

“Said a Word, Uttered Thus”: Structures and Functions of Parallelism in Arhippa Perttunen’s Poems

Jukka Saarinen

Parallelism is one of the most outstanding features of the Finnic (or Balto-Finnic) tradition of oral poetry that is found throughout areas of present-day Estonia, Finland, and adjacent parts of Russia. Performers of this poetry speak several different but closely related languages: Finnish, Karelian, Ingrian, Votic, Estonian, and Seto. Nevertheless, the poetic idiom, or register, is quite uniform, sharing the basic characteristics of meter, non-stanzaic structure, alliteration, and parallelism, with some anticipated regional variation.¹ It has various names in different languages. In Finland and Karelia, the most common designation is *Kalevala-metric* or *kalevalaic poetry*² or *runolaulu* (“runo song”).³ In Estonia it is usually called *regilaul* or *regivärss*.⁴

The poetic form has a strikingly broad range of uses for diverse genres, such as narrative poems, lyric and ritual songs, recited incantations, proverbs, and riddles. Many genres were connected to different sorts of social situations or discourse functions and a variety of modes of performance that also varied regionally. Across diverse communities and language areas where this poetry was documented as a living tradition, the poetic form exhibits great dynamism in its continuities and historical endurance in contrast to its range of uses in different practices. When considering variation in the poetic form, the most significant historical factor has been changes in language and dialect. In both western regions of Finland and to the south near the Gulf of Finland, words became somewhat shorter, but further south in Estonia the shortening of words was greater and began earlier. The metrical form historically was based on a trochaic tetrameter with flexibility in the first foot, which means that a basic line had eight syllables, although an extra syllable or two could be added in the first two positions.

¹On the meter and poetic form, see further Sadeniemi (1951), Kuusi et al. (1977:62-8), Leino (1986:129-42), and Sarv (2000).

²Anachronistically named for the Finnish national epic *Kalevala* (Lönnrot 1835 and 1849). The Finns and Karelians seem to lack a uniform indigenous designation for the register.

³From *runo* (“poem,” originally “poet,” “singer”) and *laulu* (“song,” “singing”). This designation stresses ways of performing verses but is not accurately representative of the tradition in its entirety.

⁴*Regilaul* stresses ways of performing verses (*laul* “song,” “singing”), and *regivärss* stresses the poetic form (*värss* “verse,” “line”).

Alliteration is another distinctive feature in *kalevalaic* poems, although it is not technically required within every verse line. There are two kinds of alliteration in these poems: in “strong alliteration,” words begin with the same vowel, as in *Ulappalan ukko vanha*, or with the same consonant followed by the same vowel, as in *Vaka vanha Väinämöini*; in “weak alliteration,” only the first consonant is repeated, as in *Vihannalla yainivolla*. Changes in the lengths of words and other phonological changes increase variation in the syllabic rhythm of the tetrameter to different degrees on a regional basis, while the shortening of words allows more words to be used in a line, which can enhance alliteration in some regions (see Sarv 2008:171-183 and Frog and Stepanova 2011:198-204). Semantic parallelism in this poetic form has also been observed to vary somewhat between the northern and southern regional divisions previously mentioned, with an increase in repetition of sounds and words across parallel lines in the southern region, but this has been suggested to be related to the increase in the number of words possible in parallel lines where words become shorter (Sarv 1999:131-32).

Background of Research

In Finnish research, parallelism has been recognized for a long time. Henrik Gabriel Porthan, an eighteenth-century scholar who wrote an influential study of Finnish poetry, *De Poesi Fennica* (1766-88), dedicated a substantial part of his presentation to parallelism. He calls it “repetition of thought”; according to Porthan (1766:22), parallelism was considered “quite indispensable” in this poetry. Other scholars have dealt with parallelism in their writings. Elias Lönnrot (1802-84), compiler of the Finnish national epic *Kalevala* (1835 and 1849), wrote extensively on metrics and alliteration in poetry, for example, in the preface of *Kalevala*, but he failed to write on parallelism. Lönnrot’s lack of discussion on this topic is more striking because he expanded the use of parallelism in *Kalevala* much more than it was found in original folk poetry (Steinitz 1934:17 and Krohn 1918:73).

Discussions of parallelism in the northern form of this Finnic tradition were given a central position in international discussions on parallelism by the German linguist Wolfgang Steinitz in his study *Der Parallelismus in der Finnisch-Karelischen Volksdichtung* (“Parallelism in Finno-Karelian Folk Poetry”). Steinitz studied parallelism by using the repertoire of one singer, Arhippa Perttunen (1769-1841), from Viena Karelia. His approach to the question is linguistic and very systematic. It is impossible within the limits of this paper to offer a comprehensive overview of his study, but a few key points are worth mentioning.

Steinitz’s work seems to be the only monograph thus far produced in Finland that has concentrated exclusively on parallelism. In later research Matti Kuusi has perhaps been the most influential Finnish scholar who has written on parallelism, although folklorists after Kuusi have generally focused less on the formal aspects of poetics until the last few years (Kuusi 1949:91-93, 1983:191-95, and 1952:257-61; in English, see Kuusi et al. 1977). Kuusi proposed a formal definition of parallelism that is introduced with a critical discussion and illustrative examples below. In Estonia, on the other hand, parallelism has been studied much more

extensively. Theoretical discussions on parallelism have been more prominent in Estonia than in Finland, and there are several important works on the subject.⁵

The aim of this article is to provide a general description of verse parallelism as it is found in northern areas of *kalevalaic* poetry. This essay is less concerned with theorizing parallelism and its semantics than with the formal aspects of its operation in *kalevalaic* poetry, especially in relation to patterns in usage that become observable through quantitative analysis that builds on and extends current knowledge of parallelism in this tradition.

The Current Study

My interest in parallelism arises from my study on the poetics of one of the most prominent singers of this tradition, Arhippa Perttunen (1769-1841), from the Latvajärvi village in Viena Karelia—the same singer whom Steinitz used for his own study on parallelism. Arhippa was one of the most important informants, or “singers of poetry,” for Lönnrot when he was collecting poetry for *Kalevala* (Lönnrot and Magoun 1963:365-66). Arhippa presumably was born in 1769 in Latvajärvi village in the parish of Vuokkiniemi, where he lived until his death in 1841. Lönnrot met Arhippa on his fifth trip to collect poetry in April 1834, and spent three days with the aged singer. Arhippa impressed Lönnrot with his good memory and with his songs, which Lönnrot felt were coherent and internally well-organized. Arhippa was later met by two other collectors: Johan Fredrik Cajan (1815-1887) in 1836 and Matthias Alexander Castrén (1813-1852) in 1839. Together these three collectors recorded about 85 texts and text-fragments, totaling 5,995 lines of epic, lyric, and magic poetry.

The analyses presented here are based on examples from the repertoire of Arhippa. By removing the text-fragments, I have built a corpus of 5,874 lines that serves as the primary research material for my study. I consider *poetics* to be a kind of grammar that regulates the way lines and poems are composed, and features like metrics, alliteration, and parallelism play an important role in this grammar. Though I examine the “grammar” of one singer, I do not propose that it is the singer himself who has composed the lines that he sings during the performance or prior to it. Like Steinitz, I examine the grammar of the tradition in texts selected from an individual singer’s repertoire.

Among the different areas where this poetic form can be found, Viena is a remote northern region where traditional poetry was maintained more conservatively through the nineteenth century and into the twentieth (Siikala 2002 and Tarkka 2013). This region has been considered the most conservative with regard to meter (Leino 1986:129-42). The poetic idiom is very similar on both sides of the Finnish-Russian border. Arhippa, like other people in Latvajärvi, spoke the Viena dialect of Karelian. In *kalevalaic* poetry, the linguistic divide between its use by speakers of Karelian and speakers of the adjacent Finnish dialects is mostly reflected on the phonetic level. I discuss below the form used in the northern tradition area, contrasting it to southern Finnic areas on the Karelian Isthmus, Ingria, and Estonia. Arhippa was

⁵See, for example, Metslang (1978), Peegel (1997), Sarv (2000:85-96), and Labi (2006); in English, see also Sarv (1999).

in several respects an exceptional singer, and his repertoire has provided an empirical basis for major studies of poetics that have proven historically enduring (Steinitz 1934 and Sadeniemi 1951). At least in terms of the formal aspects of the poetic system, Arhippa's poetry can be considered representative of the northern tradition. These findings on how these poetics work in Viena, however, should not be assumed to be fully representative of the tradition in all regions, but these findings remain relevant for comparison in the analysis of parallelism in those regions.

Forms and Principles of *Kalevalaic* Verse Parallelism

This essay deals specifically with a form of semantic parallelism called verse parallelism: the repetition of the same content using different words while applying the same syntax. The same content can refer to a wide range of semantic relations, ranging from strictly synonymic to many kinds of analogical relations. When speaking of verse parallelism, the unit repeated is most frequently a single line, the basic eight-syllable unit of *kalevalaic* poetry. Half-line parallelism occurs when the unit repeated is only half a line long, and line-pair parallelism occurs when the repeated unit is two lines. These phenomena resemble each other in many respects, and I include them in the notion of verse parallelism. There are also parallel sequences in which the repeated unit is longer than two lines in the poems,⁶ but these will not be discussed here.

In the anthology *Finnish Folk Poetry: Epic*, Matti Kuusi et al. (1977:66), a former professor of folklore at the University of Helsinki, defines “the principal rules” governing the composition of parallel sets of lines:

The repeated line, or lines, must not contain anything that does not have a corresponding component in the first line. In echoing the first line, the repeated line has to parallel each separate item, apart from verbs and particles.

In other words, the first line is syntactically the most complete, and the parallel line or lines can be elliptical. In the first example the words in the first line have their counterparts in the parallel

⁶See also Frog, “Parallelism Dynamics I,” in this volume.

line (indented);⁷ in the second example the parallel line lacks a counterpart to the 3rd person singular, past tense verb *puuttu* (“became caught”) owing to ellipsis:⁸

<i>Tek-i</i>	<i>tiijo-lla</i>	<i>veneh-tä</i>
make-PST.3SG	knowledge-ADE	boat-PART
<i>Lato</i>	<i>purt-ta</i>	<i>laula-ma-lla</i>
pile-PST.3SG	sailboat-PART	sing-INF-ADE

Made a boat with his knowledge,
built a craft with his singing.⁹

<i>Puuttu</i>	<i>kala</i>	<i>onke-hen-sa</i>
be.caught-PST.3SG	fish	fishing.rod-ILL-3SG.POSS
<i>Taimen</i>	<i>takla</i>	<i>rauta-han-sa</i>
trout	tinder	iron-ILL-3SG.POSS

A fish bit (lit. “was caught on”) his (fishing rod’s) hook,
a trout on his fire steel’ (lit. “tinder iron”¹⁰).

Kuusi’s definition needs some refinement, even correction, because it rapidly becomes apparent from the corpus that not every word in a parallel line necessarily has its own corresponding word in the main line, as illustrated in the following example:

⁷All the examples are taken from a research corpus of reconstructed texts, built for my own study, based on texts that were recorded in oral performances from Arhippa Perttunen in 1834, 1836, and 1839 (Saarinen, forthcoming; see also Saarinen 2013). The examples are glossed following the general guidelines set out in the Leipzig Glossing Rules, which can be found at <http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php>. The original texts belong to the folklore collections in the Archives of the Finnish Literature Society (SKS KRA Lönnrotiana 5:66-109. 1834, J. Fr. Cajan 3:461-89. 1836, M. A. Castrén 1:14-149. 1839) and they are published in *SKVR* I, Volumes 1-4.

⁸List of glossing abbreviations:

ADE	adessive (case)
GEN	genitive (case)
ILL	illative (case)
INF	infinitive
PART	partitive (case)
PERF	perfect (tense)
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
PRS	present (tense)
PTCP	participle
PST	past (tense)
SG	singular

⁹Glosses and translations are by the author and Keith Bosley (Kuusi et al. 1977).

¹⁰The word *takla* (“punk,” “tinder”) might actually be here a phonetic variant of *takra* (“bait”), which actually would make more sense in the context: “bait-iron” = “fish-hook.”

<i>Kuin</i>	<i>sie</i>	<i>valki-n</i>	<i>valjastele-t</i>
if	you	white.horse-GEN	harness-PRS.2SG
	<i>Länkitä-t</i>	<i>hyvä-n</i>	<i>hepoise-n</i>
	collar-PRS.2SG	good-GEN	horse-GEN
<i>Vihanna-lla</i>	<i>vainivo-lla</i>		
green-ADE	meadow-ADE		
	<i>Pyhä-n</i>	<i>pello-n</i>	<i>pientare-lla</i>
	holy-GEN	field-GEN	edge-ADE

If you harness the white horse,
 if you collar the good horse
 on the green meadow,
 on the edge of the holy field.

It is more accurate to speak of “components” or “elements” in a line that is described grammatically as phrases: noun phrases (NP), adjective phrases (AP), adpositional phrases (PP), adverbial phrases (AdvP) and verbs (V). In the first verse-pair the corresponding components are the verbs *valjastelet* / *länkität* (“harness” / “collar”) and the object-NPs *valkin* / *hyvän hepoisen* (“white horse” / “good horse”). In the second verse-pair the parallel components are the locational NPs with different attributes: an adjective *vihannalla* (“green”) and an adjective + genitive *pyhän pellon* (“holy field”).

Also, it is not only verbs and particles that can be left unparallelled through ellipsis, though they are the most frequent. In the following case the elided phrase is the NP that acts as the object in the sentence:

<i>Lask-i</i>	<i>virkk-u</i>	<i>vitsa-lla</i>
hit-PST.3SG	horse-PART	rod-ADE
<i>Helähytt-i</i>	<i>helmi</i>	<i>vyö-llä</i>
twang-PST.3SG	bead	belt-ADE

Hit the horse with a rod,
 clouted with a beaded belt.

In this last example the nature of the relationship between the corresponding phrases is noteworthy. The first verb *laski* (“hit”) has a literal meaning of striking the horse with a rod, whereas the parallel verb *helähytti* (“twang”) refers to an abrupt action producing a certain kind of sound. It is not a transitive verb, but in this parallel context it can be interpreted as referring to the same action as the parallel verb. Similarly the instrument used for striking in the main verse is a *vitsa* (“rod”), but its equivalent in the parallel verse designates a different type of object, a *helmivyö* (“pearl-belt” or “belt decorated with pearls”)—still, in the context of parallelism they refer to the same object. Although the verse presents an established formula of the poetic idiom, a determinant in the word choice is alliteration—*helähytteä* and *helmi*. The word used for “horse,” *virkk-u*, is also not the most common one but has the same initial letter as the word for

rod, *vittsa*. There is strong alliteration in both lines: *vi-* / *vi-* and *he-* / *he-*. Mari Sarv (1999:127) has argued that the flex in the semantics of individual words in order to meet the sound requirements of alliteration has become intertwined with the use of semantic parallelism in this form of Finnic poetry. In her view, the repetition of the same idea serves in part to resolve the semantic “haze” produced by word choices determined more by sound than by sense.

Steinitz makes the important point that parallelism is closely connected to alliteration (see also Sarv 1999:132-37). Besides the “vertical” relations between words in separate lines, Steinitz advocated that one should look at the “horizontal” relations between words in the same line as well (1934:182-83). Very often alliteration links words within a line, and its influence on the choice of words is clearly recognizable. An example from Arhippa’s poems illustrates this:

<i>Ve-i</i>	<i>sammo-n</i>	<i>venoise-he-nsa</i>
bear-PST.3SG	sampo-GEN	boat-ILL-3SG.POSS
<i>Talu</i>	<i>talka</i>	<i>pohja-ha-nsa</i>
carry-PST.3SG	keel	bottom-ILL-3SG.POSS

Bore the *sampo*¹¹ to his boat
 carried (it) to his keel-bottom (boat).

The corresponding verbs (3rd person, singular, past) *vei* (“to convey,” “bear”)—*talu* (“to bear,” “lead”), are quite synonymic, though *talu* (from *taluo*) is not a verb normally used in this kind of context. The object *sammon* (“a mythic, wealth-producing artifact”) has no parallel in the second line—there is an ellipsis—while *venoini* and *talka pohja* both refer to the boat. The word *venoini* is a diminutive form of *veneh*, the standard word for boat, whereas *talka pohja* refers to bottom of a boat, which has a *talka* (“a protecting board attached to the keel”) in the bottom. The whole is referred to metonymically, and at the same time we get some information on the boat’s appearance: it is a boat with a *talka*. *Talkapohja* is a *bahuvrihi* compound, which points to a referent by specifying some characteristic or quality of the referent. *Bahuvrihi* compounds are a typical way of composing poetical synonyms that, in a parallel line, often correspond to more referative (that is, words with a more referential meaning) words in the first line (Peegel 1997:51-54). The first line employs standard or normal words that have a neutral referential meaning, but there is still strong alliteration. The words in the second line are more unusual, and there is a descriptive designation for the boat, one that is definitely not used in everyday speech. The words share a semantic likeness with their counterparts in the first line, but their mutual bond through alliteration is similarly significant when we think about the principles on which this line pair is composed.

Words in parallel lines typically obtain their meaning in context, in relation to their counterparts in the first line. So it is quite usual that parallel lines contain verbs meaning some undefined activity, such as verbs referring only to the sound produced by the action. The reverse, however, does not occur: either the words in the first line are more referentially specific to the

¹¹ In *kalevalaic* poetry (and in *Kalevala*), the *sampo* is the magical object of indeterminate type constructed by the smith Ilmarinen.

action, or there is no difference in referentiality; this is indicated by the fact that the order of the lines can sometimes appear changed, even in the repertoire of one singer.

In half-line parallelism one line contains two parallel parts. An example of this is the title of this essay:

<i>Sana-n</i>	<i>virikko</i>		<i>noin</i>	<i>nime-si</i>
word-GEN	say-PST.3SG		thus	name-PST.3SG

Said a word, thus uttered.

Most often the eight-syllable line is divided evenly: both parts have four syllables. Structures like 3+5 syllables, however, are possible too:

<i>Kuu-n</i>	<i>luota</i>		<i>lomasta</i>	<i>päivä-n</i>
moon-GEN	from		between	sun-GEN

From the moon, from between the sun.

The line *Sanan virikko noin nimesi* is an introductory phrase for direct speech: invariably the next line repeats the words of one of the participants. The first part, *sanan virikko*, can be quite directly translated as “said a word” > “said,” though the verb *virkkoo* is not the most common for this sense. The parallel verb *nimesi* (3rd, singular, past) literally means “named” and obtains its meaning in the semantic field of “saying something,” which is derived from the first part of the line. The quite redundant object-NP *sanan* of the verb “said” has a counterpart from a different linguistic category: *noin* “thus,” which is an adverb. Lines containing half-line parallelism can have parallel lines of their own, can be independent lines with no parallels, or they can be parallel to other lines. Many kinds of combinations are possible.

If the unit that is repeated consists of two lines, we can speak of line-pair parallelism. These lines can form one clause, as in the following example, or consist of a main clause and a subordinate clause:

<i>Käkyvö-t</i>	<i>kukahteloo-pi</i>		
cuckoo-PL	call-PRS.3SG		
<i>Korja-n</i>	<i>kirjava-n</i>	<i>kok-i-lla</i>	
sleigh-GEN	colorful-GEN	prow-PL-ADE	

<i>Oravaise-t</i>	<i>juoksentel-i</i>		
squirrel-PL	run.about-PST.3SG		
<i>Aiso-i-lla</i>	<i>vaahter-is-i-lla</i>		
shaft-PL-ADE	maple-ADJ-PL-ADE		

<i>Tetryö-t</i>	<i>kukerteloo-pi</i>
black.grouse-PL	coo-PRS.3SG

<i>Peällä</i>	<i>luoki-n</i>	<i>kynnäppä-is-en</i>
on [lit. head-ADE]	collar.bow-GEN	elm-ADJ-GEN

Cuckoos are calling
 on the prow of the colourful sleigh.
 Squirrels ran about
 on the maple shafts.
 Black grouses were cooing
 on the collar-bow of elm.

Though they function very much like line parallels, parallel line pairs generally lack an ellipsis, with rare exceptions. In other words, all the phrases of the main line pair have their counterparts in other lines. In this example the activities of animals dramatize the excitement of a hero riding in his sleigh in a series of analogical processes that appear simultaneously. Animals (cuckoos, squirrels, black grouses) move around or make sounds on parts of the sleigh. The first line pair refers to the whole of the sleigh with a single pattern of alliteration that includes all the words, which can be seen as emphasizing it as a two-verse unit (see Frog, “Parallelism Dynamics II” in this volume). The other line pairs refer to the sleigh metonymically, through descriptions of its parts’ wooden materials (maple, elm). In the second and third line pairs, there is no alliteration at all within any of the lines, which suggests that in this type of parallelism the correspondence of components in the first line pair may take precedence over conventions of alliteration within a line.

Statistical Analysis

In presenting the scope and frequency of parallelism in the selected poems, I highlight two facets of the question. First, I present the percentage of lines classified as “parallel.” Second, because parallel sets can vary from two lines up to seven here, I present the percentage of sets of different length. I also consider a line that is not followed by parallel verses as a kind of “parallel set.” This way it is possible to describe how frequently those isolated lines appear in the poems.

I have divided the material broadly into three categories: narrative poems, incantations, and other poetry (mostly lyrical). Table 1 presents the number of lines and percentages of first lines (including lines not followed by parallel verses) and parallel lines in the three categories:

Table 1.

	Narrative	Incantations	Other	Total
First line	2,428	893	266	3,587
%	63.4	57.3	54.7	61.1
Parallel line	1,402	665	220	2,287
%	36.6	42.7	45.3	38.9
Total	3,830	1,558	486	5,874
%	100	100	100	100

Parallel lines are a less common in the narrative poems than in the other categories. This might be connected to the types of lines that Steinitz (1934) found most often to have no parallels at all: lines for naming (*Eigennamerverse*) and for introducing direct speech (*Sagte-Verse*). These two types are typical to epic poetry. In general, less than half, or about four lines out of every ten, are parallel lines in Arhippa's texts.

There are 3,587 parallel sets in the corpus. Table 2 gives the amounts and percentages of parallel sets of different lengths: 1) one line (lines lacking parallel verses), 2) two lines, 3) three lines, and 4) four or more lines:

Table 2.

	Narrative	Incantations	Other	Total
1 line	1,279	345	91	1,715
%	52.7	38.6	34.2	47.8
2 lines	972	451	147	1,570
%	40	50.5	55.3	43.8
3 lines	125	85	17	227
%	5.1	9.5	6.4	6.3
4 or more lines	52	12	11	75
%	2.1	1.3	4.1	2.1
Total	2,428	893	266	3,587
%	100	100	100	100

Parallel sets of only one line, or lines lacking parallel verses, are most common in narrative poems. Of those parallel sets that contain more than one line, sets of two lines are by far the most frequent. According to this data, an ideally “average” text of ten parallel sets would be comprised of five solitary lines, four sets with two lines and only one set with three or more lines. On the other hand, the number of parallel sets of only one line is 1,715, which is only 30% of all 5,874 lines of the corpus, so seven lines in ten form part of some parallel structure.

Table 3 presents the figures for half-line parallelism. The percentages in the table are of the full corpus, and the division is made between lines with half-line parallelism, which serve as the first line in a parallel set, and those that serve as parallel line. About 5% of the lines include half-line parallelism, which is more common as a first line. In the total corpus, half-line parallelism appears as a first line in about three out of four cases. At first glance, there may seem to be a pronounced difference between the percentage of first line uses in narrative poetry (80.5%), in incantations (71.3%), and other poetry (62.5%). These differences of proportion, however, should be viewed in light of the greater frequency of parallel sets of a single line in narrative poetry as shown in Table 2, and the number of instances is very low especially in the category of other verses, so the proportion of difference may be in part an accident of the sample. Notably, the line *Sanan virkko noin nimesi* occurs 57 times in the corpus; so the prevalence of first line uses in narrative poetry owes much to its popularity in Arhippa's idiom. Had he chosen to use another formula known to him in order to introduce direct speech in these situations (for example, *Niin sano sanalla tuolla* “So he said with that word”), the proportion of half-line

parallelism in narrative poetry would have dropped approximately to the same level as incantations.

Table 3.

	Narrative	Incantations	Other	Total
as first line	161	67	10	238
% of all lines	4.2	4.3	2.1	4.1
% of half-line parallelism	80.5	71.3	62.5	76.8
as parallel line	39	27	6	72
% of all lines	1	1.7	1.2	1.2
% of half-line parallelism	19.5	28.7	37.5	23.2
Total	200	94	16	310
	Narrative	Incantations	Other	Total
% of all lines	5.2	6	3.3	5.3
% of half-line parallelism	100	100	100	100

Table 4 shows the relationship between alliteration and parallelism in the first and parallel lines:

Table 4.

	First line	Parallel line	Total
no allit.	898	420	1318
%	25	18.4	22.4
weak allit.	1006	371	1377
%	28	16.2	23.4
strong allit.	1683	1496	3179
%	47	65.4	54.2
Total	3587	2287	5874
	100	100	100

Parallel lines seem to contain more alliteration, especially strong alliteration. First lines have more weak alliteration, which could be connected to the fact that first lines, on average, have more words, which increases the probability of randomly occurring alliteration. First lines often begin with short adverbs and pronouns like *niin* (“so”), *siitā* (“from there,” “then”), *silloin* (“then”), and *tuo* (“that”), which makes any words beginning with “n,” “s,” or “t” in the line alliterate—and words in Finnic languages begin with those sounds quite frequently.

Statistically verse parallelism in Arhippa’s repertoire consists mostly of an alteration of solitary (or un-parallel) lines and sets of two parallel lines. On average only one parallel set in every ten sets is longer than two lines. Only one-third of all lines, however, are solitary; because part of the solitary lines contain half-line parallelism, the proportion of lines that are not involved in any parallel structure is even smaller.

Semantics of Parallelism

In Finnish studies semantic relationships between lines have often been reduced to relationships between words, what Wolfgang Steinitz (1934:179-81) later described as *parallelismus der Worte* (“parallelism of words”). Perhaps the most significant early theorist on this topic was Kaarle Krohn, who was one of the founders of the Historical-Geographic, or Finnish Method, in folklore studies. Krohn (1918:72-83) describes “laws of thought” according to which individual words of a line relate to each other through parallelism. These “laws” are based on certain principles that define the relationship. The “law of similarity” includes identity, synonymy, resemblance, opposition, abstract versus concrete, concept versus metaphor, generic versus particular, whole versus part, and concept versus property; the “law of connection” includes spatial, temporal, and causal connection (*ibid.*). For example, *venehtä* (“boat”) / *purttä* (“sailboat”) could be defined as a synonymic parallel, while *kala* (“fish”) / *taimen* (“trout”) combines a generic category with particular variety within that category (Krohn 1918:74-78 and 1926:80-82).

Wolfgang Steinitz (1934) made a major contribution to the discussion of parallelism in the tradition and to discussions of parallelism more generally in advancing the division of parallelism in two types: synonymic parallelism (*der synonyme Parallelismus*) and analogical parallelism (*der analoge Parallelismus*). He further divides analogical parallels into many categories: opposing, varying, lists, and so on. In his opinion these two types of parallelism had not been properly distinguished in previous studies. For example, he criticizes Kaarle Krohn for neglecting the difference between them. Steinitz understands that words belonging to these two groups should be studied separately. He is also not satisfied with Krohn’s classification: he argues that Krohn’s classification is not based on the materials themselves, but it has been externally imposed. Steinitz argues that classifying thousands of parallel word pairs in Krohn’s system would not be very useful, although he admits that he could not develop a satisfying classification system for parallel words. He focuses on one category, an “especially interesting group of parallel words, namely the identical” (1934:181). Steinitz concludes his observations by giving an example of organizing parallel noun pairs into conceptual categories (*Begriffskategorien*). He defines categories like mythical and religious beings, inanimate nature, animals, humans, parts of the body, objects, time, and spiritual concepts. He lists examples of the kinds of parallels that the words in each category receive, but he does not analyze the list (179-215). In comparison to Krohn’s approach to parallelism through his “law of similarity” and “law of connection,” Steinitz’s system is very static. Krohn’s principles or “laws” can be translated as processes that are involved in the composition and transmission of tradition. Of course Krohn aimed at reconstructing the original text, and, for him, analyzing these and similar principles was merely a means to understand how a poem had changed over time. If, however, we dismiss Krohn’s paradigm of slow devolutionary change and understand the principles he proposes as features of poetic grammar, I think they can be used as a starting point for establishing refined and more developed rules of this grammar.

Steinitz (1934:41-64) does not concentrate only on what is parallel, but also on what is not. He finds certain types of lines that are more often unparallel rather than having a parallel line. The most important of these are lines including proper names (*Eigennamerverse*) and lines

used to introduce direct speech—he calls them “said-lines” (*Sagte-Verse*). These can also be combined: lines like *Sanoi vanha Väinämöinen* (“old Väinämöinen said”) always appear without a parallel line.

The division between synonymic and analogical parallelism is valid, but the distinction is not as clear cut as Steinitz claims. Semantic relationships between parallel lines are diverse and their limits fuzzy. More generally Steinitz seems reluctant to deal with meanings beyond asserting this basic division. His approach is otherwise focused on formal criteria, and when discussing word parallelism, he concentrates on word classes and morphology. He makes observations on semantic relations between words in his handling of these formal features, but his observations do not form any uniform system.

A major part of the parallel sets in Arhippa Perttunen’s poems can be characterized as synonymic: lines that refer to objects and actions that can be considered “the same” when examined from a different angle. Mostly, these sets also consist of two lines: they form couplets or pairs. But parallel sets in which each line has a more distinctive meaning are common as well. An example of these is a clause in two sets, where *Pohjon akka* (“the mistress of Pohjo”) asks the smith Ilmorini to forge the mythic *sampo*:

<i>Kuin</i>	<i>sie</i>	<i>loaji-t</i>	<i>uuve-n</i>	<i>sammo-n</i>
If	you	make-PRS.3SG	new-GEN	sampo-GEN
	<i>Kirjo</i>	<i>kanne-n</i>	<i>kirjoale-t</i>	
	colorful	cover-GEN	embroider-PRS.2SG	
<i>Yhe-n</i>	<i>joukoise-n</i>	<i>sula-sta</i>		
one-GEN	swan-GEN	feather-ELA		
<i>Yhe-n</i>	<i>värttinä-n</i>	<i>muru-sta</i>		
one-GEN	distaff-GEN	piece-ELA		
<i>Yhe-n</i>	<i>villa-n</i>	<i>kylkyvö-stä</i>		
one-GEN	wool-GEN (?)	snippet-ELA(?)		
<i>Maijo-sta</i>	<i>mahova-n</i>	<i>lehmä-n</i>		
milk-ELA	barren-GEN	cow-GEN		
<i>Yhe-n</i>	<i>osraise-n</i>	<i>jyvä-stä</i>		
one-GEN	barley-GEN	grain-ELA		

If you make the new *sampo*,
 embroider the colorful cover,
 from one feather of a swan,
 from one piece of a distaff,
 from one snippet of wool
 from the milk of a barren cow,
 from one barley-grain.

The first parallel set is synonymic: *sampo* is *kirjokansi* (“colorful cover”). In the second set *Pohjon akka* states the materials required for making *sampo*. The *sampo* is not just any object,

and it must be forged using those materials that are expressed in the parallel set. The set is structured around the use of the word *yhe-n* (“one-GEN”), which appears in every line except one. Remarkably there is no alliteration: only the line that lacks the word *yhen* has strong alliteration, and—disputably—the last line has weak alliteration, two words beginning with a different vowel.¹² These lines express ingredients, which are minimal, of one piece. All the ingredients are different and all are needed: besides sharing the qualities “minimal” and/or “impossible,” they also refer to important economic activities: agriculture, animal husbandry, or hunting. Parallelism here indicates some sort of equivalence between the items listed. The deviant line (*Maijo-sta*) expresses an ingredient that does not exist.

The same formulaic construction based on *yhen* is found elsewhere too. In a lyric poem, which would presumably be performed during a feast when people gather to drink, eat, and sing, Arhippa sings:

<i>Mikä</i>	<i>meät</i>	<i>koolla</i>	<i>soatto</i>
what	us	together	bring-PST.3SG
<i>Kuk</i>	<i>on</i>	<i>tuo-nut</i>	<i>tuku-lla</i>
who	be-PRS.3SG	bring-PERF	wad-ADE (?)
<i>Juo-ma-han</i>	<i>yhe-n</i>	<i>pikari-n</i>	
drink-INF-ILL	one-GEN	goblet-GEN	
<i>Yhe-n</i>	<i>kannu-n</i>	<i>koato-ma-ha</i>	
one-GEN	jug-GEN	pour-INF-ILL	
<i>Kuin</i>	<i>yhe-n</i>	<i>emoise-n</i>	<i>lapse-t</i>
like	one-GEN	mother-GEN	children
<i>Yhe-n</i>	<i>kanta-ma-t</i>	<i>kapoise-n</i>	
one-GEN	carry-PTCP-PL	girl-GEN	
<i>Yhe-n</i>	<i>peipoise-n</i>	<i>pese-mä-t</i>	
one-GEN	finch-GEN	wash-PTCP-PL	
<i>Yhe-n</i>	<i>sotka-n</i>	<i>suoritta-ma-t</i>	
one-GEN	scaup-GEN	dress-PTCP-PL	

What summoned us,
 who brought us together
 to drink one goblet,
 to pour down one jug,
 like children of one mother,
 carried by one girl,
 washed by one finch,
 dressed by one scaup.

¹² On so-called “vowel alliteration,” see Leino (1970:219-49).

There are three parallel sets: the first and the second form an interrogatory clause—who (or what) summoned us?—and the last set could be described as a parable. The singer compares himself and his audience to siblings: “children of one mother, carried by one girl.” The word *kantamat* (“carried by”), the parallel of *lapset* (the standard word for “children”), is a participle denoting something “carried” in the womb of a *kapo* (“girl”). The participle-parallels continue in the next lines, where the actions are “washing” and “dressing,” and the mother is paralleled in metaphors expressed through birds: a finch and a snow bunting. The word *yhen* links these two last sets together. Except for the first line in both sets, the lines contain strong alliteration. In this case the parallel verses present analogical equivalents that describe the same relationship in a series of metaphors; this series differs from the example about the materials needed to make the *sampo* in that there is only an accumulation of metaphors, not of the things to which they ultimately refer. Metaphors are uncommon in parallel sets: metaphors stand mostly alone and are often marked by words *niin kuin* or *kuin on* (“like”). The last set is, in a way, a metaphor in itself—a metaphor of the participants at the feast—and contains another metaphor—a metaphor of the mother and her children.

Perspectives

Verse parallelism is a poetic device that figures throughout *kalevalaic* poetic tradition and encompasses all of its genres. Over 70% of all lines in Arhippa Perttunen’s poems are part of a multi-line parallel group. If we add the number of examples of half-line parallelism and line-pair parallelism, which is not presented in tables above, the percentage would be even higher. Verse parallelism creates structures that are, for the most part, dual but can extend to longer sets of parallel lines. At least part of these longer sets is situated at points of special significance in the discourse: longer series of parallel lines code and stress meaningful elements in the poems; an example can be seen in the verse on the forging of the *sampo* cited above.

It is interesting to note that melodies and performance patterns often have a dual structure; for example, performing a song by a lead singer and a choir or by a lead singer and an “assistant” who repeats the line or lines sung by the lead singer (see Kallio, this volume). The textual and musical structures seem independent of each other, sometimes converging but diverging again to create a kind of multi-layered fabric (Laitinen 2004:182-83).

Verse parallelism deepens and extends description in the discourse and makes it richer. The relationships that emerge as parallelism are semantically varied: they repeat, expand, contrast, introduce alternative equivalents to the first parallel unit, or embellish the image by referring to it through metonymy. In the dual structure the first line, or the “main line” as it is often called in Finnish scholarly discourse, is always the syntactically valid unit, while subsequent parallel lines may be subject to ellipsis. The main line is often the most semantically valid unit. Words in parallel lines acquire their full meaning only in the semantic field set by the first line, and these words are often unusual, descriptive, and periphrastic, rather than words that form a regular part of everyday speech or conversational register. The first line normally has the full referential power of a proposition, and parallel lines add to this power. In comparison to many other poetic traditions, discourse in *kalevalaic* poetry might seem plain. For example,

kalevalaic epic poems lack rich, extended descriptions of preparing for battle, fighting, sea voyages, and other themes common in epic traditions. But a great part of the expressive and descriptive power of *kalevalaic* poetic tradition lies in parallel lines.

Speaking on alliteration in *kalevalaic* poetry, Pentti Leino (1986:134) states:

Over half the lines in Finnish folk poetry have strong alliteration. In the epic poems about a fifth of the lines contain weak alliteration, and about the same number have no alliteration; in lyric poetry alliteration is somewhat more frequent. It is thus a tendency, not a rule; a poem in the Kalevala metre [*sic*] which contains no alliteration, however, is nevertheless an anomaly, and a description of alliteration is thus added to the metrical grammar.

Parallelism has been considered one of the most important stylistic features in *kalevalaic* poetry. I disagree: parallelism is not a stylistic feature. Parallelism defines *kalevalaic* poetry as much as meter and alliteration. It is not regular like meter, but is necessary and unavoidable. There is no poem without parallelism.

Finnish Literature Society (SKS)

References

- Frog and Stepanova 2011 Frog and Eila Stepanova. "Alliteration in (Balto-) Finnic Languages." In *Alliteration in Culture*. Edited by Jonathan Roper. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 195-218.
- Krohn 1918 Kaarle Krohn. *Kalevalankysymyksiä I*. Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran aikakauskirja, 35. Helsinki: Suomalais-ugrilainen Seura.
- Krohn 1926 _____. *Die folkloristische Arbeitsmethode: begründet von Julius Krohn und weitergeführt von nordischen Forschern*. Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning, Series B, Skrifter 5. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Kuusi 1949 Matti Kuusi. *Sampo-eepos: typologinen analyysi*. Published Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Helsinki. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Kuusi 1952 _____. "Kalevalaisen säkeen, säeryhmän ja runon painavoituvuudesta." *Virittäjä*, 56/4:241-61, 351-52.
- Kuusi 1983 _____. *Maria Luukan laulut ja loitsut: tutkimus läntisimmän Inkerin suomalaisperinteestä*. Publications of the Finnish Literature Society, 379. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

- Kuusi et al. 1977 Matti Kuusi, Keith Bosley, and Michael Branch. *Finnish Folk Poetry: Epic. An Anthology in Finnish and English*. Publications of the Finnish Literature Society, 329. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Labi 2006 Kanni Labi. *Eesti regilaulude verbisemantika*. Dissertationes philologiae Estonicae Universitatis Tartuensis, 18. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Laitinen 2004 Heikki Laitinen. “Anni Tenisovan Marian virsi.” In *Kalevala ja laulettu runo*. Ed. by Anna-Leena Siikala, Lauri Harvilahti, and Senni Timonen. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. pp. 157-93.
- Leino 1970 Pentti Leino. *Strukturaalinen alkusointu Suomessa: folklorepohjainen tilastoanalyysi*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Leino 1986 _____. *Language and Metre: Metrics and the Metrical System of Finnish*. Studia Fennica, 31. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Leipzig Glossing Rules *Leipzig Glossing Rules*. Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Department of Linguistics. <http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php>
- Lönnrot 1835 Elias Lönnrot. *Kalewala, taikka wanhoja Karjalan runoja Suomen kansan muinoista ajoista*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Lönnrot 1849 _____. *Kalevala*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Lönnrot and Magoun 1963 Elias Lönnrot and Francis Peabody Magoun. *The Kalevala, or, Poems of the Kaleva District*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Metslang 1978 Helle Metslang. *Süntaktilisi aspekte eesti regilaulu värsiparallelismis*. Unpubl. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Tallinn.
- Peegel 1997 Juhan Peegel. *Kuld on jäänud jälgedesse: regivärsi keelest ja poetikast*. Tartu: Eesti Kirjandusmuuseum.
- Porthan 1766 Henrik Gabriel Porthan, ed. *De Poësi Fennica, I*. Aboae: Joh. Christoph. Frenckell. <http://www.doria.fi/handle/10024/109619>
- Saarinen 2013 Jukka Saarinen. “Behind the Text: Reconstructing the Voice of a Singer.” *RMN Newsletter*, 7:34-43.
- Saarinen (forthcoming) _____. *Runolaulun poetiikka—Säe, syntaksi ja parallelismi Arhippa Pertusen runoissa*. Unpubl. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Helsinki.

- Sadeniemi 1951 Matti Sadeniemi. *Die Metrik des Kalevala-verses*. Folklore Fellows' Communications, 139. Helsinki: Suomalainen tiedeakatemia.
- Sarv 1999 Mari Sarv. "Regilaul: Clearing the Alliterative Haze." *Folklore: Electronic Journal of Folklore*, 10:126-40.
- Sarv 2000 _____. "Regilaul kui poeetiline süsteem." In *Paar sammukest: Eesti kirjandusmuuseumi aastaraamat*, 17. Tartu: Eesti kirjandusmuuseum. pp. 7-122.
- Sarv 2008 _____. *Loomiseks loodud: regivärsimõõt traditsiooniprotsessis*. Publ. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Tartu. Tartu: Eesti Kirjandusmuuseum.
- Siikala 2002 Anna-Leena Siikala. "The Singer Ideal and the Enrichment of Poetic Culture: Why Did the Ingredients for the Kalevala Come from Viena Karelia?" In *The Kalevala and the World's Traditional Epics*. Edited by Lauri Honko. Studia Fennica Folkloristica, 12. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. pp. 26-43.
- SKVR 1908-95 *Suomen Kansan Vanhat Runot*. 34 vols. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. <http://skvr.fi>
- Steinitz 1934 Wolfgang Steinitz. *Der Parallelismus in der Finnisch-Karelischen Volksdichtung: untersucht an den Liedern des karelischen Sängers Arhippa Perttunen*. Folklore Fellows' Communications, 115. Helsinki: Suomalainen tiedeakatemia.
- Tarkka 2013 Lotte Tarkka. *Songs of the Border People: Genre, Reflexivity, and Performance in Karelian Oral Poetry*. Translated by Leila Virtanen. Folklore Fellows' Communications, 305. Helsinki: Suomalainen tiedeakatemia.