From Maria to Marjatta: The Transformation of an Oral Poem in Elias Lönnrot’s *Kalevala*¹

Thomas DuBois

The question of Elias Lönnrot’s role in shaping the texts that became his *Kalevala* has stirred such frequent and vehement debate in international folkloristic circles that even persons with only a passing interest in the subject of Finnish folklore have been drawn to the question. Perhaps the notion of academic fraud in particular intrigues those of us engaged in the profession of scholarship.² And although anyone who studies Lönnrot’s life and endeavors will discover a man of utmost integrity, it remains difficult to reconcile the extensiveness of Lönnrot’s textual emendations with his stated desire to recover and present the ancient epic traditions of the Finnish people. In part, the enormity of Lönnrot’s project contributes to the failure of scholars writing for an international audience to pursue any analysis beyond broad generalizations about the author’s methods of compilation,

¹ Research for this study was funded in part by a grant from the Graduate School Research Fund of the University of Washington, Seattle.

² Comparetti (1898) made it clear in this early study of Finnish folk poetry that the *Kalevala* bore only partial resemblance to its source poems, a fact that had become widely acknowledged within Finnish folkloristic circles by that time. The nationalist interests of Lönnrot were examined by a number of international scholars during the following century, although Lönnrot’s fairly conservative views on Finnish nationalism became equated at times with the more strident tone of the turn of the century, when the *Kalevala* was made an inspiration and catalyst for political change (Mead 1962; Wilson 1976; Cocchiara 1981:268-70; Turunen 1982). The 1980s were marked by both the centennial of the *Kalevala* (1985) and a renewed interest in the topic of its (in)authenticity, addressed by some of the leading figures in Finnish and American folklore studies (Dundes 1985; Honko 1986 and 1987; Jones 1987; Alphonso-Karkala 1986; Lord 1987/1991; Pentikäinen 1989; Voßschmidt 1989).
overall interpretations, thematic molding, and career phases. Shortcut explanations—citing the small number of lines actually composed by Lönnrot himself, for instance—oversimplify and obscure the role Lönnrot played. Side-by-side textual comparison of the sort facilitated by the publication of Kuusi, Bosley, and Branch’s (1977) excellent bilingual anthology of verbatim folk epic texts offers a means of sensing Lönnrot’s role in transforming such texts into cantos for his *Kalevala*. Researchers who have availed themselves of this resource to date, however, have concentrated largely on thematic variation rather than linguistic or stylistic alteration (Alphonso-Karkala 1986; Lord 1987/1991; Sawin 1988). What is needed, I believe, is a detailed thematic and stylistic analysis of a single portion of Lönnrot’s poem in order to demonstrate exactly how the author handled traditional material and (re)presented it to an outside audience.

This close analysis must rest, I believe, on a twofold attention to both the author’s *intellectual* agenda (what he believed he was accomplishing for the Finnish people and for the world) and his *artistic* agenda (what he believed constituted an aesthetically pleasing poem). If we compare a passage from Lönnrot’s text—here, a portion of the epic’s final Poem 50—with the transcription of an oral performance that served as its model—the *Nativity* song of Arhippa Perttunen (SKVR I,2 1103)—then we can glimpse the scholarly and poetic judgments that underlie Lönnrot’s epic. We can see, in other words, how Lönnrot’s good intentions led him to alter significantly the poems he had observed in their traditional milieu.

Undertaking the task of comparing two such pieces of poetry—one the product of a single oral performance and the other the product of a long process of literary revision—would be valuable in itself as a defense or explication of Lönnrot’s motivations. We may reap additional rewards from such an analysis as well, however. For in comparing these two texts, we will come to appreciate the contrasting aesthetic systems that informed Arhippa’s oral epic performance and Lönnrot’s literary epic product. And an understanding of these underlying artistic considerations will prove, I believe, a far more significant and wide-ranging discovery than any devoted solely to the cause of defending or criticizing Elias Lönnrot.

In this paper, then, I propose to examine first how Arhippa Perttunen, singing in an oral tradition he had experienced all his life, conceived of and controlled his poetry. By referring to three alternate

---

3 Not so in the Finnish literature, where extremely detailed studies have been produced: See Kaukonen 1939-45, a detailed examination of the sources Lönnrot used for his epic; Kaukonen 1979, a shorter history of Lönnrot’s method and career; and similar useful overviews by Anttila 1985, Kuusi and Anttonen 1985, and Pentikäinen 1989.
performances of the same song—Arhippa’s 1834, 1836, and 1839 versions of the Nativity—we can perceive the stylistic range and regularities he commanded. Then, with this oral aesthetic system in mind, we will examine how Elias Lönnrot approached, appropriated, and textually performed the same poem in his 1849 Kalevala. Again, alternate “performances”—this time Lönnrot’s earlier 1833 and 1835 written versions—will help us discern the poet’s range and tastes. An examination of these poets’ stylistics will lead us to an appreciation of contrasting discursive agendas, that is, the structural and narrative imperatives resulting from Arhippa’s oral aesthetic and Lönnrot’s Romantic sensibilities. And an understanding of these discursive considerations will allow us, finally, to perceive how each poet contextualized his performance in a wider intertextual framework: the pious Messiah Cycle for Arhippa (a cycle of poems concerning the life and career of Jesus), and a surmised pre-Christian heroic Väinämöinen Cycle for Lönnrot. We will learn, I contend, a great deal about the workings of oral performance in traditional Finland and its transformation into the product of a particular mode of nineteenth-century literacy.

Arhippa Perttunen: Oral Performer in Context

Much is known about the singer Arhippa Perttunen (1769-1840) and his relation to the epic songs that he performed. Later dubbed the “King of Finnish folk poetry” (runon kuningas; Haavio 1943:35), Arhippa could boast beautiful songs and a prodigious memory that brought him fame during his life in local and national contexts alike. He attributed his repertoire and skills to his father, who used to spend evenings singing epic songs with a farmhand from another district. The songs that Arhippa learned from his father, Suuri Iivana (“Great Iivana”) were in turn passed on to the next generation’s Arhippainen Miikkal, whose blindness may have contributed to the continuation of this familial oral tradition (Haavio 1943:39). Arhippa’s acclaim as a singer led to repeated notations of his repertoire: not only did Elias Lönnrot visit him for the purpose of collecting his poems (1834), but J. F. Cajan (1836) and M. A. Castrén (1839) each, in turn, made a pilgrimage to the village of Latvajärvi for the same purpose. The 4124 lines of poetry collected from Arhippa thus include multiple versions of many of his favorite songs over a wide span of years.

Nineteenth-century folklorists studying Arhippa’s poetry limited their
analyses primarily to considerations of subject matter and memory. Cajan and Castrén both noted Arhippa’s reluctance to sing loitsut (incantations), which the singer viewed as sinful and godless (ibid.:38). Haavio (1943:40) notes Arhippa’s particular fondness for the epic genre, although he knew poems of other genres as well. In addition, folklorists observed the overall unity, or wholeness, of Arhippa’s poems, finding little evidence of logical gaps or inconsistencies (ibid.:38-40). It is clear that these observers attributed Arhippa’s consistency to his fine memory rather than to any particular rhetorical structuring operating within the poems themselves and conveying the impression of integrity. For collectors of the day, such performances were viewed as fossils, preserving the artistry of poets far in the past. The better the memory, the more faithful the rendition, and the more valuable the text.

Several researchers have studied Finnish Kalevalaic poetry from contemporary perspectives. Oral-formulaic theory has been applied tentatively to Finnish oral epic singing by such eminent researchers in the field as Paul Kiparsky and Albert Lord. Kiparsky (1976:96) notes that singers in the tradition varied texts not so much by adding otherwise independent themes or passages but by varying the completeness of the rendition they gave: details could be included or omitted, provided they “belonged” to the song as generally sung in the singer’s region. Albert Lord (1987/1991) focuses in part on the relations between Lönnrot’s Kalevala and published variants of source folk poems, although his comments are necessarily limited. Lord also draws attention to Lönnrot’s own distinction between singers who desired to repeat their songs verbatim—as Lord puts it, those who memorized—and those who instead remembered: reconstructing their songs in a process which Lord notes is “more potent, I believe, than it is generally credited with being” (1987:307; 1991:115).

In Finland, Jukka Saarinen and Lauri Harvilaherti have furthered oral-formulaic research on this genre. After extensive computer-assisted analysis of Kalevalaic texts, Harvilaherti arrives at a three-level model for understanding the way in which Finnish folk poets stored, retrieved, and performed their songs (1992:93):

Competent singers characterize or recall first of all the poem’s overall structure (the contents and order of broad narrative wholes). These broad entities are in turn constituted from small, recurrent optional units, which vary in number within the tradition: precise descriptions of actions/events, frames/individuals, and characterizations. A third group is made up of recurrent units at the level of the line or below.
He also notes that variation on these secondary and tertiary levels can be used by a singer to give a particular shape to a performance, modulating it “according to his own preferences and purposes” (1992:97).

Jukka Saarinen (1988; 1991) has further explored such variation in the songs of both Arhippa Perttunen and his son Miikali. In the later article he distinguishes between two types of narrative elements, hierarchically treated within the tradition. Lower-level elements (typically those that describe, detail, specify, or ground) cannot occur without the upper-level elements they augment. On the other hand, such upper-level narrative elements can appear with or without lower-level adjuncts. This hierarchical system helps explain why certain parts of Arhippa and Miikali’s songs are open to variation while other parts remain fixed. Saarinen goes on to discuss the greater and lesser kinds of additions, repetitions, and alternations characteristic of the singers’ songs. The addition of extra lines, especially supplemental parallel lines (see below for further discussion) arises, according to Saarinen and musicologist Ilkka Kolehmainen (1977), from the desire to match closing or climactic moments in the melodic line with similarly charged moments in the narrative.

In a related vein, I have attempted to demonstrate the ethnopoetic architecture of Arhippa’s performances and its underlying basis in an oral aesthetic (DuBois forthcoming). Not only did accomplished Finnish performers comply with the prosodic conventions of the folk poetry genre, I maintain, they used a related set of linguistic devices to delineate an overarching rhetorical structure for their poems as wholes. Whereas the prosody of Finnish folk poetry includes a particular meter (trochaic tetrameter), rules about syllable placement within the line, alliteration, and line-pair parallelism, broader aesthetic shaping was achieved by such features as line groupings of three and five, strategic use of particles (e.g., niin, “thus”) and enclitics (e.g., -nsA, third-person human possessive marker), and an interplay of succinct and lengthy passages. In the case of the particularly artful singer Arhippa Perttunen, improvisational additions, repetitions, and deletions of lines allowed the singer to vary his performance, selectively highlighting a given narrative moment through techniques of expansion and compensating for the investment of discourse time by streamlining other portions of the poem. Such improvisation allowed the singer to spotlight a given aspect of the narrative, structure the performance in a novel way, and tailor the performance itself to the tastes, familiarity, and interests of the audience. Following Hymes (1981; 1982; 1985), we can contextualize this body of rules and practices as a kind of
ethnopoetic “grammar,” set in play nearly automatically during the oral performance. And crucially, it was the implicit understanding of this grammar of performance that permitted audiences to appraise and appreciate the artistry of their entertainers. As in all good performance, a balance between predictability and innovation had to be struck, and this balance lay along the axis of traditional prosody and rhetorical shaping.

Appendix I contains a transcription of Arhippa’s 1834 performance of the *Nativity*, as performed for Elias Lönnrot. The text’s printed appearance has been altered along lines suggested by scholarship in ethnopoetics to make evident the rhetorical mechanisms operating within the poem itself.)

Below I shall make some observations about the particular kinds of artistic shaping noticeable in Arhippa’s text.

Dialogue stands as a crucial structuring device in Arhippa’s *Nativity*. Each of the three main parts of the performance (which Kuusi [1977:552; 1980:233-34] believes originate in separate poems) features a particular type of dialogue, made central by its placement in the text and paucity of competing detail. Part I, entitled here “The Berry and Mary” (ll. 1-28), focuses on the berry’s terse and mysterious call to Mary, a call that results in her eventual impregnation. The lengthy second part of the poem, “Mary, Piltti, and Ugly Ruotus’ Wife” (29-230), is dominated by Mary’s three attempts to find a sauna in which to give birth, instructing her servant Piltti to run to the village three times, and receiving there a negative response from Ugly Ruotus’ wife on each occasion. The repetition of Mary’s instructions to Piltti, Piltti’s word-for-word rendition of these lines for Ruotus’ wife, the wife’s equally repetitive responses, and Piltti’s faithful rendition of these as well create a highly stylized passage in which familiar lines are repeated for purely aesthetic reasons. In the final part of the poem, “Mary, the Road, the Moon, and the Sun” (231-94), Mary’s conversations again form the core of the text, as Mary addresses each of three natural beings (the road, the moon, and the sun) for information about her lost son.

What is crucial to note about these turns at talk is that they do not simply “help” tell the story or delineate the characters—rather, they are the narrative events around which the entire poem’s structure revolves. Thus, Arhippa’s poem opens with only two brief lines prior to the berry’s call and ends with the final words of the sun. No further discourse is necessary in a text so emphatically dominated by dialogue.

---

4 For further discussion of this methodology, and its application to Finnish folk poetry, see DuBois forthcoming.
On the more local, stanzaic level, too, Arhippa uses various devices to structure and give point to his song. He transgresses the prosodic rule of line-pair parallelism, for instance, to create line groupings of three or five at prime narrative moments. Note, for example, his description of where Mary hides her child:

Neitsy Maria emonen   Virgin Mary little mother      231
rakas äiti armollinen   dear mother full of grace 232
piiletteli poiuttahan   she hid her son          233
kullaista omenoansa    her golden apple        234
alla sieklan sieklottavan under a sieve for sifting 235
alla korvon kannettavan under a pail for carrying 236
alla jouksovan jalaksen under a running sled runner 237

Here the regular progression of line pairs is dramatically offset by the final series of three lines, stylistically linked by the repetition of the addessive preposition *alla* (“under”), as well as by syntactic and grammatical parallelism. Such a covariation between groupings of two and three breaks the potential monotony of the poetry and allows the singer to identify key moments.

Likewise, the crucial narrative moment at which Mary consumes the berry is highlighted by a striking “run” of five parallel lines:

Tempo kartun kankahalta  She drags a pole from the marsh 21
senni päällä seisataksen and standing on that 22
heitti marjan helmohinsa she threw the berry into her lap 23
helmoiltansa vyönsä päälle from her lap onto her belt 24
vyönsä päältä rinoillensa from her belt onto her breast 25
rhoiritansa huulellensa from her breast onto her lip 26
huuleltansa kielellensä from her lip onto her tongue 27
siitä vatsahan valahti. from there it slid into the stomach 28

Here the regular alternation of the ablative (“from off of”) and allative (“onto”) cases, along with the presence of the personal ending -nsA help express the lines’ unity. And the final, fifth line (28), which culminates the action of the previous four, is at once semantically linked to and poetically differentiated from the lines leading up to it: shifting to an elative/illative (“from out of/into”) progression, replacing a noun with a pronoun (*siitä*) and including a verb (*valahti*, “slid”). We can sense here, in other words, a very fine management of audience expectation and surprise—an impression borne out by examination of similar structuring devices in others of Arhippa’s songs.
An examination of Arhippa’s poetry may also lead to the conclusion that we can use the presence or absence of ethnopoetic structuring as an index of the integrity, or even orality, of a given portion of the *Kalevala*. For although Lönnrot understood the prosody of Kalevalaic poetry well, he did not sense the kinds of structuring described here. And the absence of this notion, coupled with a literary poetic sensibility largely at odds with that of the folk tradition, led to major restructurings of the poems destined for inclusion in the *Kalevala*. The fact that Lönnrot himself conceived of his assimilation of the Kalevalaic tradition as largely oral—since he had memorized most of the lines of the *Kalevala*—obsured for him the very substantive ways in which literacy altered his understanding, appreciation, and appropriation of the poetry.

**Elias Lönnrot: Literate Performer in Context**

Before examining Lönnrot’s version of the lines quoted above, we need to understand the process by which he created his text. Although Lönnrot clearly enjoyed the folk epic tradition and became one of its great extollers to the world, it must be said that his views and interpretations of Kalevalaic singing differed markedly from those of traditional singers or audiences. Whereas a traditional singer such as Arhippa contextualized his songs within his childhood experiences and lifelong familiarity with the performed tradition itself, Lönnrot contextualized the poems within the intellectual construct of “national literature.” As an educated doctor, schooled in the general European embrace of such works as the *Iliad*, *Edda*, and *Ossian*, Lönnrot was thrilled primarily by the fact of the poems’ existence, and secondarily by the seeming antiquity of the poems’ content. Matters of style, performance context, repertoire choice, and so forth—those aspects so interesting to folklorists today and so consequential to the performers themselves—seemed trivial in comparison with the historical significance of the poems.

Thus, whereas the traditional audience listened to a song for entertainment in the here and now, Lönnrot listened for enlightenment in the ancient past and validation in the intellectual present. And whereas a singer such as Arhippa Perttunen gained competence in the tradition through listening repeatedly to the songs and absorbing gradually what Kuusi and Anttonen have termed the *kalevalakieli* (the traditional aesthetic means and practices that characterize this mode of singing; 1985:61-63), Lönnrot spent his brief moments as an audience member engaged in the
necessarily logocentric act of shorthand notation: documenting for his contemporaries and followers the fact and the content of the poems he heard.

When Lönnrot returned home after any of his numerous short-term collecting expeditions, he brought with him long passages of written words with only a glimmering memory of their performed reality. Literacy allowed him to distance the poems from their performed context, and he then approached them anew along lines established by his own teachers and contemporaries (Ong 1986: points 4 and 7, 39-40). The great H. G. Porthan (1739-1804) had initiated Finnish intellectual interest in Kalevalaic singing and its content. Drawing on Macpherson’s purportedly authentic Scottish epic *The Poems of Ossian* (1765) for inspiration, Porthan collected and published a number of Finnish epic songs in his five-part study *Dissertatio de Poesie Fennica* (1766-78) and led his students to examine the content of such songs in detail (Hautala 1954:62-68). Under the tutelage of the Turku Romantic scholar R. von Becker, one of the next generation of scholars to find significance in Kalevalaic poetry, the young Lönnrot pursued studies of the epic figure Väinämöinen, resulting in his thesis of 1827 (*ibid.*:101-2). K. A. Gottlund (1796-1875), drawing further on literary fascination with epics, pointed to the possibility of constituting an epic equal to those of Homer out of the traditional songs of the Finnish people (1817) and made a first attempt at creating one in his two-volume work *Pieniä Runoja Suomen Poijille Ratoxi* (*Little Songs for the Entertainment of the Sons of Finland, 1817-21*; Kuusi and Anttonen 1985:43). And Sakari Topelius (1781-1831), a district physician from Uusikarlepyy, created his own first draft of such an edited epic in his five-part *Suomen Kansan Vanhoja Runoja ynnä myös Nykyisempitä Lauluja* (*Ancient Poems of the Finnish People along with some Newer Songs, 1822-31*) a text which Väinö Kaukonen (1979:19) describes as crucial to the formation and form of Lönnrot’s original *Kalevala*. Lönnrot’s experience of any text he collected thus hinged on the notions created by these intellectuals and the variant texts familiar to him from Topelius’ collection.

The editing methodology that Lönnrot developed on this basis became a combination of faithful transcription and careful comparative emendation. A given singer’s poem led Lönnrot to associate it in his own mind either initially with other poems of precisely the same content, or secondarily with poems of seemingly related content. Lönnrot writes repeatedly in his essays and letters of the existence of *toisinnot* (“variants”)—by which he means different versions of the same *ikivanha* (“ancient”) poem. When writing of Arhippa Perti nnen, for instance,
Lönnrot states: “A number of these [poems] were ones that I had not obtained yet from anyone else,” from which we can infer that he viewed the poems as having their own separate existence outside of given performances. When describing the wealth of collected poems available to him for his revision of the *Kalevala*, Lönnrot writes to A. J. Sjögren that his note pages are “almost entirely full of additions, although many of these are variants.” This superorganic view of the poems naturally led the editor more toward regularization and emendation than toward absolute fidelity to transcribed texts, as we shall see.

Particularly subject to alteration in Lönnrot’s compilation work were the very kinds of three- and five-part runs of lines that help structure Arhippa’s poetry. Lönnrot’s method and mindset favored expansion at the expense of structural harmony, a shortcoming much criticized by some contemporaries familiar with the folk tradition (e.g., Castrén [Kaukonen 1979:165]). And structuring devices inherent in a given performer’s singing became lost in a confused jumble of lines from different performances. As an example, consider the path the berry follows in Lönnrot’s 1849 *Kalevala*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tempoi kartun kankahalta</th>
<th>She dragged a pole from the marsh</th>
<th>107</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jolla marjan maahan sorti</td>
<td>by which she knocked the berry</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niinpä marja maasta nousi</td>
<td>thus the berry rose from the ground</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaunoisille kautoloille</td>
<td>to the beautiful shoetops</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaunosilta kautoloilta</td>
<td>from the shoetops</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puhthaille polviloille</td>
<td>to the spotless knees</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puhthaita polviloita</td>
<td>from the spotless knees</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helveille helmasille.</td>
<td>to the bright apron-hem.</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nousi siitä vyörivoille</td>
<td>It rose from there to the waistline</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vyörivoilta rinnoillansa</td>
<td>from the waistline to her breast</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rinnoiltansa leuillensa</td>
<td>from her breast to her chin</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leuilltansa huulillensa</td>
<td>from her chin to her lips</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siitä suuhun suikahutti</td>
<td>from there it slipped into the mouth</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keikahutti kielellensä</td>
<td>tripped quickly on her tongue</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 “Useimmat niistä [runoista] olivat sellaisia, joita en ennen muilta ole saanut” (Haavio 1943:35).

6 “melkein kaikkialla täynnä lisäyksiä, mutta paljon niistä on toisintoja” March 1848 (Kaukonen 1979:163).
Presenting Lönnrot’s text in an ethnopoetic format reveals the extent to which his conglomerative editing damages the structural cohesiveness of the source oral performances. In the above sequence of 14 lines (50:109-22) we can recognize several competing ethnopoetic systems. Lines 109-14 begin with the particle niinpä (the phatic explative niin, “thus,” plus the emphatic enclitic -pA, “indeed”), an occurrence that tends to announce a significant unit of related lines or climax moment in the singing of poets such as Arhippa (DuBois forthcoming). Indeed, in Lönnrot’s text, this particle announces the occurrence of a unified run of lines, each formed of a reference to an article of clothing or body part plus an appropriate adjective. A regular alternation between the allative (“onto”) case and the ablative (“from off of”) further links line pairs so that the singleton line 114 “heleville helmasille” (“onto the bright apron-hem”) stands as a contrastive climax to the berry’s run. Rather than leave the berry there, however, Lönnrot uses lines reminiscent of Arhippa’s rendition to bring the berry from the maiden’s waist to her mouth (115-18). Here, the verb nousi (“rose”) is repeated, announcing a further run of related lines in which references to two body-parts are combined within each line with an alternation of ablative and allative cases. As in Arhippa’s poem, the enclitic personal marker -nsA (“her”) again provides further structural cohesion. Finally, in lines 119-22, Lönnrot uses an amalgamation of repeated words (e.g., siitä “from there”), related verbs (suikahutti, “slipped”; keikahutti, “tripped”; valahti, “slid”), and references to body-parts to build a final sequence for his berry.

Although structuring devices abound in Lönnrot’s passage, they do not achieve the unity evident in Arhippa’s briefer run. Instead, the flow of discourse is interrupted as poetic voice and device shift from section to section. Clearly, Lönnrot’s penchant for expansion and desire to create stanzas of roughly even length led him to combine lines from different poets in imperfect ways.

In some cases Arhippa, too, alternated structuring devices to break the berry’s run up into several parts, as in the version of the poem he performed for Cajan. But in contrast to Lönnrot’s attempts, Arhippa is able to create a unified passage in which seemingly distinctive portions are linked together by shared devices and vocabulary (SKVR 1103a:23-37):

Niin mänövi mättähälle Thus she went to the hill 23
tempo kartun kankahalta she drags a pole from the marsh 24
Here we can notice that the same structuring devices recur throughout the lines: *niin* is used over and over again to tie the lines together, while the personal enclitics *-nsA* and *-he* ("her") further mark structural unity. Although lines 27-28 seem to differ from the run of three lines interlarded with the repeated "Niin marja ylemmä nousi" ("Thus the berry rose up"—29, 31, 33), the interspersed lines retain the same adjective plus alliterating noun structure, the same use of the allative case *-lle*, and the same recurrence of personal markers as was introduced in the previous two lines. The overall effect of this progressively more elaborate run of lines 26-34 is that the culminating set of three lines (35-37) stands apart as terse and final, illustrating the interplay of long and short passages that pervades Arhippa’s songs.

As time progressed, and the corpus of poetry familiar to Lönnrot grew, so too, the minuteness of comparison of which Lönnrot was capable increased. In the revision of the *Kalevala* undertaken during the years 1847-48, we see Lönnrot associating poems on the basis of fragmentary congruence or partial thematic similarity. A firsthand observer, August Ahlqvist, described Lönnrot’s method for revising his epic in detail. According to Ahlqvist, Lönnrot had set up a large board on which he had displayed the contents of the *Kalevala*. After reading a passage from a collector’s notebook (be it his own or that of any of the several fieldworkers who contributed material for the revised *Kalevala*), Lönnrot consulted the board to locate the place where the passage would “best” fit. He then opened his copy of the *Kalevala* to the appropriate page and wrote in the alternate lines on one of the separate blank pages inserted into the
work for this purpose. The result of this months-long process was a resource book for the revision of the Kalevala so extensive that Lönrott wrote to his friend Fabian Collan in May of 1848: “Now the collected poems could well yield seven Kalevalas, each entirely different.” The fact that this process of association depended largely on Lönrott’s own internalization of the poems’ content is underscored by Ahlqvist’s comment: “This work would be much more difficult for someone else, since Lönrott knows almost every word of the Kalevala by heart so that in that way he needn’t consult his board so often but can go instead straight to the Kalevala.”

This process of text-building was for Lönrott not only largely associative but also necessarily sequential, in a manner that we may recognize as characteristic of literacy (Ong 1982,1986; Lord 1987). The poems that Lönrott had heard and learned first became the stem on which he grafted further texts, lisäyksiä (“additions”), much in the way that the initial string of cards in a game of solitaire provides the basis for all subsequent acts of association. Thus, since Arhippa’s Nativity was not collected until the year after Lönrott had created the proto-Kalevala (a first draft of the epic completed in 1833 but never published), the new poem had to be worked into a preexisting narrative framework that contained none of the Messiah Cycle poems. The existence of a Nativity poem in the final portion of Topelius’ anthology (Kaukonen 1979:20) along with the occurrence of a marsh seems to have led Lönrott to associate the poem’s Maria with the pregnant girl and condemned illegitimate son of the poem known by folklorists as Väinämöinen’s Judgment (Väinämöisen tuomio). Thus, although in the proto-Kalevala (in the manuscript entitled

---

7 “nyt kerätyistä runoista saisi hyvin seitsemän kappaletta Kalevaloja, kaikki erilaisia” (Kaukonen 1979:164).

8 “Vaan toisille olisi paljon vaikeampi tämä työ, sillä L. muistaa melkein joka sanan Kalevalasta ulkoa, eikä niinmuodoin tarvitse niin yhä katsoa tauluansa, menee vaan suoraan Kalevalaan” (Kaukonen 1979:162).

9 For translations of the Proto-Kalevala and 1835 Kalevala, see Magoun 1969; for a complete translation of the 1849 Kalevala’s Poem 50, see Magoun 1963.

10 Note that Lönrott’s final version of this poem both starts and ends in the marsh; see Appendix II.

11 For a classic examination of this poem’s reconstructed Urform, see Haavio 1950.
“Väinämöinen”) the Nativity story is entirely absent, the 1835 Kalevala has included those portions of the poem (with significant alterations; see below) leading up to the son’s mysterious disappearance (the beginning of section III in Arhippa’s text). At that point, Lönnrot ties the text to the beginning of his previous account of Väinämöinen’s judgment by placing the son not in the heavens but in a marsh—the place of illegitimate children condemned to infanticide. From there he will be rescued and condemned again to death by Väinämöinen, only to miraculously upbraid the ancient hero for his foolishness. In the 1849 Kalevala Lönnrot has included even more of Arhippa’s song, although, again, the child ends up in the same morass. Thus, although the Nativity song swells from 171 lines (its length in the 1835 version) to a full 341 lines (in the 1849 version), it remains narratively subordinated to the song of Väinämöinen’s Judgment, for which it becomes a kind of introductory excursus, leading to the important moment of Väinämöinen’s insulted departure from the land of Kalevala.

**Lönnrot vs. Arhippa: Clashing Aesthetic Systems**

It is in this act of linking poems that Lönnrot’s own ideas about poetry and narrative come to the fore. And here, too, Arhippa’s oral aesthetic finds its most concerted challenge. An examination of the beginning of Lönnrot’s Nativity sequence provides an apt example. Consider lines 73-88, similar in many details to their source in Arhippa’s performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arhippa’s Text</th>
<th>Lönnrot’s Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marjatta, korea kuopus</td>
<td>Marjatta comely youngest child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viikon viipyi paimenessa</td>
<td>long worked as a shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paha on olla paimenessa</td>
<td>it is hard to be a shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tyttölapsen liiatenki:</td>
<td>too much indeed for a girlchild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mato heinässä matavi</td>
<td>a worm slithers in the hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sisiliskot siuottavi.</td>
<td>lizards wriggle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ei mato maailmattaka</td>
<td>a worm really didn’t slither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sisilisko siuotellut</td>
<td>nor did a lizard wriggle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkui marjanen mäeltä</td>
<td>Cried a berry from the hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puolukkainen kankahalta:</td>
<td>a lingonberry from the marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Tule, neiti, noppimahan,</td>
<td>“Come maiden and pluck me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punaposki, poimimahan</td>
<td>red cheek pick me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tinarinta riipimihän</td>
<td>tin-breast gather me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vyö vaski valitsemahan</td>
<td>copper-belt choose me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If we compare Lönrot’s reworking of this passage to Arhippa’s original, we can note some of the ways in which Lönrot’s literary tastes cause him to alter the poem’s stylistic mechanisms and character motivations. In Arhippa’s version, for instance, the idea of the berry falling prey to lowly slithering beasts (etana, “snail”; mato, “worm”) stands as a poetic metaphor for natural decay: that which is not harvested by humans will be consumed by miserable scavengers. The berry calls for the maiden to save it from rotting on the vine. In Lönrot’s version, on the other hand, the berry clearly plays on the maiden’s delicate fear of slithering things. By prefacing the berry’s call with the lines “a serpent is slithering on the grass / lizards are wriggling there / the serpent did not really crawl / nor the lizard wriggle” (77-80), Lönrot creates a psychological character sketch of a high-strung maiden—one earlier elaborated by the various tasks that the overly modest girl refuses to do, e.g., eating fertile eggs (23-24) or the meat of once-pregnant ewes (25-26), touching cows’ teats (27-34), or riding in a sled drawn by sexually mature horses (35-42). The crafty berry uses the girl’s fears to trick her into consuming it. Finally, the passage is rounded out by lines that accord the maiden a unique position among countless other women similarly tempted by the berry. It is only the extremely modest, sensitive Marjatta who responds to the berry’s entreaty and fear tactics.

Lönrot’s text thus makes explicit both the motivations and the psychology of its characters, depicting them with foibles and guile absent from Arhippa’s poem. This tendency arises, of course, from the fact that for Arhippa the characters are already familiar to his audience. The Virgin Mary and Holy Spirit need no characterization; one need only invoke what Kellogg (1979) has called the “vast context of story”—the great intertextual or extratextual body of other narratives and knowledge shared by performer and audience alike, signalled metonymically, as Foley (1991, 1992) would put it, by the very use of their names or actions. When Lönrot chooses to desacralize the Virgin (a choice that we will examine below), the now-unfamiliar, faulted, and demonic figures he creates require explication entirely superfluous to Arhippa’s traditional performance. We will return to this particular and crucial difference between these two performances at the end of this paper.

For Lönrot, the cryptic brevity of Arhippa’s opening passage must have seemed deplorably incomplete, clearly the sign of a degenerated form. In addition to the lack of immediate psychological grounding, Lönrot
perceived at least three major lacks in this short passage, emended in his own version. First, in accordance with literary standards of his time, Lönnrot could not accept the notion that dialogue could precede character identification: both the berry and the maiden needed to be identified as characters and embedded in an interaction that would justify the dialogue. As a corollary to this initial structural shortcoming, Lönnrot must have felt that since the maiden becomes the more consequential character in the poem as a whole, she must be introduced first and in greater detail than the berry. The fact that Arhippa’s poem fails to identify the maiden in any way prior to the berry’s calling to her becomes evident as a narrative “flaw” when we notice the pains to which Lönnrot went to correct it. The opening lines of Poem 50 (1-42) are thus devoted to characterizing the maiden “Marjatta korea kuopus” (“Marjatta comely youngest child”), whose traits, by the way, are anything but divine. For Lönnrot, the opening must have seemed a naked dialogue scene calling for the textual grounding provided by the opening of the Väinämöinen’s Judgment poem.

The second major structural lack in the passage—from Lönnrot’s point of view—was the failure to explain how or why the maiden came to be in a marsh in the first place. The very expression “in the first place” here highlights the nineteenth-century literary habit of delineating place (setting/situation) as a necessary precondition to the presentation of plot details. There must be a reason, in other words, for the convergence of the characters in a certain spot and a basis for their eventual interaction. In a nineteenth-century Romantic epic sensibility dominated by works such as Macpherson’s Poems of Ossian, where place is elevated to the status of central theme, it would be unconscionable to allow the topographic vagueness of Arhippa’s poem to stand. Thus, Lönnrot provides a sound and logical justification for the maiden’s arrival in the marsh in lines 43-48: she has been sent there as a shepherdess and has been led to the marsh by her sheep. This explication provides information on not only where the maiden is, but also why she is there, harnessing the delineation of setting and character to the broader cause of emplotment. Marjatta sits on the hill in the marsh because she has been made a shepherdess, a task assigned to her in turn because of her overly modest refusal to do other types of household work. Characterization (lines 1-42) leads to a resultant situation and setting (43-58) that culminates in the dialogue.

Thirdly, however, Lönnrot must have found the berry’s initiation of the dialogue entirely too forward and abrupt, even given the elaborate preamble provided by the above-mentioned lines. Thus, in the 1849 Kalevala he places the first utterance of the conversation in Marjatta’s
mouth, making her sighingly question (in the manner of nineteenth-century pastoral heroines) her present condition and fated destiny:

Tuossa tuon sanoiksi virkki, \( \text{There she said a word} \) 59
itse lausui, noin nimesi: \( \text{herself uttered, thus spoke:} \) 60
“Kuku, kultainen käkönen, \( \text{“Cuckoo, golden cuckoo-bird} \) 61
hope’inen hoilattele, \( \text{call out, silver one,} \) 62
tinarinta, riukuttele, \( \text{tin-breast, sing out} \) 63
Saksan mansikka, sanel \( \text{German strawberry, say} \) 64
käynkö viikon villapääänä \( \text{will I live long with free hair} \) 65
kauan karjanpaimenena \( \text{spend much time as a shepherd} \) 66
näillä aavioilla ahoilla, \( \text{in these open clearings,} \) 67
leve’illä lehtomailla! \( \text{in these broad groves!} \) 68
Kesosenko, kaksosenko \( \text{One summer’s time, a pair,} \) 69
viitosenko, kuutosen \( \text{a fifth, a sixth} \) 70
vainko kymmenen keseä \( \text{perhaps ten whole years} \) 71
tahi ei täyttehen tätänä?” \( \text{or not fully that?} \)” 72

With these lines provided (drawn largely from lyric poems outside the Messiah cycle), Lönnrot creates a narrative sequence appropriate to the genre of nineteenth-century epic. The “completion” of Arhippa’s narrative “fragment” depends on Lönnrot’s own notions of narrative requisites and the associative processes that led him to connect Arhippa’s lines with those of other poems.

This associative process took place during the first stage of Lönnrot’s revisions: when collected lines were written in as “variants” (toisinnot) in the leaves of Lönnrot’s notebooks and modified Kalevala. Once this process of association was complete—a process mediated by literacy but also reliant on Lönnrot’s quasi-oral internalization of the tradition—the more fundamentally literary process of text-building could begin. But crucially, throughout both stages of the process, Lönnrot’s mindset remained unmistakably literate, conceiving of texts in a way that only someone learned in the ways of written literature would.

Lönnrot’s resultant emendations are very different from the kinds of variations evident in Arhippa’s three versions of the Nativity. Where Arhippa modifies his performance, it is for surface (though not trivial) aesthetic effect rather than fundamental narrative restructuring. Whether Maria sends her servant three times forth to search for a sauna (as in the version Arhippa performed for Lönnrot) or only once (as in the versions performed for Cajan and Castrén), the overall interactions, characterizations, and narrative events remain unchanged. The performance is varied to entertain, to refine, to surprise within the framework of its
tradition—not to “rewrite” the story. Such cannot be said, in contrast, of Lönnrot’s variations.

Maria and Marjatta: Intertextual Contexts

Chief among the transformations which Lönnrot effects in his use of the Nativity stands the desacralization of Maria, her conversion from “rakas äiti armollinen” (“dear Mother full of mercy/grace”) to “Marjatta korea kuopus” (“Marjatta comely youngest child”). This change is accomplished through more than simple epithet substitutions, however. Throughout Lönnrot’s text, the virgin is accorded emotions and reactions wholly absent from Arhippa’s Virgin, recasting her as a young, frail, and very human character. In the lines prior to the berry’s call (as discussed above) Marjatta is portrayed as overly modest and dreamy, and in the portion of the poem developed from Arhippa’s performance, Marjatta evinces nervousness (75-80), embarrassment (129-30), plaintiveness (156-60, 179-84), indignation (169-78, 195-200) and tearful sorrow (289-90). So humanized is the matala neiti (“lowly [i.e., deflowered] maiden”) that Lönnrot is able to place a very mortal midwife’s charm into her mouth (304-14) as a young mother’s prayer. Such entreaties to God are absent from Arhippa’s poem, probably because the Virgin is regarded as not needing to call on God for help, being always confident of his assistance.

For Arhippa, such attention to the emotive life of his protagonist would have seemed unnecessary or inappropriate. Arhippa’s Maria is dignified and forceful, even in her predicament: her entreaties of Piltti and of Ruotus’s wife, as well as those of the road, moon, and sun, are made with forceful insistence rather than high-strung plaintiveness. Likewise, her search for her son has a tone of empowerment absent from Lönnrot’s passive Marjatta. Indeed, when Arhippa supplies further epithets for Neitsy Maria (“Virgin Mary”) in other versions of the poem, these are ones that emphasize her sacredness: for example, “vanhin vaimoloista” (“oldest of women”) and “eläjien ensimäinen” (“first among beings”) (1836 version, SKVR I,2 1103a:11-12). And in the 1839 version of the poem sung for Castrén (SKVR I,2 1103c), the refusals of the road and moon to divulge the whereabouts of the child result in the Virgin cursing them, dooming them (in the manner of etiological Saints’ legends) to the lowly duties that they perform today.

Part of the reason for Arhippa’s silence regarding his protagonist’s emotions must lie also with the generic expectations of Finnish oral epic.
The lyric sentiment belonged to other kinds of songs in the Kalevalaic meter, for instance the *huolilaulu* (“song of cares”), *itkuvirsi* (“lament”), and certain wedding songs—and was marked as a particularly (though not exclusively) female theme (Timonen 1990a, b). Lönnrot’s readiness to transgress these generic bounds in his *Kalevala*, thus creating a mixed form atypical of the folk tradition, reflects his Romantic notions of the epic genre and nineteenth-century tastes born of such poets as Macpherson and Runeberg.

When one knows the folk poems that served as Lönnrot’s base, one can sense in the *Kalevala* both its author’s oral familiarity and the text’s written artificiality. There is a pulling together of detail and commentary that could arise only from a truly intimate knowledge of the main plot and form of the epic; at the same time, however, the plethora of addenda alert us to a mind working over time rather than within it and unaware of the complexities that underlay that momentary achievement of the oral performance.

Lönnrot’s Poem 50 differs from Arhippa’s *Nativity* in that the former places plot above all else, delineating characters that help convey the significance of the plot actions and deploying details so as to heighten and prolong the reader’s awareness of these actions. Arhippa’s *Nativity* does something entirely different. The plot is already known; it exists in the Bible. The *Nativity* is an intertextual, metonymic meditation on that plot, in which, I think, the hierarchy of importance that places action over character over place over detail is exactly inverted: now the details (sparse though they be) command prime attention, coupled with imaginatively (but economically) depicted settings, in which somewhat less important characters carry out nearly trivial acts. The sacred events within the narrative—the Annunciation, the Nativity, the Crucifixion—are camouflaged within metaphorical structures that operate as a somewhat puzzling allegorical narrative, sensible, nonetheless, to an audience “alive to the encoded signals for interpretation” (Foley 1992:293). It may be possible to conjecture, as Haavio did (1935:67-77), that the notion of an impregnating berry arose from a lax understanding of the “Hail Mary” or a misguided interpretation of a painted Flight into Egypt (in which the Virgin is often depicted riding a donkey and eating strawberries; Kuusi 1963:292-300), but Arhippa Perttunen, at least, knew better than that. For him, this poem was sacred and beloved, not because it was quaintly misinformed, but because it recapitulated a sacred event. It participated in a valuable way in the great unity of story that constituted the Christian message.
For Lönnrot, on the other hand, the Christianity of the poem poses certain problems. Most obviously, it strenuously resists any assumption of pre-Christian provenience, threatening as well to drag the other poems of the *Kalevala* into the Christian Middle Ages by association. Thus, somehow, Lönnrot must partition this most Christian of poems, set it off as different from its (earlier) counterparts. The most logical way to accomplish this end, is, of course, by placing it at the end of the epic and linking it to an ascribed era of conversion, when understandings of biblical events would have been tenuous and naive. The point can be driven home by enveloping the poem into the Väinämöinen cycle, making it not the recounting of a sacred act alone, but a detail in explaining how the pagan hero Väinämöinen came to leave his beloved songlands. The very human Marjatta becomes reminiscent of the Virgin Mary but not identical to her, further distancing the poem from its pious origin. And if most readers of the *Kalevala* would probably think of Poem 50 as a poem about Marjatta and the arrival of Christianity (for Marjatta, notwithstanding all Lönnrot’s emendations, remains an extremely appealing and central character), it is clear from Lönnrot’s own synopsis of the epic that for him Poem 50 was about Väinämöinen’s departure and the coming of Christianity. Marjatta is not even mentioned in the description of the epic Lönnrot wrote late in life:

> The last song, which gives an explanation of Väinämöinen’s departure, also signifies the downfall of paganism before the teachings of Christianity, said downfall being the principal reason for Väinämöinen’s leaving.12

In placing the Nativity at the end of his work, Lönnrot followed the lead established by Topelius in his earlier anthology, who accorded the poem the status of a “newer poem” reflective of a Roman Catholic era. But in embedding this Christian song in a pagan heroic epic carefully cleansed of other overtly Christian references before its final canto, Lönnrot was acting entirely on his own, accomplishing a transformation that he no doubt believed reflected the poem’s original state, but that can hardly be regarded as a slight emendation.

In essence, Arhippa’s *Nativity* is a complex oral meditation, Lönnrot’s Poem 50 a complex literary explanation. Arhippa’s song

---
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provides a metaphoric recapitulation of the birth and death of Christ, focusing on that female (p)recapitulation of Christ himself, the Virgin Mary. Lönrot’s poem, for its part, provides an explanation of how the prior 49 poems of the 1849 Kalevala fit into Finnish history: Poem 50 is the single point in the epic in which the mythic, legendary, and quasi-historical elements of the poems meet the solid earth of historical reality in the moment of conversion. If Väinämöinen is compelled to leave by the arrival of Christianity, symbolized (but no longer necessarily embodied) in the son of Marjatta, then all the narrative events prior to that moment must have occurred in the pre-Christian past. There is no need to wonder whether some of the poems may be of more recent vintage: the Christian elements so assiduously expunged from the prior 49 poems must have been late additions, removed by a judicious editor.

Examining Arhippa’s oral performance and Lönrot’s literary text side by side teaches us a great deal about the traditional poetics of Finland and the nineteenth-century ideals of its Romantic elite. Each man looked to a different aesthetic system for his foundation, and built songs with tools characteristic of that world. Arhippa found his groundings in the oral tradition of his father, and created a text structured through devices typical of that same tradition. Lönrot found his groundings in the intellectual movements of his day, and created a text structured along contemporary literary lines. And each man embedded his particular song of a maiden and child in a different “vast context of story”: the miracle of the Christian revelation for Arhippa, and the miracle of a national soul for Lönrot.
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Appendix 1

SKVR 1,2 1103 Latvaj. Lönnrot AII 6, n. 93 1834. Arhippa Perttunen
[Present translation based in part on Kuusi et al. 1977:283-91.]

I. The Berry and Mary

Marjanen mäeltä huuti puna puola kankahalta “Tule neiti poimomahan vyö vaski valitsemahan ennen kun etona syöpi mato musta muikkoali!”

Neitsy Maaria emonen rakas äiti armollinen viitisekse vaatisekse pää somille suorieli vaatehilla valkehilla

A berry called from the hill a cranberry from the marsh: “Come maiden and pick me copper-belt choose me before the snail consumes the black worm destroys!”

Virgin Mary little mother dear mother full of grace dresses, adorns wrapped her head in a headdress in clothes of white
Läksi marjan poimentaan She went to pick the berry  12
punapuolan katsontaan the cranberry to see to  13
niin meni mäille, sano thus she went to the hills, say  14
keksi marjasen meältä she picked the berry on the hill  15
punapuolan kankahalta the berry on the marsh  16
On marja näkemiehen It looks like a berry  17
*puola ilman luomeehen* 13  *a cranberry without interest*  18
alahahko ois maasta syöä too low to eat from the ground  19
ylähähkö puuhun nosta. too high from a tree.  20
Tempo kartun kankahalta She drags a pole from the marsh  21
senni päällä seisatken and standing on that  22
heitit marjan helmohinsa she threw the berry into her lap  23
helmoiltansa vyönsä päälle from her lap onto her belt  24
vyönsä päältä rinoillensa from her belt onto her breast  25
rinoiltansa huulellensa from her breast onto her lip  26
huuleltansa kieellensä from her lip onto her tongue  27
siitä vatsahan valahti. from there it slid into the stomach.  28

II. Mary, Piltti, and Ugly Ruotus’ Wife

Siitä tyyty siitä täyty Sated from that, filled from that  29
siitä paksuki panihen grew fat from that  30
lihavaksi liittelihen added weight  31
niinkohun kovoa kanto thus a heavy womb she carries  32
vatsan täyttä vaikieta a stomach full of trouble  33
Kanto kuuta 2, 3 She carries it for months 2, 3  34
3 kuuta, 4 kuuta 3 months, 4 months  35
4 kuuta 5 kuuta 4 months, 5 months  36
7:n kaheksan kuuta 7, 8 months  37
ympäri 9 kuuta around 9 months  38
vanhojen vaimon määriin as old women count  39
kuuta 1/2 10. half of the tenth month  40
Niin kuulla 10:llä Thus in the tenth month  41
lyöäh kavon kipua There strikes the pain of wives  42
imen tulta taikatah the fire of girls sparks  43

13 The asterisk (*) denotes lines ellipticized in the recorder’s fieldnotes but supplied by the editors of SKVR.
vaimon vaivaksi tuleepi a wife’s trial comes 44

Sanan virkko noin nimesi: She says a word, uttered thus: 45

“Piltti pieni piikaseni “Piltti my little servant girl 46
lähe kylpyä kylästä go find a bath in the village 47
saunoa Sarajahasta a sauna in Saraja 48
jossa huono hoivan saisi where a wretch can receive attention 49
avun anke tarvitsisi.” help for the luckless one in need.” 50

Piltti pieni piikojansa Piltti her little servant girl 51
hyvä kielas käskieki good at taking orders 52
keipiä kehuttuoaki easy to persuade, 53
sekkä juoki jotta joutu both ran and rushed 54
ylähäiset maat aleni pulled down the highlands 55
alahäiset maat yleni pulled up the lowlands 56
Ruman Ruotuksen kotihin. to Ugly Ruotus’ (Herod’s) home. 57

Ruma Ruotus paitulainen Ugly Ruotus shirt-sleeved one 58
syöpi juopi pöyän päässä eats, drinks at the table’s head 59
päässä pöyän pääillaan at table’s head in his shirt-sleeves 60
aivin aivinaisillaan in his clean linen 61
elääpi hyvän tavalla he lives life well 62

Ruma Ruotuksen emäntä Ugly Ruotus’wife 63
liikku keski lattiella moves about the middle of the floor 64
lieho sillan liitoksella lightly treds upon the floorjoint 65

Sano Piltti piikojansa Says Piltti her little servant girl 66
“Läksin kylpyä kylästä “I went to find a bath in the village 67
saunoa Sarajahasta a sauna in Saraja 68
jossa huono hoivan saisi where a wretch can receive attention 69
avun anke tarvitsisi.” help for the luckless one in need.” 70

Ruma Ruotuksen emäntä Ugly Ruotus’s wife 71
sanan virkko noin nimesi says a word uttered thus 72

“Ei ole kylpyä kylässä “There is not a bath in the village 73
saunoa Sarajahasssa a sauna in Saraja 74
On talli Tapo meällä There is a stable on Tapo hill 75
huone hongikko koissa a room in a fir grove house 76
johon portot pojan saapi where whores go to have a son 77
tuulen lautat lapsen saapi.” harlots to have a child.” 78

Piltti pieni piikojansa Piltti her little servant girl 79
pian juoksi jotta joutu soon ran and rushed 80
sano tuolta tultuaan says once she’s returned from there 81

“Ei ole kylpyä kylässä “There is not a bath in the village 82
saunoa Sarajahasssa a sauna in Saraja 83

Ruma Ruotus paitulainen Ugly Ruotus the shirt-sleeved 84
syöpi juopi yöyan päässä eats, drinks at the table’s head 85
päässä yöyan paiollaan at table’s head in his shirt-sleeves 86
aivin aivinaisillaan in his clean linen 87
elääpi hyvän tavalla he lives life well 88

Ruma Ruotuksen emäntä Ugly Ruotus’ wife 89
liikkuk keski lattiella moves about the middle of the floor 90
liehu sillan liitoksella lightly treds upon the floor-joint 91

Mie sanon sanalla tuolla I say these words when there 92

‘Läksin kylpyä kylästä ‘I went to find a bath in the village 93
saunoa Sarajahasta a sauna in Saraja 94
jossa huono hoivan saapi where a wretch can receive attention 95
avun anke tarvitseepi.’ help for the luckless one in need.’ 96

Ruma Ruotuksen emäntä Ugly Ruotus’ wife: 97
‘Ei ole kylpyä kylässä ‘There is not a bath in the village 98
saunoa Sarajahasssa a sauna in Saraja 99
On talli Tapo mäellä There is a stable on Tapo hill 100
huone hongikko keolla a room in a fir grove house 101
johon portot pojan saapi where whores go to have a son 102
tuulen lautat lapsen luopi’.” harlots to make a child’.” 103

Vaimon vaivalle tuleepi A wife’s trial comes 104
Neitsy Maaria emonen Virgin Mary little mother 105
niin sano toisen kerran thus says a second time 106

“Sekä juokse jotta jouvu “Both run and rush 107
mene kylpyä kylästä go find a bath in the village 108
saunoa Sarajahasta a sauna in Saraja 109
jossa huono hoivan saisi where a wretch can receive attention 110
avun anke tarvitseisi.” help for the luckless one in need.” 111

Piltti pieni piikojansa Piltti her little servant girl 112
hyvä kieläs käsikieki good at taking orders 113
kepiä kehuttuoki easy to persuade 114
sekä juoksi both ran 115
Ruma Ruotus jotta joutu Ugly Ruotus and rushed 116
alahaiset maat yleni pulled down the highlands 117
ylähaiset maat aleni pulled up the lowlands 118
Ruma Ruotus paitulainen Ugly Ruotus the shirt-sleeved 119
syöpi juopi pöyän päässä eats, drinks at the table’s head 120
päässä pöyän paiollaan at table’s head in his shirt-sleeves 121
aivin aivinaisillaan in his clean linen 122
elääpi hyvän tavalla he lives life well 123
Sano Piltti piikojansa Says Piltti her servant girl 124
“Läksin kylpyä kylästä “I went to find a bath in the village 125
saunoa Sarajahasta a sauna in Saraja 126
jossa huono hoivan saisi where a wretch can receive attention 127
avun anke tarvitsisi.” help for the luckless one in need” 128
Ruma Ruotuksen emäntä Ugly Ruotus’ wife 129
liikku keski lattiella moves about the middle of the floor 130
liehu sillan liitoksella lightly treds upon the floor-joint 131
sanan virkko noin nimesi says a word utters thus 132
“Eule kylpyä kylässä “There is not a bath in the village 133
saunoa Sarajahasssa a sauna in Saraja 134
On talli Tapomäellä There is a stable on Tapo hill 135
huone hongikkokeolla a room in a fir grove house 136
johon portot pojan saapi where whores go to have a son 137
tuulen lautat lapsen luopi.” harlots to make a child.” 138
Piltti pieni piikojansa Piltti her little servant girl 139
sekä juoksi jotta joutu both ran and rushed 140
sano tuolta tultuaan says once she’s returned from there 141
“Eule kylpyä kylässä “There is not a bath in the village 142
saunoa Sarajahasssa. a sauna in Saraja. 143
Ruman Ruotuksen emäntä Ugly Ruotus’s wife 144
sanan virkko noin nimesi says a word utters thus 145
‘On talli Tapomeällä ‘There is a stable on Tapo hill 146
huone hongikkokeolla a room in a fir grove house 147
johon portot pojan saapi where whores go to have a son 148
tuulen lautat lapsen luopi.’ harlots to make a child.’ 149
Niin sanoo mokomin.” Thus something like that she says.” 150
Oli aikoa vähäsen There was little time 151
yhä tuskaksi tuleepi still the pain comes 152
painuupi pakolliseksi presses into aches 153
vaimon vaivoksi tuleepi. a wife’s trial comes. 154

*Kohtu käänty kovaksi etc.* the womb turns heavy 155
[vatsan täytyt vaikieksi] [the stomach full of trouble]

sanan virkko noin nimesi says a word uttered thus 156

“Piltti pieni piikaseni “Piltti my little servant girl 157
lähe kylypyä kylästä go find a bath in the village 158
saunoa Sarajahasta a sauna in Saraja 159
jossa huono hoivan saisi where a wretch can receive attention 160
avun anke tarvitsisi.” help for the luckless one in need.” 161

Piltti pieni piikojansa Piltti her little servant girl 162
sekä juoksi jotta joutu both ran and rushed 163
alahaiset maat yleni pulled up the lowlands 164
ylähäiset maat aleni pulled down the highlands 165
Ruman Ruotuksen kotihin to Ugly Ruotus’ home 166

Ruma Ruotus paitolainen Ugly Ruotus the shirt-sleeved 167
syöpi juopan pöyän päässä eats, drinks at the table’s head 168
päässä pöyän paiollaan at table’s head in his shirt-sleeves 169
elääpi hyvän tavalla he lives life well 170

Ruma Ruotuksen emäntä Ugly Ruotus’ wife 171
liikku keski lattiella moves about the middle of the floor 172
liehu sillan liitoksella lightly treds upon the floor-joint 173

Piltti pieni piikojansa Piltti her little servant girl 174
sanan virkko noin nimesi says a word uttered thus 175

“Läksin kylypyä kylästä “I went to find a bath in the village 176
saunoa Sarajahasta a sauna in Saraja 177
jossa huono hoivan saisi where a wretch can receive attention 178
avun anke tarvitsisi.” help for the luckless one in need.” 179

Ruma Ruotuksen emäntä Ugly Ruotus’s wife 180
sanan virkko noin nimesi says a word uttered thus 181

“Ei ole kylypyä kylästä “There is not a bath in the village 182
saunoa Sarajahassa a sauna in Saraja 183
On talli Tapomeäille There is a stable on Tapo hill 184
huoni hongikko keolla a room in a fir grove house 185
johon portot pojan saapi where whores go to have a son 186

---

14 Lines in brackets ([ ] ) were added by the present author to complete ellipses occurring in the original text and denoted by “etc.”
tuulen lautat lapsen luopi.”  harlots to make a child.”  187

Piltti pieni piikosehe  Piltti her little servant girl  188
sekä juoksi jotta joutu  both ran and rushed  189
sano tuolta tultuaan  says once she’s returned from there  190

“Ei ole kylpyä kylässä  “There is not a bath in the village  191
saunoa Sarajahassa  a sauna in Saraja  192
jossa huono hoivan saisi  where a wretch can receive attention  193
avun anke tarvitsisi.  help for the luckless one in need.  194

Ruma Ruotuksen emäntä  Ugly Ruotus’ wife  195
sanan virkko noin nimesi  says a word uttered thus  196

‘On talli Tapomeällä  ‘There is a stable on Tapo hill  197
huone hongikkokeolla  a room in a fir grove house  198
johon portot pojan saapi  where whores go to have a son  199
tuulen lautat lapsen luopi.’  harlots to make a child’.”  200

Oli aikoa vähäsen  There was little time  201
vaimon vaivakse tulee  a wife’s trial comes  202
kohtu kääntyy kovaksi  the womb turns heavy  203
vatsan täysä vaikieksi  the stomach full of troubles  204
Otti vassan varjoksensa  She took a sauna-whisk for protection  205
koprin helmansa kokoili  gathered her skirt in her fists  206
käsin kääri vaatteensa  wound up her clothes in her hands  207
itse noin sanoiksi virkki  herself thus put in words  208

“Lähtie minun tuleepi  “Go I must  209
niin kun muinenki kasakan  just like a farmhand of old  210
eli orjan palkkalaisen.”  or a serf, a hireling.”  211

Astua taputteloo  She steps lightly  212
huonehesen hongikolle  to the room in the fir grove  213
tallih on Tapomeälle  to the stable on Tapo hill  214
niin sano sanalla tuolla  thus she says in words when there  215

“Hengeäs hyvä heponen  “Breathe good horse  216
vatsan kautti vaivallisen  across my troubled stomach  217
kyly löyly löyhähytä  bathhouse heat let loose  218
sauna lämpönen lähetä  sauna warmth send off  219
vatsan kautti vaivallisen  across my troubled stomach  220
jossa huono hoivan saisi  where a wretch can receive attention  221
avun anke tarvitsisi.”  help for the luckless one in need.”  222

Hengäsi hyvä heponen  Breathed the good horse  223
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finnish Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kylyn löylyn löyähytti</td>
<td>bathhouse heat let loose</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sauna lämpösen lähetti</td>
<td>sauna warmth sent off</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vatsan kautti vaivallisen</td>
<td>across the troubled stomach</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jouluna Jumala synty</td>
<td>On Christmas God is born</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paras poika pakkasella</td>
<td>the best boy in the frost</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synty heinille heposen</td>
<td>born onto the hay of horses</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suora jouhen soimen päähän</td>
<td>into the straight-mane’s manger</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. Mary, the Road, the Moon, and the Sun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finnish Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neitsy Maria emonen</td>
<td>Virgin Mary little mother</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rakas äiti armollinen</td>
<td>dear mother full of grace</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pilletteli poiuttahan</td>
<td>she hid her son</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kullaista omenoansa</td>
<td>her golden apple</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alla sieklan sieklottavan</td>
<td>under a sieve for sifting</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alla korvon kannettavan</td>
<td>under a pail for carrying</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alla jouksovan jalaksen</td>
<td>under a running sled runner</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kato pieni poikuoh</td>
<td>The little son disappears</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kultainen omenuutensa</td>
<td>her golden apple</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alta sieklan sieklottavan</td>
<td>from under a sieve for sifting</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alta juoksevan jalaksen</td>
<td>from under a running sled runner</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alta korvon kannettavan</td>
<td>from under a pail for carrying</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etsi pientä poiuttansa</td>
<td>She searched for her little son</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kullaista omenoansa</td>
<td>her golden apple</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kesällä kevysin pursin</td>
<td>in summer with a light boat</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talvella lylyin lipein</td>
<td>in winter with sliding skis</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etsittiin vain ei löytty</td>
<td>He was searched for but not found</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neitsy Maaria emonen</td>
<td>Virgin Mary little mother</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kävi teitä asteloo</td>
<td>walked roads, stepped</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiehyt vastaan tulevi</td>
<td>She comes upon a road</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niin tielle kumarteleksen</td>
<td>thus bowing to the road</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itse noin sanoiksi virikki</td>
<td>herself she put in words thus</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Tiehyöt Jumalan luoma”</td>
<td>“Road, God’s creation”</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>näitkö pientä poiuttani</td>
<td>have you seen my little son</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kullaista omenoani?”</td>
<td>my golden apple?”</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tie vastaan sanoo:</td>
<td>The road in response says</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Jos tietäisin en sanoisi”</td>
<td>“If I knew I would not say”</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSFORMATION IN LÖNNROT’S KALEVALA

poikas’ on minunki luonut
ratsuilla ajettavaksi
kovic kengin käytäväksi.”

Neitsy Maaria emonen
rakas äiti armollinen
aina etsivi etemmä

kuuhut vastaan tulevi
niin kuulle kumarteleksen
*itse noin sanoiksi virkki*

*Kuu se vastaan sanoo
“Jos tietäisin en sanoisi
poikais on minunki luonut
päivällä katoamahan
yön on aian paistamahan.”

Aina eistyppi etemmä
Neitsy Maaria emonen
rakas äiti armollinen
etsi pientä poiuttansa
kullaista omenoansa

saat vastaan tulevi
päivälle kumarteleksen

“Sie kuuhut Jumalan luoma
näätkö pientä poiuttani
kullaista omenoani?”

“Sie päivä Jumalan luoma”
Näätkö pientä poiuttani
kullaista omenoani?”

Niin päivä Jumalan luoma
sanan virkko noin nimesi

“Poikas’ on minunki luonut
päivän ajan paistamahan
yön ajan lepäämähän

Tuolla on pieni poikuosi
kultainen omenasi
ylisessä taivosessa
isän Jumalan sialla

There is your little son
your golden apple
in the high heavens
in God the Father’s place

he’ll come from there to judge.”
Appendix II

Elias Lönnrot, New Kalevala (1849), Poem 50:ll. 73-420 (Stanzaic divisions as in Lönnrot’s text).

Marjatta, korea kuopus  Marjatta comely youngest child  73
viikon viipyi paimenessa long worked as a shepherd  74
paha on olla paimenessa it is hard to be a shepherd  75
tyttölapsen liiatenki: too much indeed for a girlchild  76
mato heinässä matavi a worm slithers in the hay  77
sisiliskot siuottavi. lizards wriggle  78
Ei mato maaellutkana a worm really didn’t slither  79
sisilisko siuotellut nor did a lizard wriggle  80
Kirkui marjanen mäeltä Cried a berry from the hill  81
puolukkainen kankahalta: a lingonberry from the marsh  82
“Tule, neiti, noppimahan, “Come maiden and pluck me  83
punaposki, poimimahan red-cheek pick me  84
tinarinta riipimähän tin-breast gather me  85
vyö vaski valitsemahan copper-belt choose me  86
ennenkuin etana syöpi before the snail consumes  87
mato musta muikkoavi! the black worm destroys!  88
Sata on saanut katsomahan A hundred have come to look at me  89
tuhat ilman istumahan a thousand just to sit by me  90
sata neittä, tuhat naista a hundred maidens, a thousand women  91
lapsia epälukuisin children beyond count  92
ei ken koskisi minuhun no one would touch me  93
poimisi minun poloisen.” pick poor little me.”  94

Marjatta, korea kuopus  Marjatta comely youngest child  95
meni matkoa vähäisen went a little way  96
meni marjan katsantahan went to look at the berry  97
punuopan poimintahan to pick the lingonberry  99
kätösillä kaunihilla with her beautiful hands  100
Keksi marjasen mäeltä She picked the berry on the hill  101
punuopan kankahalta: the lingonberry on the marsh:  102
on marja näkemiänsä It looks like a berry  103
puola ilmoin luomiansa a lingonberry without interest  104
ylähäkkö maasta syöä too high to eat from the ground  105
alalahko puuhun nousi! too low to climb into the tree  106

Tempoi kartun kankahalta She dragged a pole from the marsh  107
jolla marjan maahan sorti by which she knocked the berry to  108
niinpä marja maasta nousi the ground  109
kaunoisille kautoloille thus the berry rose from the ground  109

kaunosilta kautoloilta from the shoetops 111
puhtahille polviloille to the spotless knees 112
puhtahilta polviloilta from the spotless knees 113
heleville helmasille. to the bright apron-hem. 114
Nousi siitä yöriivoille It rose from there to the waistline 115
vyörivoilta rinnoillensa from the waistline to her breast 116
rinnoiltansa leuoillensa from her breast to her chin 117
leuoiltansa huulillensa from her chin to her lips 118
siitä suuhun suikahutti from there it slipped into the mouth 119
keikahutti kielellensä tripped quickly on her tongue 120
kieleltä keruksisihin from the tongue into the throat 121
siitä vatsahan valahti. from there it slid into the stomach. 122

Marjatta, korea kuopus Marjatta comely youngest child 123
tuosta tyytyi, tuosta täytyi grew sated from that, filled from that 124
tuosta paksuksi panihe grew fat from that 125
lihavaksi liittelihe. added weight. 126
Alkoi pauloitta asua She began to live without a waistband 127
ilman vyöttä völlehtiä to lie about without a belt 128
käyä saunassa saloa to visit the sauna in secret 129
pime’issä pistelläitä to frequent in the darkness 130
Emo aina arvelevi The mother ever wondered 131
äitinsä ajattelevi: her mother thought about it: 132
“Mi on meiän Marjatalla “What is going on with Marjatta 133
ku meiän kotikanalla with our homespun hen 134
kun se pauloitta asuvi that she lives without a waistband 135
aina vyöttä völlehtivä ever lies about without a belt 136
käypi saunassa saloa visits the sauna in secret 137
pime’issä pisteleikse?” frequents in the darkness?” 138

Lapsi saattavi sanoa A child thought to say 139
lapsi pieni lausuella: a little child to declare: 140
“Se on meiän Marjatalla “This is what’s with Marjatta 141
sepä Kurjetta rukalla this with luckless Mari 142
kun oli paljon paimenessa she was working much as a shepherd 143
kauan karjassa käveli.” walked long among the herd.” 144

Kantoi kohtua kovoa She carried a heavy womb 145
vatsantäyttä vaikeata a stomach full of trouble 146
kuuta seitsemän, kaheksan months seven, eight 147
ynähän yhksän kuuta, a ninth month as well 148
vaimon vanha’an lukuhun as an old woman numbers it 149
kuuta puolen kymmenettä. half of the tenth month. 150

Niin kuulla kymmenennellä Thus in the tenth month 151
impi tuskalle tulevi the virgin begins to hurt 152
kohtu kääntyvi kovaksi
painuvi pakolliseksi.

Kysyi kylpyä emolta
“Oi emoni armahani
laita suojoa sijoa
lämpymyttä huonehutta
piian pieniksi pyhiksi
vaimon vaivahuonehksi!”

Kysyi kylpyä emolta
“Oi emoni armahani
laita suojoa sijoa
lämpymyttä huonehutta
piian pieniksi pyhiksi
vaimon vaivahuonehksi!”

Emo saattavi sanoa
oma vanhin vastaella
“Voi sinua, hiien huora!
Kenen oot makaelema? Ootko miehen naimattoman
eli nainehen urohon?”

Marjatta korea kuopus
tuop’ on tuohon vastoavi:
“En ole miehen naimattoman
enkä nainehen urohon.
Menin marjahan mäelle
punapuolan poimentahan
otin marjan mieelle
toisen kerran kielellä.
Se kävi kerustimille
siitä vatsahan valahti
työssä tuostaa täyssä
sain kohulliseksi.”

Kysyi kylpyä isolta:
“Oi isoni armahani!
Anna suojoa sijoa
lämpymyttä huonehutta
jossa huono hoivan saisi
piika piinansa pitäisi!”

iso saattavi sanoa
taatto taisi vastaella:
“Mene portto poikemmaksi
tulen lautta tuonemmja
kontion kivikoloihin
karhun louhikammoihin
sinne, portto poikimahan
tulen lautta lapsimahan!”

 Iso saattavi sanoa
taatto taisi vastaella:
“Mene portto poikemmaksi
tulen lautta tuonemmja
kontion kivikoloihin
karhun louhikammoihin
sinne, portto poikimahan
tulen lautta lapsimahan!”

The mother thought to say
her elder to answer:
“Woe to you, demon’s mistress!
Whom have you slept with?
With an unmarried man
or a married husband?”

Marjatta comely youngest child
answered this to that:
“Not with an unmarried man
nor a married husband.
I went to the berry on the hill
to pick a lingonberry
I took the berry gladly
a second time on my tongue
It travelled into my throat
from there it slid into the stomach
I grew sated from that, filled from that
from that I became pregnant.”

The father thought to say
the father knew to answer:
“Go, whore, be off
Give me a cozy place
a warm room
where a wretch can receive attention
a girl pass her pain!”

Harlot, away
to the brown one’s stone-piles
to the bear’s rock den
there, whore, to give birth
harlot to bear a child!”
Marjatta korea kuopus  Marjatta comely youngest child  193
tuop’ on taiten vastaeli:  knowingly answered this:  194
“En mä portto ollekan  “I am not a whore at all  195
tulen lautta lienikänä.  not a harlot indeed.  196
Olen miehen suuren saava I am to bear a great man  197
jalon synynn synnyttää  to give birth to one of noble birth  198
joll’ on valta vallallenki  who will have power over the powerful  199
väki Väinämöisellenki.”  even over the people of Väinämöinen.”  200

Jo on piika pintehissä  Already the girl is perplexed  201
minne mennä kunne käyä where to go, where to visit  202
kusta kylpyä kysellä  where to ask for a bath  203
Sanan virkko noin nimesi:  She said a word uttered thus:  204

“Piltti pienin piikojani  “Piltti my littlest serving girl  205
paras palkkalaisian!  best of my hirelings!  206
Käypää kylpyää kylästä  Go get a bath in the village  207
saunoa Saraojalta a sauna in Saraoja  208
jossa huono hoivan saisi  where a wretch can receive attention  209
piika piinansa pitäisi!  a girl pass her pain!  210
Käy pian välehen jou’u  Go soon and hurry  211
välehemmin tarvitahan!”  you will need to hasten!”  212

Piltti, piika pikkarainen Piltti her small servant girl  213
sanan virkko noin nimesi: said a word uttered thus:  214
“Keltä mä kysyn kylyä  “Whom shall I ask for a sauna  215
keltä aihelen apua?” whom shall I entreat for help?”  216

Sanoi meiän Marjattainen Our small Marjatta said  217
itse virkki noin nimesi: herself said, uttered thus:  218
“Kysy Ruotuksen kylyä  “Ask for Ruotus’ sauna  219
saunoa Sarajan-suista!” a sauna at the edge of Saraja!”  220

Piltti piika pikkarainen Piltti small servant girl  221
tuo oli nöyrä neuvottava she was easy to advise  222
kärkäs ilman kääsemättä spry without ordering  223
kehummattaki kepeä quick without persuading  224
utuna ulos menevi goes out like mist  225
savuna pihalle saapi. like smoke into the farmyard.  226
Kourin helmansa kokosi She gathered her apron-hem in her palms  227
käsin kääri vaatehensa wound up her clothes in her hands  228
sekä juoksi jotta joutui both ran and rushed  229
kohin Ruotuksen kotia. toward Ruotus’ home.  230
Mäet mätky vienissä The hills rang out as she went  231
vaarat notkui noutessansa the mountains clamored as she climbed  232
kävyt hyppi kankahalla the pinecones jostled in the marsh  233
somertet hajosi suolla   the gravel scattered in the swamp 234
Tuli Ruotuksen tupahan   She came to Ruotus’ house 235
sai sisälle salvokseen.   got inside the log building. 236
Ruma Ruotus paitulainen   Ugly Ruotus shirt-sleeved one 237
syöpi juopi suurten lailla   eats, drinks in the manner of the great 238
päässä pöyään paioillansa   at table’s head in his shirt-sleeves 239
aivan aivinaisillansa   in his clean linen 240
Lausui Ruotus ruoaltansa   Ruotus declared from over his food 241
tiuskui tiskinsä nojalta:   scolded from beside his plate 242
“Mitä sie sanot katala?  “What do you have to say, good-for-nothing 243
Kuta kurja juoksentelet?”  why, luckless one, do you run about?” 244
Piltti piika pikkarainen   Piltti small servant girl 245
sanan virkkoi noin nimesi:   said a word uttered thus: 246
“Läksin kylpyä kylästä  “I went to find a bath in the village 247
saunoa Saraojalta   a sauna in Saraoja 248
jossa huono hoivan saisi   where a wretch can receive attention 249
avun ange tarvitseisi.”   help for the luckless one in need.” 250
Ruma Ruotuksen emäntä   Ugly Ruotus’ wife 251
käet puuskassa käveli   walked with hands on her hips 252
liehoi sillan liitoksella   lightly treds upon the floor-joint 253
laahoi keskilattialla   thudded about the middle of the floor 254
Itse ennätti kysyä   Herself f had time to ask 255
sanan virkkoi noin nimesi:   said a word uttered thus: 256
“Kellen kylpyä kyselet   “For whom do you ask for a bath 257
kellen aihelet apua?”   for whom do you entreat for help?” 258
Sanoi piltti (sic) pieni piika:   Said Piltti15 the little girl: 259
“Kysyn meiän Marjatalle.”  “I ask for our Marjatta” 260
Ruma Ruotuksen emäntä   Ugly Ruotus’ wife 261
itse tuon sanoiksi virkki:   herself put this into words: 262
“Ei kylyt kylähän joua   “There are no bathhouses in the village 263
ei saunat Sarajan suulta.   no saunas at the edge of Saraja 264
On kyly kyöömäellä   There is a bathhouse on the burned-over hill 265
hepohuone hongikossa   a stable in a fir grove 266
tuliporton poiat saa’a   for a whore to have a son 267
lautan lapsensa latoa:   a harlot to create a child: 268

15 Here Lönnrot’s text reads *piltti*, implying the term should be taken as an epithet for “young girl” rather than as a proper name. Since the word seems to be treated as a proper name in the rest of the text, however, and in Lönnrot’s *Kanteletar*, I have capitalized it here.
kun hevonen hengännevi
niinp’ on siinä kylpeötte!”

Piltti piika pikkarainen
pian pistihe takaisin
sekä juoksik jotta joutui
Sanoa tultua ta’atse:
“Ei ole kylpyä kylässä
saunoa Saraojalla.

Ruma Ruotuksen emäntä
sanan virkkoi noin nimesi:
’Ei kylty kylähän joua
ei saunat Sarajan suulta.
On kyly kytömäellä
hepohuone hongikossa

Marjatta matala neiti
tuosta täytyi itkemähän.
Itse tuon sanoiski virkki:
“Lähteä minun tulevi
niinkuin muinenki kasakan
—lähteä kytömäelle
käyä hongikkokeolle!”

Käsin kääri vaattehensa
kourin helmansa kokosi
otti vastan varjoksensa
lehen lempi suojaksensa.
Astuin taputtelevi
vatsanvaivoissa kovissa
huonehesen hongikkohon
tallihin Tapiomäelle.

Sanovi sanalla tuolla
lausi tuolla lausehella:
“Tule Luoja, turvakseni
avukseni armollinen
näissä töissä työlahissä
when the horse breathes
then you can bathe!”
Piltti the little servant girl
soon comes back
both ran and rushed
said once she’d returned from there:
“There is no bath in the village
no sauna in Saraoja.

Ugly Ruotus’ wife
said a word uttered thus
‘There is no bathhouse in the village
no saunas at the edge of Saraja.
There is a bathhouse on the burned-over hill
for a whore to have a son
for a harlot to create a child:
when the horse breathes
then you can bathe inside!’
Thus it is, she said like that,
thus just so she answered.”
Marjatta lowly maiden
began to cry at that
herself put into words:
“Go I must
just like a farmhand of old
or a serf, a hireling
—go to the burned-over hill
visit the fir grove!”
She wound up her clothes in her hands
gathered her apron-hems in her palms
She took a sauna-whisk for protection
a dear leaf-bundle for shelter
She stepped lightly
in heavy stomach pains
to the room in the fir grove
to the stable on Tapio hill.
She says these words
declared this in speaking:
“Come, Creator, to give me refuge
to help me, dear one
in these strenuous tasks
ajoissa ani kovissa!
in these heavy times!

Päästä piika pintehestä
Deliver the girl from this pain

vaimo vatsanvääntehestä
the wife from this stomach-ache

ettei vaivoihin vajoisi
that she not succumb to her pains

tuskihinsa tummeneisi!”
fall beneath her trials.”

Niin perille päästynänsä
Thus arriving at the place

itse tuon sanoiksi virkki:
herself she put in words:

“Henkeäs hyvä hevonen
“Breathe, good horse

huokasi vetäjä varsa
puffed, young draft horse

kylylöyly löyhäytä
bathhouse heat let loose

sauna lämpöinen lähetä
sauna warmth send off

jotta, huono, hoivan saisin!
that I, poor one, can find attention!

Avun, ange, tarvitseisin.”
Help for me, the luckless one, in need.”

Henkäsi hyvä hevonen
Breathed the good horse

huokasi vetäjä varsa
puffed the young draft horse

vatsan kautta vaivaloisen:
across the troubled stomach:

min hevonen hengitäväi
when the horse breathed

on kuin löyly lyötäessä
it was like letting loose sauna heat,

viskattaessa vetonen.
water being thrown.

Marjatta matala neiti
Marjatta lowly maiden

pyhä piika pikkarainen
holy little servant girl

kylpi kylyn kyllältänsä
bathed in the bathhouse to her content

vatsan löylyn vallaltansa
warmed her stomach as much as she cared

Teki tuonne pienien poian
She made a little son there

latoi lapsensa vakaisen
created an innocent child

heinille hevosentuoksi
onto the hay of horses

sorajouhen soimen päähän.
into the straight-mane’s manger.

Pesi pienen poikuensa
She washed her little son

kääri kääreliinahansa;
wound him up in his swaddling;

otti pojan polvillensa
she took the son to her knees

laittoi lapsen helmahansa.
placed the child on her apron-hem

Piiletteli poittutansa
She hid her son

kasvatteli kaunoistansa
looked after her lovely one

kullaista omenuttansa
her golden apple

hope’ista sauvoansa
her silver ski-pole

Sylissänsä syttelevi
She fed him in her arms

käisissänsä käättelevi.
turned him over in her hands.

Laski pojan polvillensa
She lowered the son to her knees

lapsen lantehuisillensa.
the child to her lap.

alkoi päätänsä sukia
She began to groom his head

hapsiansa harjaella.
to comb his locks.
Katoi poika polviltansa  The son disappears from her knee 351
lapsi lannepuoliltansa.  the child from her lap. 352
Marjatta matala neiti  Marjatta lowly maiden 353
tuosta tuskille tulevi  starts to hurt at that 354
rapasihe etsimähän.  sped off to look for him. 355
Etsi pientä poiuttansa  She looked for her little son 356
kullaista omenuttansa  her golden apple 357
hope’ista sauvoansa  her silver ski-pole 358
alta jauhavan kivosen  from under a grinding stone 359
alta juoksevan jalaksen  from under a running sled runner 360
alta seulan seulottavan  from under a sieve for sifting 361
alta korvon kannettavan  from under a pail for carrying 362
puiten puut, jaellen ruohot  branching trees, parting grass stems 363
hajotellen hienot heinät.  separating fine hay strands. 364

Viikon etsi poiuttansa  Long she looked for her son 365
poiuttansa pienuttansa.  for her son her little one. 366
Etsi mäiltä männiköiltä  She looked amid hills, pine groves 367
kannoilta kanervikoilta  tree stumps, heathlands 368
katsoen joka kanervan  examining every heather-bed 369
joka varvikon vatoen  checking every birch stand 370
kaivellen katajajuuret  unearthing juniper roots 371
ojennellen puien oksat.  straightening tree branches. 372

Astuajattelevi  She walked pensively 373
käy käärööttelevi.  stepped along lightly. 374
Tähti vastahan tulevi  She comes to a star 375
tähelle kumarteleikse:  bows to the star: 376

“Oi Tähti Jumalan luoma!  “Oh Star, God’s creation! 377
Etkö tieä poiuttani  don’t you know of my son 378
miss’ on pieni poikueni  where my little son is 379
kultainen omenueni?”  my golden apple?” 380

Tähti taisi vastaella:  The star knew to answer: 381
“Tietäisinkö, en sanoisi.  “Were I to know I would not say 382
Hänpä on minunki luonut  He has created me as well 383
näillä päiville pahoiolle  for these bad days 384
kymlillä kimaltamahan  to shine in the cold 385
pime’illä pilkkimähän.”  to sparkle in the dark.” 386

Astuajattelevi  She walked pensively 387
käy käärööttelevi.  stepped along lightly. 388
Kuuhut vastahan tulevi  She comes upon the moon 389
niin Kuulle kumarteleikse:  thus she bows to the Moon: 390
“Oi Kuuhut, Jumalan luoma!
Etkö tieä poiuttani
miss’ on pieni poikueni
kultainen omueni?”

“The moon knew to answer:
“Were I to know I would not say.
He has created me as well
alone at night to stay awake.”

Päätyä Päivyt vastahansa.
Päivälle kumarteleikse:

“The Sun knowingly answered:
“Indeed I know of your son!
He had created me as well
in gold to jingle
Already I know of your son!
Woe, your poor son!
There is your little son
your golden apple
he’s up to the waist in the swamp.”

Marjatta matala neiti
etsi suolta poikoansa
Poika suota löyettihin
tuolta tuotihin kotia.

Marjatta lowly maiden
searched for her son in the swamp
The son was found in the swamp
from there he was brought home.