* ‘to bid farewell’, *štobj* ‘so that’, with the latter being a loan from Russian (<чмобы). Furthermore, the raised unrounded back vowel *j* can be found in first syllables (LEH), e.g., *kjñetda* ‘to speak’.

This raising of mid-high vowels occurs in two contexts. As in the previous example, before nasals, *s*, and *h* (EMK), e.g., *sjs* ‘then’, *ljinä* ‘flax’, *mihele* ‘to a man’, *lindaš* ‘it flies’ as well as the copula verb (LEH), i.e., *um*, and the reflexive pronoun (LEH), i.e., *hiñnëga* ‘with oneself’. Furthermore, the manuscripts show instances of raising over-long mid-high vowels (LEH), for which there is no instance recorded in the phonograph recordings.

The extent to which *h* was preserved in different positions is an important element of Estonian dialectology. In the Kraasna recordings, we find it word-initially (LEH), e.g., *hing* ‘soul’, after long vowels (T49) or vowel clusters (LEH), e.g., *rîh* ‘barn’, even in a geminated form (LEH), i.e., *rîhhe* ‘into the barn’. Word-finally (LEH), it occurs as part of noun stems, e.g., *hameh* ‘shirt’, as well as in its use as the inessive suffix, e.g., *perzeh* ‘in the bottom’.

In word-final position, *v* is preserved as a fricative (LEH), e.g., *k^uòrv* ‘basket’, although it is not possible to establish clearly whether it is voiced after a long-vocalic syllable (T52), as there is only one occurrence, i.e., *pühàpài-v* ‘Sunday’, which may be devoiced. This semivowel

v is preserved before a rounded vowel in word-final position (T60). The only potential word fitting this context is in a very noisy part of the recording but may be *kaivul/kaivo* ‘into the well’.

A set of other points of enquiry relates to the historical development of consonant clusters. In the word *takãh* ‘behind’ (T36), we find that the velar plosive is geminated. Furthermore, the cluster *ht* is preserved in the partitive singular of nouns exhibiting stem allomorphy ending in *h* (T119), i.e., *hameht* ‘shirt (PART)’. The cluster **ηk* before an unstressed third syllable vowel (T121) is only attested once, as a simple voiced plosive in the form *kuñiga* ‘of the king’. The presumed metathesis of *h* in words like *vahnemba* (EMK) cannot be clearly evaluated. However, it appears that there is a word *vanhu* ‘old (PART.PL)’ in one of the distorted sections of the recordings, which may speak against this metathesis.

Finally, some observations on word-final consonants. It may be the case that there is compensatory lengthening of sibilants in word-final position (T48). Yet, due to the high-pitched noise on the recordings, it is hardly possible to ascertain the length of sibilants. The only potential form is in an unsuitable context, barely audible at the very beginning of the recording, i.e., *íéé māmīs* ‘hello, countryman’, where I believe I hear a slightly lengthened sibilant. One reviewer pointed out that lengthened sibilants would be expected in word-final position for many words in the texts based on their equivalents in other South Estonian varieties; however, as the frequency of the sibilants merges with the noise of the phonograph and the tape recorder, the length cannot be ascertained. I agree with the reviewer that there likely is lengthening of word-final sibilants, but this would need to be measured in higher quality recordings, as it is indiscernible from listening to the recordings. Ultimately, I would like to highlight that the glottal stop does, occasionally, assimilate to the following consonant, as is also the case in other varieties of South Estonian with a glottal stop, e.g., *umma^p p^rerst, mâga^k kiññ[?]* ‘[covered] up with earth’, *añna _i^h _häädä* ‘it is not an issue’.

6. Morphology

The following section presents an overview of the morphology of the Kraasna data. As the dataset is small and the texts are from particular genres, an in-depth analysis of the morphology of particular noun or verb classes cannot reliably be presented here. This also affects

the paradigms and comparative tables requested by the reviewers – a larger corpus study including the remaining manuscript materials may generate further insights, as certain categories occur in parts which were not recorded on the wax cylinders. In addition to the limitations created by the small size of the dataset, there are instances in which the Kraasna data are not internally consistent, likely as a result of interspeaker variation (see section 6.3.1 for examples). Despite this variation, the Kraasna data are still coherent as regards South Estonian or Finnic morphology, e.g., stem allomorphy depending on (historical) syllable structure leading to stem or grade alternations.

6.1. Nominal morphology

The central concepts in nominal morphology are number and case. Overall, singular forms were much more prevalent in the corpus than plural forms. The singular is regularly unmarked; the nominative plural is marked with the glottal stop, which can be heard clearly even after syncope or vowel elision, e.g., *juʔ* ‘stories’, *tuññʔ* ‘hours’. In the genitive plural, we find changes in the final vowel triggered by the general plural suffix *-i*, e.g., *rindu* ‘into the chest (pl.)’, *rihhe* ‘into the barn’. This plural suffix may also cause diphthongs in non-initial syllables, e.g., *tivvakkaiẓde* ‘into small bowls’. The partitive plural exhibits a strengthening or lengthening (T37), which is also common in other South Estonian varieties, e.g., *rükki~rüki* ‘rye’, *hainu* ‘hay’, *kañtu* ‘fish’, *šärkki* ‘shirts’, *uguritsi* ‘cucumbers’, *kapstit* ‘cabbages’, *sibulit* ‘onions’, *hàmbit* ‘teeth’, *puid* ‘trees’. In these examples, a vowel-marked partitive is more prominent with only the last four forms containing traces of the **tA* partitive marker. The genitive and partitive plural supply the stem for the semantic cases, e.g., illative *hakkijalgu* ‘into sheaves’, allative *rattit̩e* ‘onto a cart (pl.)’, comitative *latsigaʔ* ‘with children’, *käsšiga~käsiga* ‘with hands, by hand’. The latter example can also confirm the genitive plural (stem) of *käsi*-type nouns without a change to the historical **t* in the stem (T68). Apart from these forms, there are no plural forms in semantic cases.

The nominative singular and genitive singular are unmarked, though grade alternation, i.e., stem allomorphy due to historical phonotactics, can distinguish these forms for some noun classes. For the partitive singular, there are no unexpected case markers, as we find vowel-marked

forms, e.g., *poiga* ‘son’, and forms exhibiting the alveolar plosive of the historical **tA* marker, e.g., *jumalat* ‘god’, *rahvast* ‘people’, *vⁱert* ‘blood’, *tütärd* ‘daughter’, *hameht* ‘shirt’, *hobest* ‘horse’. More interesting is the gemination we observe in partitive forms (EMK), namely, between the first and second syllable before a contracted syllable (T35), e.g., *ji^mmä* ‘mother’, *ješsä* ‘father’, *ti^mmä* ‘him/her’.

We find eight semantic cases in the corpus, with six of these belonging to the local cases. The abessive was not recorded in the dataset, but, while rare, is attested consistently with *-lda*[?] in the manuscripts. The terminative is only attested once in the manuscripts (Estonica V, 1945) as *sēnāni*[?] ‘until now’. In spoken language use, it was likely replaced with postpositions indicating movement (Saa44), e.g., *mān*[?] ‘at’, *manu*[?] ‘to’, *vīrde* ‘to the edge’. The most frequently found semantic cases are the illative and allative directional cases and the comitative.

The illative has three types of markers: the *-hE* marker, the *-TE* marker, and the so-called short illative which is marked by lengthening alone. The *-hE* marker is used exclusively for trisyllabic noun stems (T129, Saa48) in the dataset (note that vowel elision makes them appear as bisyllabic stems), i.e., *kotksehe* ‘into a barn’, *länkkohē* ‘into a milk churn’, *kerkkohē* ‘(in)to church’, *huⁿkkohē* ‘into a heap’. The illative of nouns with a monosyllabic stem (T56) cannot be analysed unambiguously. There is one occasion of a highly idiosyncratic form *tⁱösse*, which is translated into Standard Estonian as *tööle* ‘to work’ in the 2014 dialect collection, while we would expect *tüühü* in Standard Võro. It is likely an illative but may not be a form of the word for ‘work’. Other monosyllabic nouns with a word-final consonant exhibit forms with a *t* element in the illative suffix, e.g., *riihtē* ‘into a barn’ – found in a barely understandable part of the recordings – and *vīrde* ‘to the edge’. The most frequent form of the illative is the short illative, which is distinguished for monosyllabic nouns with a long vowel or diphthong, e.g., *sūta* ‘into salt’, *haūda* ‘into the grave’, with a word-final geminated consonant or consonant cluster, e.g., *kirstu* ‘into a coffin’, *paikka* ‘to a place’, *säl^gä* ‘onto the back (INE)’, *sänna* ‘into the sauna’, *meisa* ‘into the forest’, with VCI#, e.g., *ku^hjä* ‘into a stack’, *kārja* ‘to the livestock’, *mārja* ‘to the berry’, *ā^hju* ‘into the oven’, or VCV# in nominative singular, e.g., *pa^tta* ‘into a pot’, *kāit-* ‘into a hand’.

The inessive is exclusively expressed with the suffix *-h*, also for monosyllabic nouns with a long vowel or diphthong (T93), e.g., *kāeh*

‘in hand’, which is given as *kääh* and *kääzeh* by Saareste (1955: 55), or after a secondary stressed syllable (T133), e.g., in *edaguh* ‘in the evening’. The suffix *-h* is consistently used to mark the inessive. The elative marker *-st* is only attested twice, i.e., *ahost* ‘out of the oven’, *jüst* ‘out of the river’, but consistent with other South Estonian varieties.

The exterior local cases are all attested with their expected forms, though the allative does not receive secondary stress (Saa38). The allative suffix is *-IE* and not geminated except in pronouns (e.g., *muttë* ‘to me’). We find the forms *košjotë* ‘to the proposal (pl.)’, *tatsële* ‘to the child’, *jimäle* ‘to the mother’, *šüümajtë* ‘for dinner time’, *mihele* ‘to a man’, *hobežetë* ‘to the horse’, *peremehele* ‘to the landlord’. The adessive is marked with *-l*, e.g., *mehël* ‘at the man’, *jimšël* ‘at the sow’, the ablative with the suffix *-lt*, e.g., *tezëlt* ‘from the other’.

The comitative is marked with the suffix *-ga*², without vowel harmony, and not geminated for any nouns, e.g., *vīga*² ‘with water’, *kirvega*² ‘with an axe’. The glottal stop may not always be audible or may assimilate to the following consonant, e.g., *jimäga* ‘with the mother’, *rihāga* ‘with a barn’, *vikadiga* ‘with a scythe’, *kablāga* ‘with a cable’, *hobežega* ‘with a horse’, *nāšitkkidēga* ‘with carrying handles’, *māga*^t ‘with soil’. The translative suffix is, as indicated in the literature (EMK), morphologically the *-st* form. There are three instances of it recorded in the corpus, i.e., *haigēst* ‘(becoming) sick’, *puhtist* ‘for the funeral’, *ūzest* ‘for the night’. The latter two forms occur as temporal adjuncts. Despite the existence of this case, it is not consistently used in all contexts where a translative form may be expected, e.g., *a kujjozē² kuiva²* ‘but they dried [fully] dry’; *rüä² sava² vāłmi²* ‘the rye (pl.) becomes ready [for further processing]’; *ku sā ei vjhma hāna² sāva kuiva²* ‘if it does not rain, the hay (pl.) will become dry’; *ni sā haigē* ‘and he became sick’; *sā mägītakkane* ‘it becomes a little tomb’. This may potentially also include sentences where there is a transition, but which may not necessarily require the use of the translative, e.g., *sā pada täüz* ‘the pot becomes full’; *sā at hapupim* ‘underneath [it] turns into curdled milk’; *a pāt sā pālinē* ‘but on top [it] turns into cream’. This phenomenon is not restricted to a particular verb (e.g., *sā* ‘becomes’), as evidenced by *kujjozē² kuiva²*. Furthermore, although some forms may be semantically interpreted as phrasal or particle verbs, e.g., *sā + täüz* ‘become full’, *sā + kuiv* ‘become dry’, or even *sā + haigē* ‘fall ill’. *kuiva²* ‘dry (pl.)’ is an adjective, as evidenced by its number agreement; *haigē* ‘ill’ is another

example of an adjective used with both marked and unmarked translative meanings. Additionally, *sā mą̀gı̀tkakkane* does not contain any particles or adjectives but just the unmarked noun phrase.

There are four possible explanations I would like to offer. First, there may have been free variation or idiolectal differences regarding the use of the translative. As the same narrative on burial rites contains the phrases *lát haigest* ‘he falls ill’ and *sā mą̀gı̀tkakkane* ‘it becomes a little tomb’, I would ascribe this to free variation rather than interspeaker differences. Second, this variation may be a sign of language attrition or shift despite the contact language Russian also marking these translative meanings. Third, we may consider the context, i.e., the point in the discourse where the marked and unmarked versions appear. For the unmarked forms, the transition is an expected result, which can be inferred from real-world knowledge, e.g., *ku sā ei vı̀h̃ma hā́ña[?] sāva kuiva[?]* ‘if it does not rain, the hay will get dry’, *timä aettas māga / sā mą̀gı̀tkakkane* ‘they cover him with earth, it becomes a tomb’; in another instance, it can be inferred from context, i.e., *kakset̃ keřtu är[?] ni sā haigē* ‘[his/her] stomach gets upset and [s/he] falls ill’. This example may be directly compared to the marked version, *jelās jelās / ni lát haigest* ‘he lives, lives, and falls ill’, where the change is unexpected, surprising, or a strong contrast to the previous information. This interpretation of the translative being explicitly marked in contexts where new or contrasting information is introduced, while being unmarked when a transition with a result which can be expected or inferred from real-world knowledge may require further discussion and analysis beyond the present dataset. Fourth, we may consider permanency as a feature influencing the choice of translative marking (Lehiste 1969, Stassen 1997). This approach may still not explain the inconsistency encountered in the marking of this case. As we have only one example of a marked translative on a predicate adjective in the recordings, a thorough discussion must also include occurrences in the manuscript to avoid reasoning based on counterexamples.

To close the discussion of nominal morphology, I would like to point out that adjectives can take the same case and number marking as nouns, while also being marked for degree of comparison. There is only one instance of the comparative in the corpus, which is marked with the *-b* suffix (EMK), i.e., *inābāt* ‘anymore (PART)’. The manuscripts, however, contain several instances of the *-mb* suffix, which makes it impossible

to give a definite answer on the morphological shape of the comparative suffix. I would further like to point out that Kallas' monograph contains a form with *-b*, i.e., *vahneb* 'older' (Kallas 1903: 42), whereas his notepads exclusively contain the form *vahnem*.

6.2. Pronouns and determiners

We can find various types of pronouns and determiners in the text. The personal pronouns can be found in the forms of *ma?*, *sa?*, *tä* (T24/25), with the oblique stem *mu* and *su* for first and second person singular (T41). The pronouns appear in the nominative, genitive, partitive, and the exterior local cases (see Table 1).

Table 1. Pronominal forms and their allomorphs in Ojansuu's Kraasna phonograph recordings.

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
NOM	<i>ma?</i>	<i>sa</i> <i>sa?</i>	<i>timä</i> <i>tä</i>	<i>mī</i>		<i>nä</i>
GEN	<i>mu</i> <i>minu</i>	<i>sinu</i>	<i>timä</i>	<i>mī</i>		
PART			<i>timmä</i> <i>timmä</i>	<i>mei[d]gi</i>		<i>näid</i>
ALL	<i>muttē</i> <i>muttē</i>	<i>suttē</i>	<i>timäle</i> <i>tälle</i> <i>tällē</i>		<i>iële</i>	<i>näile</i>
ADE	<i>mut</i> <i>mut</i>	<i>sut</i>	<i>täl</i> <i>täl</i>	<i>meil</i> <i>miel</i>	<i>teil</i>	<i>näil</i>

The demonstrative pronoun *tū* 'that' can be found, possibly also a plural *nu* 'those' in one of the distorted parts of the recordings as well as the demonstrative pronoun referring to a distance between the proximal and distal, *tā* 'that' (see Pajusalu 2015). The interrogative and reflexive pronouns appear as *kiä~kiä* 'who', partitive *kedä* for animate referents and *mis* 'what' (possibly *miä* in the genitive) for inanimate referents. These pronouns have been contracted with the comitative suffix into *minkka* 'with what' and *kinkka* 'with whom', e.g., *ravida otē ēi minkka* 'there was nothing with which to feed/cure', *otē ēi minkka ahju küttä?* 'there is nothing to heat the oven', *otē ēi kinkka kineŋda?* 'there is no

one to talk to'. This form also appears in *otē ei minnka minnä?* 'there is nothing with which to go [there is no money]', for which the referent is not clear from context – it may be about a cart or coach. Furthermore, we find the modal interrogative *kuis* 'how' in *kuis olät* (or *jelät*) 'how are you', the temporal interrogative *kunas* 'when' and *pallos* used in a question about amount with the meaning 'how many'. There are two local interrogatives, *kos* and *koh* 'where', in the illative and inessive, respectively. For these interrogative pronouns, a lengthened final sibilant can be assumed but is not certain from the recordings. From the relative pronoun, the indefinite pronoun *kiäki* 'someone' is formed in *tule ei kiäkki* 'no one comes'. A distributive form of the indefinite pronoun *egätē üttèle* 'to each and every one' can be found in the allative. A number of reflexive and reciprocal pronouns can be found in the texts: *hiñnēga* 'with oneself' in the comitative, the complement *uma* 'own', e.g., *läivä [---] uma tare põlē* 'they went to their own house', as well as the reciprocal pronoun *juś tēžēga?* 'with one another' in the comitative.

Apart from the aforementioned *pallos*, the other quantifiers are the numerals. The cardinal numbers 1–17 are: *juś~juś, kaś~kats, k^oolh, nélli, vīz~vīž, kûž, sādze, katēza, juțezä* (T125), *kümme, üstei-stkümme* (-toi-s-), *kaštei-stkümme*, *kolmtei-stkümme*[nd], *nelitei-stkümme*[nd], *viztei-stkümme*[nd], *kuztei-stkümme*[nd], *sādzetei-stkümme*.

6.3. Verbal morphology

After discussing nominal and pronominal morphology, we now turn our attention to verbal morphology. Kraasna verbs have finite and non-finite forms, with finite forms marked for person, number, tense, mood, and voice.

Non-finite forms include the infinitive and supine (in Estonian linguistics both are often treated as infinitives), and the participles. Historically, the infinitive had the suffix **tAk* which developed into a variety of allomorphs. The most clearly visible continuation of this suffix is the form *-dA?*, e.g., *kīnētda?* 'to speak', *maa-[da?]* 'to sleep', which can be contracted into a stem-final alveolar plosive, e.g., *nīttä?* 'to mow', *añda?* 'to give', alveolar nasal, e.g., *minnä?* 'to go', or geminated consonants or consonant clusters, e.g., *tappä* 'to kill', *rakko* 'to cut trees', *peśsä?* 'to beat', *kuśu?* 'to call', *meśka?* 'to wash'. In forms with a long vowel, the infinitive suffix assimilated into a semivowel, e.g., *viä?* 'to

bring', *tuvva*[?] 'to bring', forms with long *a* or *ä* are not attested in the corpus. The geminated stem consonant in infinitives with a short initial syllable (T39) occurs in both second and third grade, e.g., *jellä*[?] 'to live', *valä*[?] 'to pour', but *pešsä*[?] 'to beat', *küttä*[?] 'to heat'. For bisyllabic verbs with a short initial syllable and no stem allomorphy (T104), an assimilated suffix can be found, i.e., *jellä*[?]. For trisyllabic verbs with the passive or causative derivational suffix **-ttA* (T115), the attested forms show both a strong and a weak allomorph of the derivational suffix, i.e., *lätattä*[?] 'to wed' but *teṃmada* 'to pull'. The supine, a telic infinitive, is formed with the **mA* suffix, which may be geminated, e.g., *jįstma* 'to sit', *pidämä* 'to hold', *magämma* 'to sleep', *kaitsṃma* 'to protect', *kataittamma* 'to mangle', *ležättämma* 'to lie (down)'. For verbs with a secondary-stressed syllable, such as the above-mentioned causative verbs (T128), we can see that the bilabial nasal is consistently geminated, e.g., *kulättamma* 'to entertain', *lätättamma* 'to wed', *ležättämma* 'to lie (down)', *praššättämma* 'to bid farewell'.

The participles can be divided according to their formal and functional links to tense and voice categories. There are no attested forms of present tense participles, apart from a barely audible, potential form *jelläv* 'alive, living', which would correspond to the expected active participle form. Past tense participles are attested for active and passive voice. Examples of past tense active participles can be found as *oṅnu~^uoṅnu*[?] 'been (APP)', *k^uoṅn*[?] 'passed away (APP)', *mānu*[?] 'slept (APP)', *kündnü* 'ploughed (APP)', *vāzünü*[?] 'tired (APP)' and have the suffix *nU~nU[?]~n[?]*. They are used for forming perfective or perfect tense statements such as *om är_kuoṅn*[?] 's/he passed away', and are also found in compound tense forms like the perfect passive in *tä^uom^uoṅnu[?]pandu*[?] 'it has been put'. This also appears with an irrealis meaning, i.e., *oṅnu us jumalat oṅnu us mei[d]gi* 'if there was no god, there would not be us'. The past tense passive forms have a suffix *-t*, possibly also *-TU*, in the nominative, with the vowel *u* following in all other forms (forms showing the presumable vowel harmony are not attested in the corpus), e.g., *kāḃet* 'dug (PPP)', *paṅt* 'put (PPP)', *lätattatu* 'wed (PPP)'. The nominative plural forms *pandu*[?] 'put (PPP.PL)' and *jisṭḃdu*[?] 'placed (PPP.PL)' occur in the recordings, displaying a weakening of the passive suffix before the nominative plural marker *-[?]*.

6.3.1. Person and number marking

The first person singular is consistently zero-marked or unmarked in all synthetic tenses in the indicative, e.g., (*ma*) *káu* ‘I go’, (*ma*) *mak̄kà* ‘I sleep’, (*ma*) *pélgä* ‘I fear’, (*ma*) *jìst̄t̄* ‘I sat’, (*ma*) *pélksi* ‘I feared’. The second person singular is marked with *-t* in the present tense, e.g., (*sa*) *nak̄kat* ‘you begin’, (*sa*) *lezäätät* ‘you lie (down)’, and with the glottal stop *-ʔ* in the past tense, e.g., (*sa*) *näiʔ* ‘you saw’, (*sa*) *käveʔ* ‘you went’, (*sa*) *külʔ* ‘you heard’, with one exception where the present tense marker is used, i.e., (*sa*) *külbset* ‘you sowed’. The third person has two suffixes in the present tense, as in other South Estonian varieties, a *-s* suffix from a historical medial (Posti 1961), e.g., *nak̄kas* ‘s/he begins’, *tälattas* ‘s/he weds’, *jeläs* ‘s/he lives’, and a zero-marked or unmarked form, e.g., *lät* ‘s/he goes’, *jìst* ‘s/he sits’, *vet̄* ‘s/he takes’, *sā* ‘she/he/it becomes’. The form *sā* shows that monosyllabic verbs in this verb class are not marked with a *-b/-p* element (T47) as in South Estonian varieties with a strong North Estonian influence. The same holds for bisyllabic verb stems with a short initial syllable (T100), i.e., *tut̄t̄* ‘she/he/it comes’. In the past tense, the third person singular is unmarked or zero-marked, e.g., *viht̄* ‘s/he hit (PST) with a *viht* [in the sauna for cleaning]’, *kir̄ḡ* ‘it crowded’.

Plural verb forms are less common, especially for first and second person. There is one instance of the first person plural in present tense, which falls together with the (unmarked) first person singular, i.e., (*mī*) *jelä ~ jelā ~ jelā-gi* ‘we live’. This phenomenon can be found in other South Estonian varieties, especially when used with a personal pronoun as in this example (see Iva 2007). In varieties where this syncretism is prevalent, the second person plural falls together with the second person singular form when a pronoun is used – there is no attested form in the corpus, but the manuscripts show a different image: There appears to be a syncretism, but with an unexpected marked form, which cannot be confirmed or falsified using the recordings, i.e., from AES 202 *saʔ annàde* ‘you (sg.) give’ – *tī annàde* ‘you (pl.) give’; *lāde* ‘you go’; *sa istùdeʔ* ‘you (sg.) sit’ – *tī istùde* ‘you (pl.) sit’; *tī är tuññeðeʔ miññū* ‘you (pl.) know me’; *tī linah jelāde* ‘you (pl.) live in the city’ (Estonica V). These forms seem idiosyncratic and contradict the consistent use of *-t* in the singular in the recordings, while appearing to provide further evidence for this proposed syncretism. In the present tense, the third person plural suffixes are *-vAʔ* for verbs with an unmarked third person

singular form, e.g., *sāva*[?] ‘they become’, *lätvā*[?] ‘they go’, and *-zE*[?] for those verb classes ending in *-s* in the respective singular forms (T127), e.g., *kujjoze*[?] ‘they dry’, *küzüze* ‘they ask’. There are not many third person plural past tense forms attested in the recordings (e.g., *tuü* ‘they came’); in the manuscripts, we find *-[?]* for all verb types.

6.3.2. Mood

Grammars of modern South Estonian varieties operate with five moods: indicative, conditional, imperative, jussive, and quotative. The imperative and jussive are formally and semantically related, as the jussive is the imperative of the third person. In the present corpus we find only a few non-indicative forms. The imperative is attested for the second person singular, marked with *-[?]*, e.g., *sa min[?] ruottu [kozima]* ‘you, hurry!’; *mine^k keñeñe* ‘go and speak!’; *nu min[?] sa íegëmä* ‘now go do!’; *vī[?] timäle* ‘bring him/her’; *pan* ‘put!’; *tsuska sinu hand kaivu* ‘hang your tail into the well’. In the plural, the **-k* suffix of the imperative appears as a velar plosive with an additional personal/plural marking, i.e., *-gE[?]* in *jeläge[?]* ‘live!’ or *kuttēge[?]* ‘obey!’.

(1) shows an example of a prohibitive or negative imperative. The jussive is found only in the manuscripts – but not in the recordings – as the form *-go/ko*.

- (1) *tēñe ütles àndu ei är[?]*
 other say.3SG give.NEG.IMP NEG away
 ‘the other says: [she] shall not be given away [as a wife]’

- (2) *otnu us jumalat otnu us meid]=gi*
 COP.APP NEG.PST god.PART COP.APP NEG.PST 1PL.PART=EMPH
 ‘if there was no god, there would not be us’

There are no clear conditional or quotative forms in the recordings. One form with an irrealis meaning uses the past tense active participle (2). This example may be poetic language, though could be indicative of a participle use for the conditional (Saa52) and potentially for the quotative as well. For the quotative, Saareste provides an example from a poetic text (Saa23) with *-dav*, which is also mentioned once in AES 202, 8.

6.3.3. Voice

A noticeable stylistic element in the narratives is the frequent use of passive voice for the main verb. The present tense passive marker is *-TA*, which may appear in a weak form or assimilate to the stem. Only the third person or impersonal passive with the personal marker *-s* is attested in the recordings, e.g., *kāñitäs* ‘it is turned’, *nāttäs* ‘one begins’, *kulāttäs* ‘one is entertained’, *andas* ‘it is given’, *laottadas* ~ *laottēdas* ‘it is spread’, *tuvvas* ‘one brings’, *müvvas* ‘one sells’, *vījäs* ‘one brings’. The derivational suffix *-TA* changes its vowel to *E* before the passive marker, e.g., *kiēdettäs* ‘it is cooked’, *nīdēttäs* ‘it is mowed’, *laottēdas* ‘it is spread’. The same change applies to trisyllabic stems (Saa24), e.g., *raŋtsēdas* ‘is fed, entertained’, *kattēttas* ‘is closed shut’, *kūdzettäs* ‘is baked’. Saareste’s form for the present impersonal of the verb ‘to speak’ (Saa33) can be found as *jüldäs* ‘it is said’ with the complete elision of the alveolar plosive in the stem. There is no synthetic passive past tense in the corpus, only in the manuscripts, while anteriority is expressed with an analytic form using the participle with the copula verb, e.g., *ol pañt* ‘it had been put’; *om “olnu” pandu* ‘they had been put’. A similar analytic construction with a participle can be found with a resultative meaning, e.g., *haud ku um kābēt* ‘when the grave was (completely) dug out’. A curious form *pandaze*[?], likely a synthetic third person plural form, can be seen in (3).

- (3) *pandaze*[?] *tälle* *käe*[?] *rištī* *rindu* *pāl*
 put.PASS.3PL 3SG.ALL hand.PL folded chest.GEN.PL onto
 ‘the hands were put together (folded) on the chest for him’

6.3.4. Tense

The final verbal category is tense. Present tense is not marked in the language of the recordings despite leaving traces in the shape of the personal suffixes (i.e., third-person *-s-* for medial verbs). The past tense is marked with the vowel *-i* which precedes the personal suffix. The first and third person singular are unmarked, e.g., *tulli* ‘I came’, *tuł* ‘she/he/it came’, while the glottal stop is used to mark the second person singular, e.g., *käve*[?] ‘you (sg.) went’. This past tense marker may shorten a long stem vowel, e.g., *näi*[?] ‘you (sg.) saw’, assimilate to the *U*-stem vowel of reflexive verbs, e.g., *sündü* ‘s/he was born’, or lead

to change in the stem vowel, e.g., *vei* ‘I brought’. In the (zero-marked) third person singular, it may be contracted into the stem-final consonant, leading to a palatalisation, e.g., *tuĺ* ‘s/he came’, *kirǵ* ‘it crowed’, *jütel* ‘s/he said’, *pańđ* ‘s/he put’ (Saa38), *vjht* ‘s/he hit (PST) with a *viht* [in the sauna for cleaning]’, *küüt* ‘s/he heated’, *naĳkaś* ‘s/he began’. Also found in the corpus are past tense forms containing the marker *e* (EMK), e.g., *mähke* ‘s/he wrapped’, *jjštę* ‘I sat’, as well as the *-si* marker in *pělksi* ‘I feared’ where the plosive is preserved (T75). An interesting form using *-sE* as the past tense marker (see Pajusalu 2005) is also found, e.g., *külbset* ‘you sowed’.

In addition to the synthetic past tense, further past tense forms can be created with analytic constructions using participles and the finite copula verb, as in *om* *oĺnu?* *pandu?*, *oĺ pańt* ‘had been put’ and *om är_k^uotn?* ‘has passed away’.

6.4. The copula verb

The copula verb can be found occasionally used in the recordings, but not as often as would be expected in a written text. This is especially the case with the necessitative construction, in which the copula is not used, rendering this sentence type similar to its Russian equivalent. For finite forms, mostly third-person forms are found in the recordings, more often showing a raising of the stem vowel before the bilabial nasal, i.e., *um~^uom* (~*om*) in the singular and *umĳma?[?]~umma* (~*omĳma?[?]~omĳma*) in the plural. There is one form in the first person singular, i.e., *ma_olę* ‘I am’. In the past tense, the third person is *oĺ~oĺ* (T33). Furthermore, we also find the non-finite forms of the connegative, i.e., *olę* (*ęi*), and the past tense active participle, i.e., *oĺnu?[?]~otnu*.

6.5. Negation and other clitics

Although negation is a topic of syntax, the allomorphy and morphological forms of the negative particle will be discussed in this section. The literature on verbal negation in South Estonian offers interpretations of the form as an auxiliary verb with a highly defective paradigm, inflecting only for tense, or as a pair of negation particles which exist for present and past tense. As the negation element appears as a clitic in the corpus, the interpretation of it as a particle can be favoured, although

since the connegative form of the lexical verb is a non-finite form it would then be the predicate instead of the ‘negation verb’. The negation particle may appear rather isolated from the verb and occurs in its lexical form with the stem vowel *e*, e.g., *tijä_ei* ‘I do not know’. With increasing cliticisation, the particle assimilates to the vowel of the connegative verb, e.g., *otē ēi* ‘is not’, *añna_ih* ‘do(es) not give’. The same assimilation appears for the past tense particle with the unattested base form **es*, e.g., *otnu us* ‘there was not’, *jā ās* ‘did not stay’. The clitic may be stressed, i.e., *tijä_ei*?

Of other potential clitics, only the emphatic *-Ki* can be found, e.g., *mei[d]gi* ‘we too’, *jelā·gi* ‘[we] do live’, *ärki* ‘completely away’. There are only two occurrences of the emphatic **iks* in the manuscripts. The postpositions may also occasionally appear like clitics, e.g., *pāla* ‘under the head’, *jumata_tak* ‘behind god’, possibly also *jezä_päle* ‘onto the father’. This cliticisation may be due to the speed of spoken language with the (primary) stress removed from the adpositional element.

6.6. Derivational morphology

Apart from nominal and verbal inflection, I would like to highlight some elements of the derivational morphology present in the corpus. There are several instances of the diminutive *-kE(nE)* and its allomorphs, e.g., *seberkkene* ‘friend (DIM)’, *kündlekkene* ‘candle (DIM)’, *korvkkane* ‘basket (DIM)’, *māgittakkane* ‘little tomb (DIM)’. The latter example shows that a loanword (< Russian *могила* ‘grave’) may be affixed with this diminutive derivational suffix, despite already being affixed with the diminutive of the donor language (*-ka*). Another derivational suffix found in the corpus is the agent noun derivation *-JA*, e.g., *rabah·haja* ‘flail; (a person?) that flails’. Adverbs are derived with the *-lt* marker, e.g., *humūgult* ‘in the morning’, *lēnagult* ‘at noon’, *edagult* ‘in the evening’, *jedimädzett* ‘first’, historically other markers may have also been used, e.g., *vañlatè* ‘open’. For verbal derivation, the corpus includes examples of the frequentative **-ele-*, e.g., *häbendelä* ‘to be ashamed’, factitive **-ta-*, e.g., *praśśattāmmā* ‘to bid farewell’, *katattamma* ‘to mangle’, as well as the historical reflexive derivation **-U-*, e.g., *sündü* ‘s/he was born’, *korjus* ‘gathers’, and the deadjectival progressive verbal suffix **-nE-*, e.g., *hapņes* ‘it curdles’. However, the derivative processes associated with these derivational suffixes were

likely unproductive at the time of recording with these verbs having already been lexicalised.

6.7. Loanwords

To conclude the section on morphology, I would briefly like to discuss the treatment of Russian loanwords. These loanwords are almost exclusively nouns referring to concrete objects like tools or relate to religious language. Examples include *kata·tka* ‘barrow’, *ptū[gat]* ‘plough’, *māgītka* ‘grave’, *māgītakkane* ‘tomb (DIM)’. Other examples were not clearly understandable, e.g., the object placed in the left hand of the deceased at the burial ceremony, *?padarožij*, which could be explained with *no* ‘onto’ + *дороза* ‘way’ as grave goods (it is unlikely to be a form of *подорожник* ‘*Plantago*’). The examples above show that these forms are used with South Estonian inflectional and derivational morphology, e.g., the partitive case marker (*ptū[gat]*) and the diminutive suffix (*māgītakkane*). There is one example of the complementiser *štobji* ‘so that’, and also one verb, i.e., *pravađi·i* ‘to escort (in a procession)’, which fits syntactically into the South Estonian sentence as an infinitive despite not showing the borrowing language’s supine marker, as in *pra·vėdattamma* ‘to visit’ (<*приведать* + *-ma*).

7. Notes about syntax

As dialect syntax and the syntax of spoken language could and should provide enough talking points for a separate article, I will limit this section to a few notes for further enquiry. Sentence-level phenomena are most easily checked and verified using the recordings, as the presence, absence, or order of words is clearly audible in most cases. Despite this, there are some major differences in the manuscripts, likely due to the limited number of times a phonograph recording can be played before suffering from quality loss of the physical medium. The transcriber likely focused on phonology and word-level phenomena, adding skipped words at the end or abbreviating them. An in-depth study of syntactic elements of the Kraasna subdialect is only possible with the present dataset, as the manuscripts alone are not reliable enough for definite conclusions.

The sentence structures appear interesting and different from what I might have expected beforehand, whether it is due to the fact that we are

dealing with (spontaneous) spoken language in a monological narrative or that it is caused by the peculiarities of this South Estonian variety and its state of language contact and language shift at the time of recording. One major point of discussion, namely the motivation for marking the translative case, has already been mentioned in the previous section.

One of the reasons for the interesting word order and sentence structures is the predominant use of three sentence types: a necessitative sentence with *vaijā* ‘necessary’, sentences with *nakka~nakkas* ‘I begin; s/he begins’, and sentences in impersonal passive voice. The necessitative construction is always clause-initial and generally appears without the copula verb. The adjective *vaijā* triggers the use of the infinitive of the semantic main verb without exception. The necessitative construction is impersonal, as no overt subject is used. It may be analogous to the Russian *нужно* ‘it is necessary’.

The sentence type with *nakka~nakkas* regularly triggers the use of the supine form of the semantic verb. While *nakka~nakkas* has the semantics of ‘I begin’ and ‘s/he begins’, the use of this verb appears to be less semantically but rather functionally motivated. On the one hand, it could be interpreted as a marker of a sequence, equivalent to the conjunction ‘and then’ in the narration of a procedural or sequential story (4). On the other hand, it can be interpreted in a broader frame of aspectual marking as an inchoative marker for a spontaneous or intentional event in a reported dialogue (5). It may also be a syntactic calque from Russian *стать* ‘stand; begin; become’, which, in the source language, can be repeated in subsequent clauses.

- (4) *nakkas nāñe jikmā nakkas väike tats jikmā*
 begin.3SG woman cry.SUP begin.3SG small child cry.SUP
 ‘(and then) the wife starts crying, (and then) the small child starts crying’
- (5) *kedä sa nakkat naitma / ma nakkā poiga naitma*
 who.PART 2SG begin.2SG wed.SUP 1SG begin.1SG son.PART wed.SUP
 ‘who are you intending (‘starting’) to wed? I intend (‘start’) to wed (my) son’

Similar aspectual features can be observed in the beginning of the narrative on burial rites, i.e., *jeläs jeläs / ni lát haigest* ‘(he) lives, lives, and fell ill’, where the continuous aspect of the verb living is expressed by the reduplication of the verb. The phrase *jeläs jeläs* itself might also

be a calque from the Russian formulaic expressions *жил-поживал* or *жил-был* ‘once upon a time’, but in a reduplicated form (the Russian equivalent would be an unattested **жил-жил*). More visibly marked is the perfective with the particle *är*[?], e.g., *hāna[?] kujjozē[?] är[?]* ‘the hay dries completely’, *hapņes är[?]* ‘it curdles completely’, *meze är[?]* ‘I wash it off’, *paḡ lālattas är[?]* ‘the priest confirms the marriage’, *suiṭtas täl jo är[?] pā[?]*, ‘he is combed [until he is ready for the ceremony]’, *är[?] kuli* ‘he passed away’, *müvväs är[?]* ‘it is sold off’. The use of the particle *är*[?] is not motivated by the semantics of ‘away’ as in certain phrasal verb constructions, e.g., *veṭa pälze pīmā pātt är[?]* ‘I skim the cream off the top’.

Another example of the use of *är*[?] as part of a phrasal or particle verb is *ära aṅda[?]* ‘to give away’. As in Standard Estonian, particle verbs are fairly common in Kraasna. Other particles or adverbs which can be found in phrasal verbs include *jeṭte* ‘forth’, *pērṛä* ‘after’, *kiñ[?]* ‘closed; fixed’, and *üles* ‘up(wards)’, e.g., *paṅ hobezē jeṭte* ‘I harness the horse’, *lā hainu pērṛä* ‘I go after the hay’, *ködä kabläga kiñ[?]* ‘I tie it up with wire’, *pandas kāzēga kiñ[?]* ‘it is closed shut with a lid’, *kattēttas timä siḷmä[?] kiñ[?]* ‘his eyes are closed shut’, *aettas māga^k kiññ[?]* ‘(he) is covered up with earth’, *nāñē tuḷ hummogult üles* ‘the woman got up in the morning’, or even the illative form of the word for ‘back’, *sälḡä*, in *aettas tällē hamēh sālḡä* ‘they put a shirt on him’. These phrasal verbs have a resultative meaning or emphasise that the process has concluded.

The third common sentence type uses the impersonal passive form of the main verb, which is attested around thirty times in the corpus. Why this form was so frequently used cannot be answered definitively, although it is, formally, a more complex form than a personally inflected finite verb, as there are, potentially, additional stem allomorphy and vowel changes; it does not, however, appear to be the form one chooses by default. The use of the impersonal passive may be linked to the genre of the narrative or may have been triggered by the framing of the question or setting of the stimulus by the researcher. He possibly asked for a general account of customs instead of a personal narrative or primed the consultants by frequently using the impersonal passive himself. Admittedly, the lines between both genres are blurred in the narrative, as it appears that the stories relate to the speakers’ lives. However, the use of the impersonal passive makes it less immediate, as the verbal action becomes more abstract and less concretely tied to the particular real-world event referenced in the narrative. Having said that, the use of a

present tense form makes the story-telling more immersive and vivid compared to the use of the past tense for referencing a remote event.

The most commonly used tenses are the present and past, with rare occasions of a more remote past, e.g., the perfect. The consultants occasionally use the tenses inconsistently for their stories, changing from past tense to present tense without a concrete, cotextual motivation, e.g., use of reported speech, which supports immersive story-telling. It appears that the consultant is not only retelling an event or reporting a custom but also commenting on it, e.g., shifting from the present to past tense in *jā ās kinkka jellǎ?*, *är² kūli* ‘no one stayed alive (remained to live with), he passed away’ before returning to the procedural story with necessitives and present tense impersonal passives. This emotional level may be heard in the intonation, for example, in the same narrative, it appears the speaker uses a lamenting, even sobbing, intonation when reporting that the deceased is buried, i.e., *aettas mâga^k kiññ[?]* ‘he is covered up with earth’.

There are some instances of more complex sentences, namely questions and sentences with a complementiser. The polar question uses the clause-initial question tag *kas* in (6) and (7). The same text contains two instances of a complement phrase marked with *et*, i.e., (8) and (9).

(6) *kas sa añnat ar mułtè tütârd mehèl*
 Q 2SG give.2SG away 1SG.ALL daughter.PART man.ADE
 ‘do you give me [your] daughter for a wife’

(7) *kas vèt pap̃ lātattā?*
 Q take.3SG priest wed.IN
 ‘does the priest accept (‘take’) [our request] to get married’

(8) *kià ütles et um rikaš vaijā ära añda?*
 who say.3SG that cop.3SG rich necessary away give.INF
 ‘who says that he is rich – it is necessary to consent to the marriage (‘give away’)’

(9) *kià ütles et um hüà*
 who say.3SG that cop.3SG good
 ‘who (one) says that he is good’

Case and number agreement between the nominal head and adjectival attribute is observed in most cases, e.g., *pālze pīmà* ‘top.GEN milk.GEN’,

hüvvä kätte ‘right.ILL hand.ILL’, *hüvvä paikka* ‘good.ILL place.ILL’, *hāna[?] sāva kuiva[?]* ‘hay.PL become.3PL dry.PL’, *vattāṭiṇe pink* ‘free.NOM.SG bench.NOM.SG’, and *kurra kätte* ‘left.ILL hand.ILL’. Occasionally, the case may be redundantly double-marked, e.g., *pañđ jimäle kervale* ‘give.3SG.PST mother.ALL next_to.ALL’ or *ma jistē hobezēḷē sālǵǵ* ‘I sit.1SG.PST horse.ALL back.ILL’.

Overall, we find a frequent replacement of case marking with adpositions. Especially for the (exterior) local cases, we find the analytic case marking, e.g., *mā pālē* ‘onto (the) earth’, *rindu pāl* ‘onto the chest’, *kodo boḷē* ‘towards home’. The case governed by the postposition is mostly identical with South Estonian or Estonian forms, except in the aforementioned *pañđ jimäle kervale*, where we would expect the genitive *jimä*.

As an opposite phenomenon, the comitative is used to combine two nouns into a single noun phrase without the use of a conjunction, i.e., *jezä jimāga jikva[?]* ‘father and (‘with’) mother are crying’. This shows the close relationship between both nouns without referring to the parents by the collective **vahnemba[?]* found in the manuscripts. This form of referring to parents can also be found in other languages around the world.

Finally, some observations about speech patterns in general. We find many examples of ellipsis, as is to be expected in spoken language use. Most often, a pronoun or the copula verb is dropped, e.g., in the necessitative. The ellipsis of pronouns (10a) seems arbitrary, as there are several examples where the pronoun is used (10b) without particular emphasis on the agent.

(10a) *lā hainu pèrǵǵ*
 go.1SG hay.GEN.PL after
 ‘I go after the hay’

(10b) *ma lā kodo boḷē*
 1SG go.1SG home.GEN towards
 ‘I go home’

For sequences, a parallel sentence structure is used, e.g., *laottadas jo taivva rät māgitka pālē, pandas vatsk māgitka pālē, pandas ḷihad paḷā māgitka pālē / tuvvas vīnā māgitka pālē* ‘the tablecloth is spread onto the grave, the bread is put onto the grave, the meats are put onto the

grave, the liquor is brought onto the grave’, with impersonal passive verb forms, nominal objects, and the local adverbial *màgitka p̄ālè* ‘onto the grave’. There are only a few instances when the speakers correct themselves or start over, e.g., *la- lao- / la- / laottadas* ‘it is spread’ or *ärki k̄ul- är^k k̄uli* ‘(he) passed away’. The most interesting example is *pandas pada p̄ä- pandas padi p̄āla* ‘the pillow is put underneath the head’, where the speaker notices that she used the genitive form *pada* when the nominative object *padi* would be regularly used after the impersonal passive verb. This shows that the speakers still had a good command of the language despite the language attrition reported by Kallas (1903). Combined with their coherent story-telling and lively intonation, it can be assumed that the consultants were able to speak the language without major difficulties, at least on the topics of their narratives.

8. Summary

Access to the raw materials, i.e., the sound recordings, of the Kraasna fieldwork conducted by Heikki Ojansuu allows for the scientific examination of issues of a linguistic and dialectological nature. These recordings, in theory, allow for the falsification of claims or provide examples in support of existing descriptions. While it is not possible to provide a holistic account of the Kraasna subdialect based on the phonograph recordings alone, many points and forms can be found in the data, leading to the most comprehensive linguistic description of the Kraasna subdialect to date, and the only one not to be based on the manuscripts as the primary source. My hope is that this linguistic description reinvigorates scholars’ interest in further investigating the Kraasna subdialect, hopefully leading to more analyses based on Ojansuu’s recordings.

The Kraasna subdialect presents itself as a South Estonian variety which is in some parts similar – in others dissimilar – to the other varieties of this dialect continuum. Kraasna exhibits a noticeable Russian influence in its phonology, e.g., the iotation of the front vowels *i*, *e*, and *ü* in word-initial position or the palatalisation of consonants in the context of front vowels, and lexicon. Despite these contact-induced phenomena, the language use on record presents a fluent and confident

language use by the consultants. Morphologically, the language of the recordings complies with the existing descriptions, linking the variety to the easternmost South Estonian varieties of Võro and Seto. While this similarity can be confirmed with direct observations and comparisons, the functional description of Kraasna suggests some inconsistencies, e.g., in the use of the translative case. On the syntactic level, the Kraasna recordings differ most strongly from their transcriptions in the manuscripts. Having access to a recording of the speech event makes it possible to fill gaps and enable further research into stylistic or pragmatic aspects of language use, e.g., the use of voice and intonation, levels of self-correction, and parallel sentence structures. The extent to which these characteristics are unique to Kraasna will need to be established by future research, as they may be caused more generally by spontaneous speech or the genre of spoken text.

I propose several directions for future research and enquiry into these recordings. First, it would be useful to have new digitisations made of the phonograph recordings, using modern technology (e.g., optical precision measuring) rather than relying on the 1963 tape recordings of the originals. This would allow the reduction of mechanical noise and grant access to sections of the recordings which are distorted in the tape copies, possibly providing a quality which makes the digitisation useable for phonetic analysis. Second, the present descriptive study of the recordings needs to be compared to the remaining manuscripts from Ojansuu's 1914 and 1911/12 fieldwork, ultimately being extended to the sources by Kallas gathered in 1901 and Kreutzwald/Brandt in the mid-19th century. This may highlight differences in the speakers' language use, trends and developments, or inconsistencies in the data. The use of stylometrics or tools from forensic linguistics may help to identify the consultants based on their language use and determine whether the recordings are from one or several speakers as well as how (dis)similar their language use is compared to that of other consultants recorded in manuscripts and other data collections. Third, as the identity of the consultant(s) for the recordings is not clear, we do not know without a doubt who provided us with these clear recordings of the Kraasna Estonians' language use. A combined effort of archival research and speaker identification may provide insights into different historical stages of the Kraasna subdialect, or groups of the population which preserved Kraasna better or longer than others. It appears from

later ethnographic accounts, that members of the Kraasna community visited Seto-speaking regions and also, as Kallas suggests, that landlords brought young men and women from Seto-speaking regions in the north as spouses for the Kraasna Estonian population in the mid-19th century. The consultants who can be heard in the recordings may be affected by either process, which could explain differences from earlier language data. Fourth, this comparative effort may be supported by the comparison of the present description and dataset with other South Estonian varieties and their descriptions. How close is the Kraasna subdialect of the recordings, or the overall language use in the manuscripts, to other South Estonian, especially Võro and Seto subdialects? Fifth, the descriptions of syntax and sentence- or text-level phenomena should be compared and discussed under the research framework of South Estonian spontaneous speech or dialectal syntax. These comparisons should provide further insights into whether the peculiarities described hold true for other varieties or Estonian spoken language use in general, or if we are dealing with an exclusive development of the Kraasna subdialect. Finally, any gaps in the present analysis, for example pertaining to pragmatics or conversation analysis, should be closed by experts on these topics or discussed in further detail. To ensure brevity, the present overview is cursory, with many aspects of linguistic description offering work for future research into the Kraasna subdialect. Consequently, I hope that this is only the starting signal for more publications to come, and not the end of linguistic research into this fascinating linguistic enclave, its speakers, and their language use.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to all the colleagues who encouraged and supported my work on the Kraasna subdialect, especially to Jeremy Bradley, Elena Skribnik, and Karl Pajusalu, who all supervised the initial project. I would also like to thank Sulev Iva (Jüvä Sullõv) for his comments on my transcriptions as well as the anonymous reviewers for their observant comments. I am deeply indebted to the archives which hold the original sources as well as their helpful and accommodating staff, which enabled me to access all sources and conduct my research: the Archive of the Kirjandusmuuseum in Tartu, the University of Tartu Archives of

Estonian Dialects and Kindred Languages, the Archive of the Estonian Dialects and Finno-Ugric Languages at the Institute of the Estonian Language, the Literary archive at the Finnish Literary Society, the sound archive of the Finnish Literary Society as well as the Kalevala Society and the KOTUS archives. In addition, I would like to thank the Seto Instituut for awarding me the dissertation prize in 2019. Ultimately, I would like to acknowledge Heikki Ojansuu's work of documenting and recording Kraasna under difficult circumstances and express my respect and gratitude to his consultants for sharing their stories and enabling research even a century later.

Archival sources

- AES 202 = Akadeemilise Emakeele Seltsi Ülevaated 202. Häälikuloolisi andmeid ja tekste Kraasna murdest (Archive number AES0202). Authored by Heikki Ojansuu. 1938. The Archive of Estonian Dialects and Finno-Ugric Languages at the Institute of the Estonian Language (EMSUKA). PID: 11297/3-00-0000-0000-02D36L. <http://emsuka.eki.ee/view/book/175/0>
- ES MT 224 = Emakeele Seltsi Murdetekstid. Kraasna murdetekste ja muid märkmeid (Archive number ESMT0224). Copied from Heikki Ojansuu's 1911/12 fieldwork records. The Archive of Estonian Dialects and Finno-Ugric Languages at the Institute of the Estonian Language (EMSUKA). PID: 11297/3-00-0000-0000-0000-031BEL. <http://emsuka.eki.ee/view/book/78/0>
- Estonica I–V = Heikki Ojansuu 1910–1911. Archive of Heikki Ojansuu. Literary Archive at the Finnish Literature Society. Contains a typewritten copy of Ojansuu's 1914 materials from AES 202, prepared on 05.04.1939.
- EFAM Kallas M 4 = Materials of Estonian Folkloristic History. Authored by Oskar Kallas 1901. Estonian Folklore Archives at the Estonian Literary Museum.
- EFAM Voolaine M 1 = Materials of Estonian Folkloristic History. Authored by Paulopriit Voolaine. Estonian Folklore Archives at the Estonian Literary Museum.
- SKSÄ fonokop 32/4-8 & SKSÄ A 530/4-7, 9 = Perinteen ja nykykulttuurin kokoelman äänitteet. Collected by Armas Otto Väisänen [Heikki Ojansuu] 1914. Digitised tape recording from 1963 and the 1980s. Sound archives of the Finnish Literature Society
- SKSÄ fonokop 136/7-9 & SKSÄ A 502/15-17 = Perinteen ja nykykulttuurin kokoelman äänitteet. Heikki Ojansuu [1914]. Digitised tape recording from 1963 and the 1980s. Sound archives of the Finnish Literature Society.

References

- Cornell, Earl W., Vitaliy Fadeyev, Carl Haber, Jian Jin, Robert Nordmeyer & Mitchell Golden. 2007. Using optical metrology to reconstruct sound recordings. *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* 579(2). 901–904. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2007.05.316>.
- EMK = Pajusalu, Karl. 2020. Kraasna murrak. In Pajusalu, Karl, Tiit Hennoste, Ellen Niit, Peeter Päll & Jüri Viikberg. *Eesti murded ja kohanimed*. 3. tr, 200–201. Tartu: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.
- Ernits, Enn. 2012. Fr. R. Kreutzwald lõunaestlaste piire kompimas. In Sullõv Jüvä (ed.), *Õdagumeeresoomõ piiriq* (Võro instituudi toimõndusõq 26), 30–65. Võru: Võro Instituut'.
- Ernits, Enn. 2018. Kraasna rahvalaulude esimestest üleskirjutustest. In Sullõv Jüvä (ed.) *Valitsõmisjaotusõst keelealoluuni* (Võro instituudi toimõndusõq 33), 157–201. Võru: Võro Instituut'.
- Fadeyev, Vitaliy, Carl Haber, Christian Maul, John W. McBride & Mitchell Golden. 2005. Reconstruction of recorded sound from an Edison cylinder using three-dimensional noncontact optical surface metrology. *Journal of the Audio Engineering Society* 53(6). 485–508.
- Faster, Mariko, Laivi Org, Urmas Kalla, Sulev Iva & Triin Iva. 2014. *Eesti-võru sõnaraamat*. Võru: Võro Instituut'.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2010. Framework-free grammatical theory. In Bernd Heine & Heiko Narrog (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of grammatical analysis*, 341–365. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199544004.013.0014>.
- Iva, Sulev. 2007. *Võru kirjakeele sõnamuutmissüsteem* (Dissertationes Philologiae Estonicae Universitatis Tartuensis 20). Tartu: Tartu Ülikool. <http://hdl.handle.net/10062/4860>.
- Iva, Sulev. 2015. Liivi, Ludzi ja Kraasna maarahva kiil. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 58(7). 515–517.
- Kallas, Oskar. 1901. Kraasna maarahvas. *Postimees* (Tartu) 45(152), 11. July 1901. <https://dea.digar.ee/article/postimeesew/1901/07/11/2>.
- Kallas, Oskar. 1903. *Kraasna maarahvas*. Helsinki: Soome Kirjanduse Selts.
- Kask, Arnold. 1956. Eesti murrete kujunemisest ja rühmitumisest. In Harri Moora (ed.), *Eesti rahva etnilisest ajaloost. Artiklite kogumik*, 24–40. Tallinn: Eesti Riiklik Kirjastus.
- Krikmann, Arvo & Karl Pajusalu. 2000. Kus on keskmurde keskpunkt?. In Jüri Viikberg (ed.), *Inter dialectos nominaque. Pühendusteos Mari Mustale 11. novembril 2000* (Eesti Keele Instituudi toimetised 7), 131–172. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.
- LEH = Pajusalu, Karl, Sulev Iva & Pire Teras. 2003. Sissejuhatus. In Karl Pajusalu & Pire Teras (eds.), *Lõunaestli häälilid II*, 9–15. Tartu: University of Tartu.
- Lehiste, Ilse. 1969. 'Being' and 'Having' in Estonian. *Foundations of Language* 5(3). 324–341. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25000387>.

- Mets, Mari, Anu Haak, Triin Iva, Grethe Juhkason, Mervi Kalmus, Miina Norvik, Karl Pajusalu, Pire Teras, Tuuli Tuisk & Lembit Vaba. 2014. *Lõunaeesti keelesaarte tekstid* (Eesti murded IX). Tallinn, Tartu: Eesti Keele Instituut, Tartu Ülikool.
- Neus, Heinrich. 1850. *Ehstnische Volkslieder*. Reval [Tallinn]: Ehstländische Literärische Gesellschaft.
- Ojansuu, Heikki. 1912. Ein südestnischer beitrag zur stufenwechseltheorie. *Finnisch-ugrische Forschungen* 12. 147–149.
- Pajusalu, Karl. 1997. Keskse perifeeria mõjust eesti keele tekkeloos. In Mati Ereht, Meeli Sedrik & Ellen Uuspõld (eds.), *Pühendusteos Huno Rätsepale* (Tartu Ülikooli eesti keele õppetooli toimetised 7), 167–183. Tartu: Tartu Ülikool. <http://hdl.handle.net/10062/40524>.
- Pajusalu, Karl. 2005. Keelesaarte se-minevik. In Mari Mets & Sullõv Jüvä (eds.), *Tartu Ülikooli Lõuna-Eesti keele- ja kultuuriuuringute keskuse aastaraamat IV*, 145–150. Tartu: Tartu Ülikool.
- Pajusalu, Karl. 2007. Estonian dialects. In Mati Ereht (ed.), *Estonian language* (Linguistica Uralica Supplementary Series 1), 231–272. Tallinn: Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia.
- Pajusalu, Karl & Liena Muižniece. 1997. Mineviku partitsiibi grammatikaliseerumisest lõunaeesti murretes. In Karl Pajusalu & Sullõv Jüvä (eds.), *Õdagumeresoomõ lõunapiir* (Võro Instituudi Toimõtisõq 1). 96–101. Võru: Võro Instituut.
- Pajusalu, Karl & Pire Teras (eds.). 2003. *Lõunaeesti häälikud II* (Publications of the Department of Estonian of the University of Tartu 27). Tartu: University of Tartu. <http://hdl.handle.net/10062/55279>.
- Pajusalu, Karl, Tiit Hennoste, Ellen Niit, Peeter Päll & Jüri Viikberg. 2020. *Eesti murded ja kohanimed*. 3. tr. Tartu: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.
- Pajusalu, Renate. 2015. Võro demonstratives: changing or disappearing?. *Eesti ja soome-ugri keeleteaduse ajakiri. The Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics* 6(2). 167–190. <https://doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2015.6.2.07>.
- Posti, Lauri. 1961. Itämerensuomalaisen verbitaivutuksen kysymyksiä. *Virittäjä* 65(4). 351–366.
- Saareste, Andrus. 1955. *Petit atlas des parlars estoniens. Väike eesti murdeatlas*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Seidel, Frank. 2016. Documentary linguistics: A language philology of the 21st century. In Peter K. Austin (ed.), *Language Documentation and Description* 13, 23–63. London: SOAS. <http://www.ejournals.org/PID/146>.
- Stassen, Leon. 1997. *Intransitive Predication*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Toomse, Mihkel. 1998. *Lõuna-Eesti murded 1–30. Kaardid* (Publications of the department of Finnish and general linguistics of the University of Turku 56). Turku: University of Turku.
- Weber, Tobias. 2016. *Kraasna - The state of documentation and description of an extinct South Estonian dialect*. Unpublished BA thesis at the Institute for Finno-Ugric / Uralic Studies at Ludwig-Maximilians Universität München. <https://kraasna.wordpress.com>.
- Weber, Tobias. 2019. Can Computational Meta-Documentary Linguistics Provide for Accountability and Offer an Alternative to “Reproducibility” in Linguistics?. In

- Maria Eskevich, Gerard de Melo, Christian Fäth, John P. McCrae, Paul Buitelaar, Christian Chiarcos, Bettina Klimek & Milan Dojchinovski (eds.), *2nd Conference on Language, Data and Knowledge (LDK 2019)*. Dagstuhl: Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. <https://doi.org/10.4230/oasics.ldk.2019.26>.
- Weber, Tobias. 2021. Consultant identity in historical language data: Anthroponyms as a tool or as an obstacle?. In Anna Choleva-Dimitrova, Maya Vlahova-Angelova & Nadezhda Dancheva (eds.), *Sliadovati dostoita. Proceedings of the International Onomastic Conference “Anthroponyms and Anthroponymic Researches in the Beginning of 21st Century”*, 165–175. Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.
- Weber, Tobias. forthcoming. Philology in the folklore archive. In Lise Dobrin & Saul Schwartz (eds.), *Language Documentation and Description*.
- Weber, Tobias & Mia Klee. 2020. Agency in scientific discourse. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Braşov, Series IV: Philology and Cultural Studies* 13(1). 71–86. <https://doi.org/10.31926/but.pcs.2020.62.13.1.5>.
- Woodbury, Anthony C. 2011. Language documentation. In Peter K. Austin and Julia Sallabank (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Endangered Languages*, 159–186. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511975981.009>.

Kokkuvõte. Tobias Weber: Heikki Ojansuu Kraasna murraku fonogrammide lingvistiline analüüs. Venemaal Pihkva oblastis Krasnogorodski ümbruses elanud Kraasna maarahvas rääkis lõunaestipärast Kraasna murrakut 20. sajandi esimese pooleni. Kõik keeleteaduslikud käsitlused Kraasna murrakust on siiani kasutanud kirjalikke allikaid, enamjaolt Heikki Ojansuu 1911.–12. ning 1914. aastal kogunud käsikirju. Ojansuu tehtud fonogrammid arvati enne käesoleva uurimistöö tegemist olevat kadunud ning sellepärast pole neid varasemad uurijad kasutanud. Taasleitud helisalvestiste abil on selles artiklis kirjeldatud Kraasna murrakut esimest korda suulise kõne andmete alusel, täites lünki eelnevates analüüsides. Siinses kirjelduses järgitakse teoreetiliselt neutraalset deskriptiivset lähenemist, samas austades Eesti keeleteaduse traditsioone ja arvestades Eesti murdeuurimise varasemate tulemustega. Artikkel esitab Kraasna fonoloogia, morfoloogia ja süntaksi kohta põhiteavet, piirdudes aga korpuspõhise uurimisena fonogrammide keeleainesega. See on aluseks järgnevatele uurimisprojektidele, mis saavad käesolevat kirjeldust lähtekohaks kasutades arendada analüüsi edasi, seda laiendades ja süvendades.

Märksõnad: keelesaared, ajalooline sotsiolingvistika, Eesti dialektoloogia, keelte dokumenteerimine, fonogrammid, lõunaestsi keel, Kraasna murrak

Appendix 1: Content of the recordings

Recording 1963 / Recording 1980s / Recording no. / Researcher / Place of recording / Time of recording	Start time record- ing 1963 (recording 1980s)	End time record- ing 1963 (recording 1980s)	Title of text (Eesti murded IX) / description of recording / page in Estonica
A 502/15 fonokop 136/7 299 Ojansuu [Kraasna?] [sine dato]	0:00 (0:15)	0:55 (1:10)	[man talking, Standard Estonian?]
	0:55 (1:10)	1:11 (1:20)	[woman talking]
	1:11 (1:20)	1:33 (1:43)	[man talking]
	1:33 (1:43)	2:21 (2:32)	[man singing, Finnish?]
	2:21 (2:32)	3:12 (2:54)	[women singing]
A 502/16 fonokop 136/8 300 Ojansuu Kraasna [s.d.]	0:00 (0:12)	1:27 (1:39)	[woman speaking, distorted]
	1:27 (1:39)	2:17 (2:23)	Estonica I 6-7 (partial)
	2:17 (2:23)	2:39 (2:45)	[woman counting]
	2:39 (2:45)	3:10 (3:08)	Estonica I 6-7 (partial)
A 502/17 fonokop 136/9 301 Ojansuu [Kraasna?] [s.d.]	0:00 (0:14)	0:46 (1:01)	[woman singing]
	0:46 (1:01)	1:50 (2:29)	[story about fox and wolf, Ulla Vasiljevna? See Kallas 1903]
	1:50 (2:29)	2:20 (3:23)	Estonica I 33
	2:20 (3:23)	3:25 (4:21)	Estonica I 35-36
A 530/4 fonokop 32/4 81 „Ohjelmaa“ Väisänen / [Ojansuu] Kraasna 1914	0:00 (0:21)	2:05 (2:25)	Estonica I, 28
	2:05 (2:25)	2:35 (2:54)	AES 202
	2:35 (2:54)	3:14 (3:33)	[woman speaking]
	3:14 (3:33)	3:23 (3:45)	Estonica I, 40

Recording 1963 / Recording 1980s / Recording no. / Researcher / Place of recording / Time of recording	Start time record- ing 1963 (recording 1980s)	End time record- ing 1963 (recording 1980s)	Title of text (Eesti murded IX) / description of recording / page in Estonica
A 530/5 fonokop 32/5 82 „Häät“ Väisänen / [Ojansuu] Kraasna 1914	0:00 (0:20)	2:55 (2:30)	Pulmakombed Estonica I, 19-20
	2:55 (2:30)	3:11 (2:45)	[woman speaking]
	3:11 (2:45)	3:33 (3:10)	Ristimisest (partial) Estonica I, 18
A 530/6 fonokop 32/6 83 „Hautajaiset“ Väisänen / [Ojansuu] Kraasna 1914	0:00 (0:16)	2:52 (3:01)	Matused Estonica I, 21-22
	2:52 (3:01)	3:18 (3:23)	Leivast (partial) Estonica I, 23-24
A 530/7 fonokop 32/7 84 „Pesemistä“ Väisänen / [Ojansuu] Kraasna 1914	0:00 (0:20)	2:27 (2:24)	Nädalavahetusest Estonica I, 25-26
	2:27 (2:24)	2:54 (2:48)	Estonica I, 38
	2:54 (2:48)	3:29 (3:22)	Varas (partial) Estonica I, 29
A 530/9 fonokop 32/8 86 Väisänen / [Ojansuu] Kraasna 1914	0:00 (0:15)	3:10 (3:28)	Estonica I, 1-8 (partial)

Appendix 2: Transcribed texts from the recordings

These transcriptions are based on Ojansuu's transcriptions contained in AES 202. In many cases, Ojansuu's detailed transcriptions can be confirmed – they were only altered if the recordings clearly do not align with his transcriptions. Due to wear on the cylinders and the mechanical noise created during copying, fine details in Ojansuu's transcription were occasionally impossible to transcribe (even for a native speaker, as Jüvä Sullõv stated in personal communication). This mostly affected the quality of sibilants and vowels, as well as length or quantity, overall. I bear responsibility for the quality of the present transcriptions and hope that new digitisations will enable narrower transcriptions or phonetic analyses in the future.

502/16 (a502b_02)

The following part is transcribed from listening impression only, the text could not be linked to any instances in the manuscripts. The sentences about harvesting could be loosely related to *Estonica I*, 23 = AES 202, 17 = EMIX 'Leivast'.

nu nakka ma nāņē [---] / nakka ma nāņē [---] / (talking in background)
nakka kangast kudama / nakka kangast sâdmä / nakka kangast kudama /
ma [rabataja] // nakka [---]-telemma //
[---] [riihte] `peima / nakka rükä [---] nakka `kandma / nakka hakkijałgu
`pandma / nakka kũ vidämä / ma nakka rükä atma / nu nakka rükki
`pešmä / nakka tarę mǎn? `kandma rüki / (---) / ma- / [---] //
[ma] tullì [h]ummugult üles / mezi sũ kamm`pâ / (---) ma (--) //
kos hobęzega lât [x3] / ma- [---] ma (--) ma tetä? / tã um munakęņ ta um
är? (---) [kervalt] [---] // [mul ołł kolk- / ma kolki liñnu]
nàgłä?, nāgł, nàgłä?, nāgł (~ nāgł), nàgłä?
[varbas vārba? varbas vārba?] varbas vārba?
(--) maja vaija maijā vaijā?
haràk haraga? [x3]
takh olę_ęi xàmbit muł, takh olę_ęi hàmbit muł, takh olę_ęi hàmbit muł
ma- (--) vabā nāņē, tũ um vaba nāņē, tũ um vaĵba nāņ[ę]
malts, matdza? [x3]
ņęęęę umma pęrst pešsā?, ñęęęę umma^p pęrst pešsā?, ñęęę_ umma^p
pęrst pešsā?

ʷüts, kaís, kʷolh, nélli, víz, kúz, sãdze, kateza, ʷüteza, kũmmè
üts̄tei-stkũmmend (-toi-s-), kaís̄tei-stkũmmend, kolm̄tei-stkũmme[nd],
nel̄itei-stkũmme[nd], víz̄tei-stkũmme[nd], kũz̄tei-stkũmme[nd],
sãdz̄et̄ei-stkũmmend
vaíja kapst̄it vaĺlaʷ vígaʷ, vaíja ugur̄itsi vaĺlaʷ vígaʷ, vaíja sibul̄it vaĺla vígaʷ
vaíja (---) [x3] // ma tull̄i kav̄vend̄est [x3]
ku um vãzũnũʷ sa ei j̄ev̄vaʷ [x3]

502/17 (a502b_03)

[singing, a song with every line starting in “liiku” or “niiku”]

[The following part is mostly unintelligible; it is a version of a story about a fox tricking a wolf but not equivalent to the version in Ojansuu’s manuscripts (recorded in *Estonica V* in 1912). The text is very similar to the story told to Oskar Kallas by Ulía Vasiljevna (1903: 126) and might be from the same consultant. This part needs to be revisited when better audio quality is available, as it is impossible to link the recording to a section in the manuscripts.]

[suzi ja rep̄än ol̄li] [---] [taluga hinḡämä] / rep̄än [nigu] kallo [ni sa
pũv̄vä kallo] / tsuska sinu hand kaivu [ja] korjuz hanna täüz kallu / [susi]
tim̄ä hanna kaivu ja kaivu ärʷ hand külm̄i jã kinni (-) rep̄än [küllã külah]
jütles [külämehe] (--) / külä rahvas / hüã rahvas / suzi sit kaivu / [---]
v̄eta sul (-) lats [---] / [jelãse] keik (---) mu küllã / sa j̄öz̄et v̄ert a ma j̄öz̄e
mãttã //
hainu vikadiga nõdeit̄äs / rihãga rĩp̄itas / ümbre kãnt̄äs štoj̄ haina
kujjozeʷ / a kujjozeʷ kuivaʷ / hãñaʷ kujjozeʷ ärʷ pane rukka / lã pan̄e h̄eb-
hob̄ez̄e j̄eite lã hainu p̄er̄ã / hãñaʷ / pan̄e hãñaʷ rat̄ij̄t̄e kãdã kab̄tãga kiñʷ /
vĩ(n) hãna kũʷ / kãn(ã) gũrmã küle pãl̄e / nakka hainu kol̄kts̄emma / nakka
kol̄ks̄eh̄e hainu kãndmã //
nũssã ma l̄ehmã hoĩmigult / nũssã eđagult / nũssã ma l̄ehmã huĩmigult
ni nũssã [ku] t̄enagult ni nũssã (-) / pĩmã maʷ kurna paĩta sã pada täüz /
hap̄n̄es ärʷ pĩm / sã at hap̄upĩm / a pãt̄ sã pãliĩne / v̄eta pãlze pĩmã pãt̄ ärʷ
/ pan̄e aħjo pĩzlem̄mã / aħost ma v̄eta us̄s̄e nakka v̄ez̄ĩnd īegemã / ni ma
v̄eta v̄ei- v̄eiz̄me / mež̄e ärʷ / pan̄e ma v̄eiz̄me sũta / hapu pĩmã pan̄e aħju
/ [---] aħost us̄s̄e kohopĩmã / kohopĩmã lãnkkohe pan̄e kivi ata / pan̄e šol
pĩmã sũta / hoijã šettã (---)

530/4 (a530a_04)

ieere māmīs kuis olāt (jelät) [x3] /

kuñiga nāñe [x3] /

*taha- (---) / ülegòh[s] [x3] / jumata_tak mī jelā-gi jumata_takāh mī jelā
jumata takāh mī jelā / oñu us jumatat oñu us mei[d]gi [x3] /*

kēdēre kēdra? kēiru kēder kēdra? kēiru kēder kēdra? kēiru /

oļe ei mīnkka miñnā? rahad oļe ei? [x3] /

*ma kañu veitā vergū pālē jüst / ma kañu veitā vergū pālē jüst / ma kañu
veitā vergū pālē jüst / ni tebras ni tepra? [x3] /*

ma lā kodo botē [x3] /hādā

kabēhhezē tuļ / seberkkēne tuļ / hebehehe ne tuļ /

jimāl uoļ vīz poiga / jimāl uoļ vīz poiga / jimāl voļ vīz poiga /

vī_timāle (--) [x3] /

rūg ni rūsk [x3] /

vaija rakko?_puid kirvega? [x3] /

*mī kuòrv mī kor'vkkane [x2] / mī kuòrv mī kor'- jedimädzelt / jedimāñne
jedimädzelt / jedimāne jedimädzelt //*

añna_i^h_hādā häbendelä? vaija kjuļh [x3] /

muna(n) hüvä (---) /

*tsirb `lindaš `korgeh muna `perzeh / tsirk `lindaš `kuorgeh muza- muna
`perzeh / tsirk `lindaš `korgeh muna `perzeh //*

kakseì keñtu är? ni sā haigē [x3] /

*vanhu asju [x3] [---] / pēlgā ma pēlksi ma pēlgā ma pēlksi ma pēlgā ma
pēlk- (---) /*

mu harak mu haragā [x3] [---]

kui kündnū nī külbset [x3] /

ñjñā rabah-haja [x3] /

*ma makkā / mānu? / ma makkā / mānu? / ma makkā ma ma- [---] (vaija)
vaija maa-[da]*

530/5 (a530a_05)

tuļ jezā košjote tütri- [---] tuļli košjote suļtē // (faces away from the phonograph) / kedā sa naķkat naitma? / ma naķkà poiga naitma / kas sa aņnat ar muļtē tūitārd mehēl / ma' tūjā _ei-? / ei sā aņda? ar? / kiā ütles, et um rikaš vaijā āra aņda? / tēņē ütles aņdu ei ār? oļē _ei hüā / kiā ütles et um hüā / mine^k _keņeļe / nāil lāivā juļ? jūtte / naķkaš hāhki tēgēmā / vajā miņnā? papi mān? / kaš veļ pap? tātattā? // pap? naķkas kūzumā [---] kunas teil sāva? [---] sāva? hoļ iispāivā / palļos meil rahvast sā / [faces away: no vuot lā nu / lā nü sinnā] // ma lā koziņazega? merzjat keņeļda / inemist kūmme sāija lāt / šāt naķkas sata hoitma ravtsēmma / vīnāga jūma / ni tāstas ārki / jezā jimāga jikva?, lāivā? tālāitamma, lāivā? kerkkohē / pap? tātattas ār? / pap? and sērmūzē nāiļē kait- [---] sērmst oļē ei / sis naķka _i pap? tālāttatu / tālāttas pap? ār nāid ni nā lāivā kū? / tuļeva? kū? veettas tāvva tāde naķkas tālāitāmmā rahāga / pālē tū jūldās vaijā kuļsu vaķkà _rahvas / vaķkà rahvast tuļē inemist vīzdeļ-stkūmmēnd / ni nā naķkasē tagaži ravtsēmma / ni naķkas vīnāga jūma / nu ravtsēdas ār? nāiņas kulāitāmma nāiņas kargamma / nāiņas [jārmuļit] (-) lūumā / kulāiņas kulāiņas ni lāivā [---] uma tare pōļē /

jelāge? nu kui tēļē jumal aņd / kuļtēļge? ješsā ni kuļtēļge? jimma / nu vot hāhā keiķ / nādāli jelās / lāt imā potē koštma /

ūiļte midā tātsēle kah / kas minu [? kosjole laskave kuul] tahat minemā / sa min? ruoitū [kozima] //

inemene sūndū mā pālē / inemine sūndū mā pālē / (--) kuts pāba / naķkas last pābtsēmma / pābts latse ār? / lāt kūt saņnā / veļ sis lāiisr _saņna / mešĥ vīga? ni vīht vīhāgā? ni māhke māhku / ni tuļ tarē mān? ni paņd jimāle keļvāļē [---]

530/6 (a530a_06)

(-) jelās, jelās ni lāt haigēst, (--) haigē, ležāitās, tuļē _ei kiākki pra-vēdattamma timmā [---] mis sa ležāitāt, mis suļ um haigē. [---] ležāitāt, ležāitāt ma _oļē keiķ tēbinē [ei jovva] [---]

(---) ārki kūl- ār^k kūli uoļ aŗmas vāegā! / vaija kuļsu? mēskmā, mēstas ār?, suiņas tāl jo ār? pā, aettas tāllē hamēh šālgā, aettas tāllē hamēh [---] nu piņģi pālē tālle sāettas aņēnd, tāoitadas tāllē tāvva rāt [? piņģi pālē], pandas timā ležāitāmmā [---] naķkas nāņē jikmā, naķkas vāike tāts jikmā / jā ās kinkka jellā?, ār? kūli / vaija puhtit teitā?. vaija midāgi veļ tappā, vaja puhtit hoļ tāmmaš / tappā. / vaija miņnā t'ōsse, tettā kirst, / pandas

kirstu, pandas kãzëga kiñ? laottëdas kirstu rëvas, pandas pada pä-
pandas padi päla // pandas timä kirstu lezättämmä, kaitteitas timä siimä?
kiñ?, (-) pandaze? tälle kãe? rišti rindu päl, nu vot / nãttas puhtjst tégëmä /
kořãttas rahvast, rüga kiëdettäs, vaïsku küdzettäs // timä näsitkkidega (-)
keřkkohë / (-) nakkas keřkkohë kandma / šãt nakkas pap timmã pravadi-í
/ tãllë andas kurra kãtte (padarožij?), hüvvã kãtte andas kündlekkene // ni
kaitteitas timä sũ kinhi / (-) prašsattämmä pandaze? kãzëga (-) kiñ? [---] (-)
vïjäs timmã havva manu? haüd ku um kãbëť / timä tãstas haüda / aettas
mãga^k kiññ? / [vettas] (---) / tãllë pandas jãtgu ku [? ei] jumala kumarda?
/ timä aettas mãga / sã mãgitkakkane (-- la- lao- / la- / laottadas jo tãvvã
rãt mãgitka pälë, pandas vatsk mãgitka pälë, pandas tihad patã mãgitka
pälë / tuvvas vïnã mãgitka pälë (-) / nãttas hiñge ülendämmã: hiñg hüvvã
paikka nãttas puhtjst šerbämmã //

voť ma- ma? / jelã nu laisiga? kuis tahat [---]

(-) rüã? sava? valmi?, vaijã minnä? peim[ma] / (-) ei otë minkka peima,
vaijã uosta? [-] [peimja?] kanna edaguť huñkkohe, pane ma ha-kkijãtga.
[---] rüã? ar? peimi, nakka kũ vidãmã, nakka kuhjã pand- [---] (-) vaija
atta? rihhe / vaija rih panda? küttüimã / hummeñ nakka riht pës-

530/7 (a530a_07)

hameh jo um must. vaija hameht meška? vaija panda tikku, vaija kittã?
tibeht, vaija uosta? šippi. vaija vuetta? hameh / pane ma hamme likku
(? hammerriikue ~ hammerriikue) kãziga ma meze / vi vi vïrde / nakka
nüñktãmã hameht kãšsiga / meze ar? / lã jũ vïrde / veťa teřvã, nakka
teřvãga pësmã (-) nakka ju uhtma vïga? / pälë tũ nakka pũrdmã pane
teřna pälë kuřjoma / kuřjos ar? / vaija tuvva? tarë mãn? / veťa valoga ni
kata-tka ni kataitamma hamme-ä- (-) pũlpühã küiteitäs sañ / lã ma
sãñna / nakka ma vihãga vihtma nakka ma pãd meškma / meze nãgo viiga
/ huha ar ma ei ke^e vïga / ã ma puhta hamme(?) sãlgã, ã ma puhta [?]
kãdza? siirde / nu lãã ma tarë mãn? ar? / sã edãg / nakka edak pidãmã /
hittã edaguh magãmmã /

hummeñ om pühãpäi-v / tuť keha päl üles / meze sũ / kumarda jumalat /
nu miñ? sa tégëmã, miã suťtë vaijã, kiã lãt kãrja, kiã lãt hobëst kaitsëmna
/ aga meřsa taťti a kiã lãt mãrja / šuumaig keik korjus tarë mãn? / nakka
ü? šuimajtë / nakkã juis tëžëga? keñëľemma / tezeľt küzüze mis sa nãi? /
mis sa kũl? / iãmbã ma kãrja kãdži / leh(m) lãis rikkã vai lãis teřugu / hittã
nu hiñgãmã pälë šũmajã / lãã kosma lïhavette äde boťe (-) / pane hobëze
jeťe ni lã kosma / veťta latsë ka hiñnëga / lã kostma pãba pole mu lais

*läis jezä päle / vaijä miñnä[?] kü[?] / mis sa[?] muļļe añnat košti_ga hiñnèga /
pan muļļe hoī vèezind / tivvakaizde hiñnèga //*

*tuļ varaš, tuļ varaš vargilt tä uom uoľnu[?] pandu[?] vārā[?] kiñ[?], íal uoľ mero
kevä. kasuľ ol pañt mero päle úzest. nāñe tuļ hummogult úles, kaes: verā[?]
vaļļatè. läis ni ütles mihele: verā vaļļatè. sa käve[?] úšse[h]. ei ütles ma
káu us úšse[h]. sa- sa[?] káu us úšse[h] a miel verā[?] vaļļatè. nāñe ütles oļ
i inābāt plū-*

530/9 (a530b_01)

är veitü_i seitā [x3] /

pan hopēñ jetē [x3] /

ravida oļ ei minkka [x3]

[---] minkka ahjo küitā[?] oļ ei minkka ahju küitā[?] oļ ei minkka ahju- [---]

mā om jezändā rahvā kāeh [x2] mā on jezändā [---]

am[?] om är_kuotn[?] / mu jezā om am[?] är kuotn[?] /

kap[st]a[?] omma[?] jisēdu[?] / kap[st]a omma jisēdu[?] / kap[st]a omma jisēdu[?] /

ma kana panē jįstma munna pālè / ma kana panē jįstma munna pālè / ma

kana panē jįstma munn- [---] koľm nādālit jįst kana [x3] /

vaija haina nītā[?] [x3] / vaija haina rību[?] [x3] [---] vaija haina rukka

panda[?] [x2] / sā ei vįhma hāña[?] sāva kuiva[?] / ku sā ei vįhma hāña[?] sāva

kuiva[?] / ku sā ei vįhma sāva hāña[?] kuiva[?] / vaija haina viiā[?] ku[?] / vaija

hāña[?] viiā[?] ku[?] [x2] / ma jįstē hobezeļē šālgā [x3]

[---] pīppu teļbada (-) pīppu teļmada[?] / sa tahat pīppu teļma[da[?]] /

viļjās sinnā[?] līnā mīvvās är[?] [x3] / sā peremehele rahā [x3] /

oļ ei kinkka kįņēlda[?] [x3] [---] egatē ütēle hüā [x3]

[---] kikas kirg [x2] /

ma meišā kį [x3] /

jüts ļammas / kįik ļamba[?] [3x]

kae koh sa jelāt [3x] [---]

[nu sant jelā[?]] [---]

ma timāhavvā koi šārkkī [x3]

(---) [---] vaļļatīņe pink [x2] / muļ_umma[?] tuin[?] [x2] / [jellāv om] / haige

[---]

jimsel omma[?] väike pērza[?] [x2] [---] [timahavva (---)] muļ ol (-) -ma jütēl

/ muļ ol kaits lehmā / ma vei är[?] jāi jüts / muļ ol kaits lehmā / ma vei är[?] jāi

jüts