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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.
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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 *Uĺĺa* [Vasiljevna] is mentioned in both authors’ works. The speakers on the recordings are likely *Uĺĺa* 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.
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 Sullöv 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 šiippi (‘soap’), which I have changed to śîppi, 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 proce-
dural 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 them-
selves. 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 phono-
logical 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., košjoľę
‘to the proposal (pl.)’. The affricates appear both voiced and unvoiced
(LEH) – malts ‘Atriplex’, matdza? ‘Atriplex (pl.)’ – with the unvoiced
affricate clearly voiced and appearing to regressively velarise the pre-
ceding l in the example. This so-called “Russian L” (LEH) – tran-
scribed as <ɔ> – 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 ż (e.g., vīž ~ vīż ‘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 $xàm$ “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., $těgema$ ‘to do’, $tère$ ‘hello’, $nūhktämà$ ‘to scrub’, $þèr̃r̃à$ ‘after’, $þāl$ ‘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 $pānì$ ‘I put (psr)’, 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., $nēłī$ $~$ $nlēlī$ ‘four’, but is not always clearly audible in the recordings, e.g., $tuļi$ ‘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., $ratiļe$ ‘onto a cart (pl.)’ but $pùhtīst$ ‘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., $tāti$ ‘to the Leccinum’.

One of the most curious phenomena is the palatalisation of liquids, namely the alveolar nasal (T53) and the semivowel $ν$ (T59) in $#CV_i$, $V$,
#CVi_, #CV̅_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., \( hānä’ 'hay (pl.)' \), \( rē̱vās 'piece of clothing', ţēle 'to you (pl.)' \), while appearing as the full vowel \( i \) in the diphthong before an unpalatalised consonant in the third – or overlong – grade, e.g., \( hainə 'hay (part)', tei̱l 'at you (pl.)' \).

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., \( tūl ţe̱zā košjole ţūti̱- 'the father came to propose [to a girl]' \). 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 \( p̪e̱lksi 'I feared' \), while it is possible that an unpalatalised \( ?kōlki 'I broke [flax]' \) 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 \( šārkii 'shirt (part)' \). 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., \( ţūtįs < *ūkci 'one' and latįs < *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 \( hōpen 'horse' \). Additionally, the apocope of \( i \) may lead to the palatalisation of word-final consonants, such as the velar plosive (T70), e.g., \( kētik 'all', pīnk 'bench' \).

### 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 präššättä̈mä ‘to bid farewell’. In präššättä̈mä, 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·v́ėđattā̈mma ‘to visit’). Generally, a u o e ĭ appear in the same context (dubbed “back vowels” here), while ā ō ŭ e ĭ form the opposite group (“front vowels”). There are instances where e and ĭ are retracted, usually noted as ĵ and ĭ – they may then act as back vowels or just an allophone of e and ĭ. Especially ĭ 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-ē u-ű and o-ō. In Kraasna, we find a clear e-ē harmony, the expected u-ű harmony cannot be found in the data (likely due to the limited nature of the data), while the o-ō is very unlikely. A final observation on harmony: It was surprising to hear words with palatalised consonants and front vowels end in the velarised ſ-ľ which can be observed several times in words like pāľ ‘on top’ or sāľ ‘there’. In both words, the final ř 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 -ṭēi-st- receives primary stress instead of the expected word-initial primary stress and secondary stressed ‘teen’, e.g., kalštēi-stkūmnend ‘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 jelā-gi ‘we live’, hu-mmēn om pūhāpāi-v ‘tomorrow is Sunday’, and hittā ḡaguh magāmmā ‘I go to sleep in the evening’. Other instances are due to Russian influence, e.g., in the loanwords pravadí ‘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’_tişt_ei-ˀ ‘I do not know’.

As seen in the example above, mī jelā-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., nāgil (~ nāqi) ‘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., körv ‘basket’, korgen ‘high (INE)’, rõitu ‘swiftly’, “ol ‘was (3sg)’, ostá ‘to buy’, “öl” ‘been (PTCP.PST)’, “om ‘is (3sg)’, kōln ‘passed away (PTCP.PST)’, kēdettās ‘is cooked (IPS)’, m’el ‘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., kolktėemma ‘to break (flax)’, korvkkant ‘basket (DIM)’, talkāmmā ‘to pay [as a wedding present]’, sermst ‘ring (PART)’, pāhtėmma ‘to practise midwifery’, kuohn ‘passed away (PTCP. PST)’, rāvtsėmmā ‘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
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noticeable. This could be transcribed as a syllable break koḷtsemma or a schwa vowel rahvest ‘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., tivvakaizde ‘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., $e$ $i \rightarrow$ ji / #_. There are forms in the manuscripts, which are not iotated but turned out to be iotated in the recordings, e.g., jikma ‘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 $u \rightarrow$ jü /#_. It is not quite as widespread, e.g., jüte ‘together’, jüldäs ‘is said (tps)’, jüś ‘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., praśśattāmā ‘to bid farewell’, štobi ‘so that’, with the latter being a loan from Russian (< чтобы). Furthermore, the raised unrounded back vowel $j$ can be found in first syllables (LEH), e.g., kînlēda ‘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., sis ‘then’, ūnā ‘flax’, mihele ‘to a man’, lindas ‘it flies’ as well as the copula verb (LEH), i.e., um, and the reflexive pronoun (LEH), i.e., hiñnega ‘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., hilg ‘soul’, after long vowels (T49) or vowel clusters (LEH), e.g., riž ‘barn’, even in a geminated form (LEH), i.e., rižhe ‘into the barn’. Word-finally (LEH), it occurs as part of noun stems, e.g., hame ‘shirt’, as well as in its use as the inessive suffix, e.g., āperžeh ‘in the bottom’.

In word-final position, $v$ is preserved as a fricative (LEH), e.g., krov ‘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., pühäpāiv ‘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 kaivu/kaivo ‘into the well’.

A set of other points of enquiry relates to the historical development of consonant clusters. In the word takāh ‘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., hamēht ‘shirt (part)’. The cluster *ŋk before an unstressed third syllable vowel (T121) is only attested once, as a simple voiced plosive in the form kuniiga ‘of the king’. The presumed metathesis of h in words like vahmëmba (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., tērē 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., ummaŋ pērst, māgāk kinn ‘[covered] up with earth’, aānna_tī_hādā ‘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., jut ‘stories’, tuňń ‘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., livvakaižde ‘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’, haińu ‘hay’, kańtu ‘fish’, sārķki ‘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 ratīle ‘onto a cart (pl.)’, comitative latsiga ‘with children’, kāssiga~käziga ‘with hands, by hand’. The latter example can also confirm the genitive plural (stem) of kāsi-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., jumatl ‘god’, rahvast ‘people’, vērt ‘blood’, tūtārd ‘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., jiimā ‘mother’, jeessā ‘father’, tiimā ‘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 -ldAˀ 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., màn ‘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’, õänkkohe ‘into a milk churn’, keerkkohe ‘(in)to church’, huńkkhohe ‘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 tösse, 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., rīhtė ‘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’, hainda ‘into the grave’, with a word-final geminated consonant or consonant cluster, e.g., kirstu ‘into a coffin’, paitka ‘to a place’, šālgā ‘onto the back (IN), sāna ‘into the sauna’, meṣa ‘into the forest’, with VCi#, e.g., kuhjā ‘into a stack’, kārja ‘to the livestock’, màrja ‘to the berry’, õhju ‘into the oven’, or VCV# in nominative singular, e.g., pata ‘into a pot’, kät ‘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 ēdaguh ‘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’, jǔst ‘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 -lE and not geminated except in pronouns (e.g., muĻë ‘to me’). We find the forms košjolë ‘to the proposal (pl.)’, ĭlasele ‘to the child’, jímäle ‘to the mother’, šiūmajتحقق ‘for dinner time’, mihele ‘to a man’, hobezele ‘to the horse’, perenehele ‘to the landlord’. The adessive is marked with -l, e.g., mehèl ‘at the man’, jǐmśël ‘at the sow’, the ablative with the suffix -lt, e.g., tezélt ‘from the other’.

The comitative is marked with the suffix -gaˀ, without vowel harmony, and not geminated for any nouns, e.g., vīgə ‘with water’, kirvega ‘with an axe’. The glottal stop may not always be audible or may assimilate to the following consonant, e.g., ĭjmäga ‘with the mother’, rihgā ‘with a barn’, vikadiga ‘with a scythe’, kablāga ‘with a cable’, hobežega ‘with a horse’, nāsițiķkidega ‘with carrying handles’, māga ‘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., haigest ‘(becoming) sick’, puhtist ‘for the funeral’, āžest ‘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 kujjozeˀ kuivaˀ ‘but they dried [fully] dry’; rūā? savaˀ vàľmiˀ ‘the rye (pl.) becomes ready [for further processing]’; ku sā ei vihə hāňa? sāva kuivaˀ ‘if it does not rain, the hay (pl.) will become dry’; ni sā haige ‘and he became sick’; sā màģīlkkkænæ ‘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 tāiž ‘the pot becomes full’; sā al hapupîm ‘underneath [it] turns into curdled milk’; a päť sā päliñe ‘but on top [it] turns into cream’. This phenomenon is not restricted to a particular verb (e.g., sā ‘becomes’), as evidenced by kujjozeˀ kuivaˀ. Furthermore, although some forms may be semantically interpreted as phrasal or particle verbs, e.g., sā + tāiž ‘become full’, sā + kuiv ‘become dry’, or even sā + haige ‘fall ill’. kuivaˀ ‘dry (pl.)’ is an adjective, as evidenced by its number agreement; haige ‘ill’ is another
example of an adjective used with both marked and unmarked translative meanings. Additionally, sā màgilkakkanė 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 lāt haigest ‘he falls ill’ and sā màgilkakkanė ‘it becomes a little tomb’, I would ascribe this to free variation rather than inter-speecher 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 vihna hāna? sāva kuiva? ‘if it does not rain, the hay will get dry’, timā aetas màga / sā màgilkakkanė ‘they cover him with earth, it becomes a tomb’; in another instance, it can be inferred from context, i.e., kakset keťu ār ni sā haigest ‘[his/her] stomach gets upset and [s/he] falls ill’. This example may be directly compared to the marked version, jelās jelās / ni lāt 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., \textit{vahneb} ‘older’ (Kallas 1903: 42), whereas his notepads exclusively contain the form \textit{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 \textit{ma\textdegree}, \textit{sa\textdegree}, \textit{tä} (T24/25), with the oblique stem \textit{mu} and \textit{su} for first and second person singular (T41). The pronouns appear in the nominative, genitive, partitive, and the exterior local cases (see Table 1).

\textbf{Table 1.} Pronominal forms and their allomorphs in Ojansuu’s Kraasna phonographic recordings.

|        | 1SG | 2SG | 3SG | 1PL | 2PL | 3PL |
|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| NOM    | \textit{ma\textdegree} | \textit{sa\textdegree} | \textit{timä} | \textit{mē} | nā |
| GEN    | \textit{mu} | \textit{sinu} | \textit{timä} | \textit{mē} |   |
| PART   |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| ALL    | \textit{mūlē} | \textit{sūlē} | \textit{timäle} | \textit{īlē} | \textit{nālē} |   |
| ADE    | \textit{mūl} | \textit{sūl} | \textit{tāl} | \textit{meil} | teil | \textit{nāil} |

The demonstrative pronoun \textit{tā} ‘that’ can be found, possibly also a plural \textit{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, \textit{tā} ‘that’ (see Pajusalu 2015). The interrogative and reflexive pronouns appear as \textit{kiä}–\textit{kià} ‘who’, partitive \textit{kedä} for animate referents and \textit{miš} ‘what’ (possibly \textit{miä} in the genitive) for inanimate referents. These pronouns have been contracted with the comitative suffix into \textit{minkka} ‘with what’ and \textit{kinkka} ‘with whom’, e.g., \textit{ravida ō̱le ē̱i minkka} ‘there was nothing with which to feed/cure’, \textit{ō̱le ē̱i minkka ahju kū̄tā} ‘there is nothing to heat the oven’, \textit{ō̱le ē̱i kinkka kinē̱lda} ‘there is no
one to talk to’. This form also appears in *ole ɛi minkka miĩnã? ‘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 olat (or jeläť) ‘how are you’, the temporal interrogative kunas ‘when’ and pällos 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_ɛi kiäkki ‘no one comes’. A distributive form of the indefinite pronoun egàɫe ʊtèle ‘to each and every one’ can be found in the allative. A number of reflexive and reciprocal pronouns can be found in the texts: hinèga ‘with oneself’ in the comitative, the complement uma ‘own’, e.g., láivå [---] uma tare pôle ‘they went to their own house’, as well as the reciprocal pronoun juśs tēţega? ‘with one another’ in the comitative.

Apart from the aforementioned pällos, the other quantifiers are the numerals. The cardinal numbers 1–17 are: jütś–juś, kaś–kats, k’olh, ňelî, viţ–viţ, kąţ, sâbze, katęza, iütesc (T125), kümënē, ištei•stkiųmęnd (-toi•s-), kaštei•stkiųmęnd, kolmei•stkiųmęn[nd], ňelitei•stkiųmęn[nd], viţtei•stkiųmęn[nd], kuztei•stkiųmęn[nd], sådzei•stkiųmęnd.

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 -dAˀ, e.g., kĩneõdaˀ ‘to speak’, maa-[daˀ] ‘to sleep’, which can be contracted into a stem-final alveolar plosive, e.g., nītäˀ ‘to mow’, ańdaˀ ‘to give’, alveolar nasal, e.g., miĩnã? ‘to go’, or geminated consonants or consonant clusters, e.g., tappà ‘to kill’, rakkoˀ ‘to cut trees’, pešsã? ‘to beat’, kĩusõ ‘to call’, meška?' ‘to wash’. In forms with a long vowel, the infinitive suffix assimilated into a semivowel, e.g., viiča? ‘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., *jelã* ‘to live’, *vaša* ‘to pour’, but *peššã* ‘to beat’, *kútã* ‘to heat’. For bisyllabic verbs with a short initial syllable and no stem allomorphy (T104), an assimilated suffix can be found, i.e., *jelã*. For trisyllabic verbs with the passive or causative derivational suffix *-†A* (T115), the attested forms show both a strong and a weak allomorph of the derivational suffix, i.e., *tãltã* ‘to wed’ but *tẽmada* ‘to pull’. The supine, a telic infinitive, is formed with the *mA* suffix, which may be geminated, e.g., *jistma* ‘to sit’, *pidãmã* ‘to hold’, *magãmmã* ‘to sleep’, *kaitsẽnãma* ‘to protect’, *kataɪtma* ‘to mangle’, *leŭtãmã* ‘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., *kuštãmã* ‘to entertain’, *taɪtma* ‘to wed’, *leŭtãmã* ‘to lie (down)’, *praššatãmã* ‘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 *jelãv* ‘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 *olnu* ‘been (APP)’, *k’oln* ‘passed away (APP)’, *mãnu* ‘slept (APP)’, *kündnú* ‘ploughed (APP)’, *važnú* ‘tired (APP)’ and have the suffix *nU~nU~n*. They are used for forming perfective or perfect tense statements such as *om ār_kuoɫn* ‘s/he passed away’, and are also found in compound tense forms like the perfect passive in *tã o în ‘olnu’ pandu* ‘it has been put’. This also appears with an irrealis meaning, i.e., *olnu us jumaɫat oɫnu us me[d]gi* ‘if there was no god, there would not be us’. The past tense passive forms have a suffix -†, 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., *kušet* ‘dug (PPP)’, *pašt* ‘put (PPP)’, *tãltatù* ‘wed (PPP)’. The nominative plural forms *pandu* ‘put (PPP.PL)’ and *jistetdu* ‘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) ḱȧu ‘I go’, (ma) makka ‘I sleep’, (ma) þelgå ‘I fear’, (ma) jistę ‘I sat’, (ma) þelksi ‘I feared’. The second person singular is marked with -t in the present tense, e.g., (sa) nakkat ‘you begin’, (sa) ležätät ‘you lie (down)’, and with the glottal stop -ˀ in the past tense, e.g., (sa) näiˀ ‘you saw’, (sa) käveˀ ‘you went’, (sa) kūlˀ ‘you heard’, with one exception where the present tense marker is used, i.e., (sa) kūlset ‘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., nakkas ‘s/he begins’, lāttatas ‘s/he weds’, jelās ‘s/he lives’, and a zero-marked or unmarked form, e.g., lāt ‘s/he goes’, jist ‘s/he sits’, vēt ‘s/he takes’, sā ‘s/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., tule ‘she/he/it comes’. In the past tense, the third person singular is unmarked or zero-marked, e.g., vihit ‘s/he hit (psr) with a viht [in the sauna for cleaning]’, kirg ‘it crowed’.

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) jelā ~ jelǟ ~ jelǟ·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 sa? annāde ‘you (sg.) give’ – tī aynāde ‘you (pl.) give’; lāde ‘you go’; sa istāde? ‘you (sg.) sit’ – tī istāde ‘you (pl.) sit’; tī ār tuñneðe miñnū ‘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 -vAˀ for verbs with an unmarked third person
singular form, e.g., sāvaˀ ‘they become’, läîvāˀ ‘they go’, and -zEˀ for those verb classes ending in -s in the respective singular forms (T127), e.g., kujjozeˀ ‘they dry’, küźüze ‘they ask’. There are not many third person plural past tense forms attested in the recordings (e.g., tułi ‘they came’); in the manuscripts, we find -ˀ 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 -ˀ, e.g., sa minˀ ruoît tu [kozima] ‘you, hurry!’; mineˀ kenëte ‘go and speak!’; nu mińˀ sa ûegëmë ‘now go do’; vî_timälë ‘bring him/her’; pan ‘put!’; tsuska sinu hand kaîvu ‘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., -gEˀ in jelâgeˀ ‘live!’ or kuññëgeˀ ‘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) tēnë ütiles ãîdu ei ār?  
other say.3sg give.neg.imp neg away  
‘the other says: [she] shall not be given away [as a wife]’

(2) ołnu us jumałat ołnu us meî[ð]=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., kānītās ‘it is turned’, nātās ‘one begins’, kulaītās ‘one is entertained’, andas ‘it is given’, laottadas ~laottēdas ‘it is spread’, tuvvas ‘one brings’, mūvās ‘one sells’, vījās ‘one brings’. The derivational suffix -TA changes its vowel to E before the passive marker, e.g., ḵiēdētās ‘it is cooked’, nīdētās ‘it is mowed’, laottēdas ‘it is spread’. The same change applies to trisyllabic stems (Saa24), e.g., ravtseñas ‘is fed, entertained’, kaṅṭettās ‘is closed shut’, kūdētās ‘is baked’. Saareste’s form for the present impersonal of the verb ‘to speak’ (Saa33) can be found as jūldās ‘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., oльнāt ‘it had been put’; “om “olnu’ panduˀ ‘they had been put’. A similar analytic construction with a participle can be found with a resultative meaning, e.g., haūd ku um kāb̥e t ‘when the grave was (completely) dug out’. A curious form pandāz̥eˀ, likely a synthetic third person plural form, can be seen in (3).

(3) pandāz̥eˀ tālle kāe’ 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., tu:lī ‘I came’, tu:l ‘she/he/it came’, while the glottal stop is used to mark the second person singular, e.g., kāve’ ‘you (sg.) went’. This past tense marker may shorten a long stem vowel, e.g., nāi’ ‘you (sg.) saw’, assimilate to the U-stem vowel of reflexive verbs, e.g., sūndū ‘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’, *ki˝ğ* ‘it crowed’, *jütel* ‘s/he said’, *pańd* ‘s/he put’ (Saa38), *vih́t* ‘s/he hit (pstr) with a *viht* [in the sauna for cleaning]’, *küt* ‘s/he heated’, *nakkaš* ‘s/he began’. Also found in the corpus are past tense forms containing the marker *e* (EMK), e.g., *mähke* ‘s/he wrapped’, *jište* ‘I sat’, as well as the -*si* marker in *pełksi* ‘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 ʷôlm̥u’ pandu’*, *ôl pańt* ‘had been put’ and *om ʷăr_k̥ołn* ‘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-ʷom* (~*om*) in the singular and *uôn̥mḁ’-umma* (~*ôn̥ma’-ôn̥ma*) in the plural. There is one form in the first person singular, i.e., *ma_ôle* ‘I am’. In the past tense, the third person is *”ôl-ôl* (T33). Furthermore, we also find the non-finite forms of the connegative, i.e., *ôl ȩ* (ei), and the past tense active participle, i.e., *”ôln̥u’-ôlnu*.

### 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., tiįjā_eiˀ ‘I do not know’. With increasing cliticisation, the particle assimilates to the vowel of the connegative verb, e.g., otle eį ‘is not’, aįna_iˀ ‘do(es) not give’. The same assimilation appears for the past tense particle with the unattested base form *es, e.g., obnu us ‘there was not’, jā ās ‘did not stay’. The clitic may be stressed, i.e., tiįjā_eiˀ.

Of other potential clitics, only the emphatic -Ki can be found, e.g., mei[d]gi ‘we too’, jelā-gi ‘[we] do live’, ārki ‘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’, jumāla_tak ‘behind god’, possibly also jezā_pāle ‘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., seberkke ‘friend (ᴅɪᴍ)’, kündlekkene ‘candle (ᴅɪᴍ)’, kořvkkane ‘basket (ᴅɪᴍ)’, mągitkakkanė ‘little tomb (ᴅɪᴍ)’. 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., huṃmuｇult ‘in the morning’, ḫenagult ‘at noon’, ędagult ‘in the evening’, jedimādzelt ‘first’, historically other markers may have also been used, e.g., vaṅalé ‘open’. For verbal derivation, the corpus includes examples of the frequentative *-ele-, e.g., hābendelā? ‘to be ashamed’, factitive *-ta-, e.g., praśśattāmnā ‘to bid farewell’, kutattamma ‘to mangle’, as well as the historical reflexive derivation *-U-, e.g., sündu ‘s/he was born’, korju ‘gathers’, and the deadjectival progressive verbal suffix *-nE-, e.g., haŋnė ‘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 kata̱lka ‘barrow’, plū[gal] ‘plough’, màģitka ‘grave’, màģitkakkane ‘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’ + дорогa ‘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 (plū[gal]) and the diminutive suffix (màģitkakkane). There is one example of the complementiser štobi ‘so that’, and also one verb, i.e., pravaḍi ‘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-vēdatta̱mna ‘to visit’ (<проведать + -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 vaįjà ‘necessary’, sentences with nakka~năkkas ‘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 vaįjà 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 нужна ‘it is necessary’.

The sentence type with nakka~năkkas regularly triggers the use of the supine form of the semantic verb. While nakka~năkkas 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) năkkas nănέ jįkmà năkkas väike tató jįkmà
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) kedă sa năkkat naiima / ma năkkă poiga naiima
who.2sg begin.2sg wed.sup 1sg begin.1sg son.2sg begin.1sg
‘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., jelăs jelăs / 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 jelăs jelăs 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 ärˀ, e.g., hänäˀ kujjozeˀ ärˀ ‘the hay dries completely’, hapneś ärˀ ‘it curdles completely’, meže ärˀ ‘I wash it off’, pâp tâlattas ärˀ ‘the priest confirms the marriage’, suïtas täl jo ärˀ pá̂, ‘he is combed [until he is ready for the ceremony]’, ärˀ kûli ‘he passed away’, müvûš ärˀ ‘it is sold off’. The use of the particle ärˀ is not motivated by the semantics of ‘away’ as in certain phrasal verb constructions, e.g., veòa pâlze pîmâ pâlt ärˀ ‘I skim the cream off the top’.

Another example of the use of ärˀ as part of a phrasal or particle verb is ära aîdaˀ ‘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 jette ‘forth’, pêrrha ‘after’, kińˀ ‘closed; fixed’, and üles ‘up(wards)’, e.g., panę hobze je ñe ‘I harness the horse’, lâ hainu pêrrha ‘I go after the hay’, kôdä kablaagà kińˀ ‘I tie it up with wire’, pandas kâzëga kińˀ ‘it is closed shut with a lid’, kaîtetaas tîmâ sîlmiä’ kińˀ ‘his eyes are closed shut’, aettas mâga kińˀ ‘(he) is covered up with earth’, nâñë tuî hummogult üles ‘the woman got up in the morning’, or even the illative form of the word for ‘back’, sâlgä, in aettas tâllë hameh sâlgä ‘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 āsā kinkka jellā, ārā kūlī ‘no one stayed alive (remained to live with), he passed away’ before returning to the procedural story with necessitatives 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 mága kiṁî ‘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  aínât  ar  muılı̄c  tūârd  mehel
Q  2sg  give.2sg  away  1sg.all daughter.part  man.adep  ‘do you give me [your] daughter for a wife’

(7) kas  vej̈  pāp̈  tākattā̈
Q  take.3sg  priest  wed.in  ‘does the priest accept (‘take’) [our request] to get married’

(8) kià  ǜles  et  um  rikaš  vaij̈ā  ĕra  ańda
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  ǜles  et  um  hüâ
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 pĩmô ‘top.gen milk.gen’,
hüvvä kätte ‘right.ILL hand.ILL’, hüvvä paikka ‘good.ILL place.ILL’, hāña’ sāva kuiva’ ‘hay.PL become.3PL dry.PL’, vaḥāṭine pink ‘free.NOM.SG bench.NOM.SG’, and kurra kätte ‘left.ILL hand.ILL’. Occasionally, the case may be redundantly double-marked, e.g., pańd jimäle kervāle ‘give.3sg. PST mother.ALL next_to.ALL’ or ma jištę hobęžęte sālęg ‘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 pāłè ‘onto (the) earth’, rindu pāł ‘onto the chest’, kodo botę ‘towards home’. The case governed by the postposition is mostly identical with South Estonian or Estonian forms, except in the aforementioned pańd jimäle kervāle, where we would expect the genitive jimā.

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., jezā 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   pēr̥rā
      go.1sg  hay.GEN.PL  after
‘I go after the hay’

(10b)  ma    lā     kodo    botē
      1sg  go.1sg  home.GEN  towards
‘I go home’

For sequences, a parallel sentence structure is used, e.g., laottadas jo tāvā răt māĝitkā pālē, pandas vatsk māĝitkā pālē, pandas īḥad pāl māĝitkā pālē / tūvā vīnā māĝitkā 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 mąğiłka ṕålè ‘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 ěrki kûl- ěr kûli ‘(he) passed away’. The most interesting example is pandas pada ṕā- pandas padi ṕǟla ‘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., theiotation 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.
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## Appendix 1: Content of the recordings

| Recording 1963 / Recording 1980s / Recording no. / Researcher / Place of recording / Time of recording | Start time recording 1963 (recording 1980s) | End time recording 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 recording 1963 (recording 1980s) | End time recording 1963 (recording 1980s) | Title of text (Eesti murded IX) / description of recording / page in Estonica |
|---|---|---|---|
| A 530/5 fonokop 32/5 82 „Häät“ Väisänä | 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“ Väisänä / [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“ Väisänä / [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 Väisänä / [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 næñe [---] / nakka ma næñe [---] / (talking in background)
nakka kangast kudama / nakka kangast sâdmâ / nakka kangast kudama /
ma [rabataj] / nakka [---]-telemma //
[---] [rihite] `peima / nakka `rükä [---] nakka `kandma / nakka hakkijalg
`pandma / nakka kû vidâmâ / ma nakka rükä atma / nu nakka rükki
`pešmâ / nakka tare mân? `kandma rüki / (---) / ma- / [---] //
[ma] tulli [h]ummugult üûles / mezi sû kamûn pá / (---) ma (---) //
kos hobêzega lát [x3] / ma- [---] ma (--) ma tetâi / tû um munâkenê ta um
är? (---) [kervalt] [---] // [mul oIl kolk- / ma kolki liìnu ]
nàgla`, nàôl, nàâla`, nàôl (~ nàôl), nàâla`
[varbas vàrba` varbas vàrba`] varbas vàrba`
(---) maja väija màijä väijä`
harâk haraga` [x3]
takh ole`_ei xàmbit mul, takh ole`_ei hàmbit mul, takh ole`_ei hàmbit mul
ma- (--) vabä nâñê, tû um vaba nâñë, tû um vabä nâñ[ë]
malts, maldiä` [x3]
negezê ûmma `perst ðèssä`, negezê ûmmä` `perst ðèssä`, negez ûmma` `perst ðèssä`
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 Ulïl 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 repän oĺĺi] [---] [taluga hingämä] / repän [nigu] kallo [ni sa püvvä kallo] / tsuska sinu hand kaiu [ja] korjuz hanna täüz kalu / [susi] timâ hanna kaiu ja kaiu är' hand külni já kinni (-) repān [külâ külâh] jütles [külâmeh] (-) / külä rahas / hüä rahas / suzi sit kaiu / [---]
veța sul (-) lats [---] / [jelâse] keți (---) mu külâ / sa jozet AGMENT a ma jozé määt //

hainu viķadiga nideãis / rihâga rîptas / ümbr kânûa ştobi haina kujõe' / a kujõe' kuiva' / hâna' kujõe' är' pane rukka / ëâ pane hêb-hõbeze žete ĭâ hainu ëpêra' / hâna' / panê hâna' ratîle kõdâ kablâga kî' / vi(n) hâna kî' / kân(a) gûrmâ küle päle / nakka hainu kolkisëma / nakka kolkisëhê hainu kândmâ //
nûssa ma lehmâ hoñîmûgult / nûssa êdaguult / nûssa ma lehmâ huñmûgult ni nûssa [ku] ënaguult ni nûssa (-) / pîmâ ma' kurna paita sâ pada täüz / hapnêş är' pîm / sâ ał hapupîm / a pääl sâ päline / veța pälze pîmâ pält är' / panê ëhjo pîlenhê / ahost ma veța ușse nakka vețing îegêmâ / ni ma veța vei- veîzme / mezê är' / panê ma veîzme sîla / hapu pîmâ panė âhju / [---] ahost ușse kohopîmâ / kohopîmâ länkkohe panê kivi âla / panê şol pîmâ sîla / hoîjâ šêtiâ (---)
íere māmīs kuis olat (jelāt) [x3]  
kuńiga nāne [x3]  
taha- (-- / ülegōh[s] [x3] / jumāta_tak mī jelā:gi jumāta_takāh mī jelā  
jumāta takāh mī jelā / olnu us jumalat olnu us mee[d]gi [x3] /  
kēdere kēdraʔ keiru kēder kēdraʔ keiru kēder kēdraʔ keiru /  
ołe eį minkka miñnāʔ rahad ołe eį? [x3] /  
ma kaľū veštā vergū pālē jūst / ma kaľū veštā vergū pālē jūst / ma kaľū  
veštā vergū pālē jūst / nī tēbras nī tēpraʔ [x3] /  
ma ūā kodo bolē [x3] /hādā  
kabēhhezeˈ tuľ / sēberkkenė tuľ / hēbēhhenė tul /  
jimāl uol vīž poiga / jimāl uol vīž poiga / jimāl vol vīž poiga /  
vēʔ_timāle (-- / x3] /  
rūg ni rūsk [x3] /  
vaįja račkōʔ_puid kirvegāʔ? [x3] /  
mī kuōrv mī kořvkrävẽ [x2] / mī kuōrv mī kořv- jedimādželt / jedimānē  
jedimādzelt / jedimānē jedimādželt / //  
ańña_i�_hādā hābendelāʔ vaįja kjuhl [x3] /  
muna(n) hūvā (-- /  
tsirb `lindaš `korgeh muna `peržeh / tsirk `lindaš `korgeh muza- muna  
`peržeh / tsirk `lindaš `korgeh muna `peržeh //  
kaksei keštū ärʔ ni sā sāihe [x3] /  
vanhu aṣju [x3] [--] / pelgā ma pelksi ma pelgā ma pelksi ma pelgā ma  
pelk- (-- /  
mu harak mu haragā [x3] [--]  
kuī kündnü nī külxbet [x3] /  
tinā rabah-haja [x3] /  
ma maika / mānuʔ / ma maika / mānuʔ / ma maika ma- [--] (vaįja)  
vaįja maa-[da]
tuļ jezā košjotė tūtrī- [---] tuļlī košjote suftē // (faces away from the phonograph) / kedā sa nakkat naīma? / ma nakkā poīga naīma / kas sa ainnat ar mulē tūtrā mehēl / ma_tīja_ei? / ei sā anā2 ar? / kiā ūlēs, et um rika vajā āra anā? / tēņē ūlēs āndu ei ār? oltē_ei ārā / kiā ūlēs et um ārā / mine_keneļe / nāil lātāvā jutā juite / nakkas hākhī tēģēmā / vajā miņnā? papi mān? / kaš vēt paap tālattā? // paap nakkas kūzūmā []---] kunas teil sāva []---] sāva hoī istspāvā / pallos meil rahvast sā // (faces away: no vuot lā nu / lā nū sinān) // ma lā kožilazege2 merzjet keneļda / inemist kūmme sāja lāt / sāl nakkas sata hoitma rāvstēmma / vīnāga jūtām / ni lastas ārķi / jezā jimāga jikva2, lātāvā tālātamma, lātāvā kerkskohe / paap tālattas ār? / paap and sērmūzē nāile kātt. [---] sermst oltē ei / sīs nakkā i paap tālattatu / tālattas paap ār nāid ni nā lātāvā kū? / tuleva kū? vēgatas tāvā tāde nakkas tālātāmmā rahāga / pālē tā jūlās vaijā kutsu vakkā rahvas / vakkā rahvast tuļe inemist vīdēji stīūmnēnd / ni nā nakkassē tagaži rāvstēmā / ni nakkas vīnāga jūtā / nu rāvstēsads ār? nātās kulātātamma nātās kārgamma / nātās [jārmulit] (-) lūümā / kulaftas kuļātās ni lātāv [---] uma tare pōlē /

jelāge2 nu kui īlē jumāl ānd / kultēgė2 ješā ni kultēgė2 jīnmā / nu vot hāhā keiķ / nādālī jelās / lāt imā potē kozīma /

'ūlē midā latšēle kah / kas minu [? kojole laškave kuul] tahat minemā / sa min' ruotto [kozima] //
inemene sūndā mā pālē / inēmene sūndā mā pālē / (--) kuts pāba / nakkas last pābstēmma / pābst latšē ār2 / lāt kūl saņnā / vēt sīs láššī / saņnā / mešķ viga2 ni vihi vihāgā2 ni māhe māhku / ni tuļ tarē mān? ni paah jīmāle kerwałē [---]

388 Tobias Weber
kirstu, pandas kāzēga kińˀ. laotēdas kirstu revās, pandas pāda pä-
pandas padi päla // pandes timā kirstu ležāttāmā, kāñettas timā silmnā? 
kińˀ, (-) pandaze tālle kāer rīšī rindu pāl, nu vot / nāttas puhtīt iežēmā / koraītas rahvast, rīga kiedētās, vaīsku kūzdētās // timā nāšīlkēidega (-) 
kerkkohē / (-) nakkas kerkkohē kandma / sāl nakkas pāp tiēmnā pravadi:-i 
/ tāllē andas kurra kāīte (padarozēj?), hēvvā kāīte andas kūndlekkēe // ni 
kañettas timā sū kinnh / (-) prašāttāmā pandaze kāzēga (-) kińˀ [---] (-) 
vījjās tiēmnā havva manu?). haūd ku um kābēt / timā tāstas hāuda / aettas 
māgā kińˀ/ [vēttas] (---) / tāllē pandas jāltgu ku? et] jūlama kumardu / 
timā aettas māga / sā māgīlkakanē (-) la- laa– / laa– / laoattado jo ta’vā 
rāt māgīlka pālē, pandas vaits māgīlka pālē, pandas ǰhad pātā māgīlka 
pālē / tuvvas vīnā māgīlka pālē (-) / , nāttas hinge ulėndāmmā: hēng hēvvā 
paiķa nāttas puhtist šerbiāmmā // 
voi ma– ma? / jelā nu lātsiga’ kuis tahat [---] 
(-) rūā? sava’ valīmi’, vaija mińnā? peĩn[ma] / (-) ei ołe minkka peïma, 
vaija uosta’ [-] [peĩma’] kannā edagūt hūnkkohē, paine ma ha’kkjāltga. 
[---] rūā’ ār’ peïmi, nakkā kū vidāmā, nakkā kūhjà pand- [---] (-) vaija 
atta’ rīhhe / vaija rīh panda’ kūtūnā / hummeñ nakka riht peš-

530/7 (a530a_07)

hameh jo um must. vaija hamēt meška’: vaija panda ūkku, vaija kūtā’ 
šibet, vaija uosta’ ūppi. vaija vuëtt∫ hameh / panë ma hamme īkku 
(ʔ hammerrīkku ~ hammerruikku) kāzīga ma meže / vī vī virē / nakka 
ńuhtāmmā hamēt kāsīgā / meže ār’ / lā jā virē / vēta tēvā, nakka 
tēvāga pešmā (-) nakkā ju uhtma viģa’ / pālē tū nakkā pūrdmā panē 
tenīna pālē kujōma / kujō sār’ / vaija tuvva’ tarē mān’ / vēta valoga ni 
kata-tka ni kata-tamāmā hamme__ā__- (-) pūlpūhā kāñeītās saīn / lā ma 
sāīna / nakkā ma vihāga vihtma nakkā ma pād meškma / meze nāgo viģa 
/huha ār ma e kē’e viģa / ā ma puhta hamme(ʔ) sālgā, ā ma puhta [ʔ] 
kādsā’ sīrē / nu laā ma tarē mān’ ar’ / sā edāg / nakkā edak pīdāmā / 
hītā edagū magāmāː / 

huumeñ om pūhpāpāi’ / tuļē kēha pāl üles / meže sū / kumarda jumāt / 
nu miń? sa tegēmā, miā suftē vaijā, kīa lāt kārja, kīa lāi hobest kaitsēmā / 
aga meśa ta’ti’ a kīa lāt mārjā / sūmaig keįk korej tarē mān’ / nakka 
i’ śu’meį’ / nakka juās težēga’ kenejemma / teņet kūzůse mis sa nāi? / 
mis sa kūʔ / tāmba ma kārja kādži / leh(m) lāis rūkkā vai lāis tēgū / hītā 
nu hingāmā pālē šiĦājā / lāā kostma lēhavēte āde bolē (-) / panē hobezę 
jette ni lā kostma / vētā latse ka hiĦēga / lāā kostma pāba pole mu laīš
läis jezä_päle / vaįja miñnä’ kū? / mis sa? muľtè ańnat košti ga hiňnèga / pan muľtè hoń vēežind / livvakkaizdë hiňnèga //
tul varaș, tul varaș vargilt tā uom uolnu? pandu? vārä’ kīn?, ĩāl uol męro kevā. kasul ol pańt męro pāle Ļəest. nānè tul hummoqult ules, kaes: verā’ vaľtət. lātś nī ńules mihele: verā vaľtət. sa kāve’ ușse[h]. ei ńules ma ‘kāu us ușse[h]. sa- sa’ ‘kāu us ușse[h] a miel verā’ vaľtət. nāne ńules ńe ńi inābät ptū-

530/9 (a530b_01)
är veƫu _i señå [x3] /
pan hopeñ ješte [x3] /
раведа ńe ęi minkkà [x3]
[---] minkkà ahjo kūtā’ ńe ęi minkkà ahju kūtā’ ńe ęi minkkà ahju- [---]
mā on jezāndā rahvà kāeh [x2] mā on jezāndā [---]
än’ on är_kuoñ?/ mu ježà on an’ är kuohn?/
kap[st]a’ onima’ jisšedu’/ kap[st]a’ onima’ jisšedu’/
ma kana pane jismta munnà pālè / ma kana pane jismta munnà pālè / ma kana pane jismta munn-

[---] pīppu tēmbara (-) pīppu tēnimada’/ sa tahat pīppu tēnimada[da’]/
vījās sinnà’ līnā mūvvās ěr’ [x3] / sā perēnehele rahā [x3] /
ńe ęi kinkkà kņešta’ [x3] [---] egāle ńutele hūā [x3]
[---] kikas kirg [x2] /
ma jiešta kie [x3] /

jūts łańmas / kik łamba? [3x]
kae koh sa jelāt [3x] [---]
[nu sant jelā’] [---]
ma timāhańva koi sārkk’ [x3]
(---) [---] vaňtiniñe pink [x2] / muľ_uńma’ tunń? [x2] / jelläv om / haitge
[---]
jinšel onima’ vāike pērza’ [x2] [---] (timāhańva (---)) muł ol (-) -ma jūtel / muł ol kaiś lehmā / ma vei ěr’ jūž / muł ol kaiś lehmā / ma vei ěr’ jāi jūť