ÁGOST PÁVEL’S PREKMURJE SLOVENE GRAMMAR

Neobjavljena slovnična Avgusta Pavla Vend nyelvtan je bila zamišljena kot normativna slovnična knjižne prekmurske. Starinski pojavi in avtorjeva panhrona obdelava jezika pa izpričujejo, da je slovniča tudi pomemben vir primerjalnega gradiva. Pričujoči prispevek prikazuje na osnovi terenskih zapisov in opisov posameznih govorov odnos med to slovničo in živim narčjem, s posebnim ozirom na govor Pavlove rojstne vasi, Cankove. Drugotni namen prispevka je seznaniti bralca z obsegom in ureditvijo rokopisa.

Ágost Pávél’s unpublished Vend nyelvtan was ostensibly written as a normative grammar of literary Prekmurje Slovene. Nevertheless, the conservative features of the language and the author’s panchronic treatment of it suggest that the work may be considered a valuable source of comparative material. The present paper attempts to show the relationship of the language of the grammar to the living dialects, based on available field notes and descriptions of local Prekmurje dialects, particularly that of Pávél’s own village, Cankova. A secondary aspect of the paper is to acquaint the reader with the scope and organization of the manuscript.

0 If one of Ágost Pávél’s earliest works, A vashidegúti szlovén nyelvjárás hangtana [The Phonetics of the Slovene Dialect in Cankova] (1909), brought to light in comprehensive detail the sound system of a typically conservative Prekmurje dialect, then one of his last, Vend nyelvtan (hereafter VN) (ms. completed in 1942)\(^1\) gives a mature treatment of the phonology as well as the remaining aspects of Prekmurje grammar.\(^2\) However, this latter work was never published, nor has the manuscript been, to my knowledge, examined in any linguistic studies. Intended as a textbook of the “official” Prekmurje literary language (Novak 1970: 305–306), the work at first glance appears to be a somewhat stylized descriptive grammar of a Prekmurje dialect, rich with detailed phonological rules, paradigm tables and thorough lists of word classes, but without the pedagogical apparatus of a classroom textbook. Since the ostensibly pedagogical purpose of the work is by now obsolete, we shall attempt to reevaluate VN as a potential source of comparative material for the study of the history of Slovene and Slavic. It is hoped that this

\(^1\) I am grateful to Prof. Ludvik Olas (University of Maribor), Jože Vugrinec and Franc Kuzmič (both of the Študijaška knjižnica in Murska Sobota) for drawing my attention to the manuscript.

\(^2\) The grammar was commissioned by the Hungarian Cultural Society for Prekmurje (Vendvidéki Magyar Közművelődési Egyesület [VMKE]. Slov. Madžarsko kulturno društvo za Vendsko krajino) to give credence to the individuality of the language of Prekmurje Slavs (Vend nyelv) and by extension to the theory that the Prekmurje Slavs were in fact a separate people, distinct from the osztrák szlovénok (Austrian Slovenes) of Slovenia proper. Entrusted as the only scholar capable of writing such a work, Pávél took on the job reluctantly with the justification that it would be better he write the book than someone unqualified to do so. Pávél had hoped that the text would be turned down by the censors, in which case he would have reworked the language in the "gajica" alphabet. As it turned out, the book was praised as "an excellent scientific work that, with some exceptions, gives a true picture of the language of Prekmurje," however, the Society added that "it is much more than the Society intended... moreover, the average person could not learn to speak the Prekmurje language from it" (Novak 1970: 305–307).
will pave the way for the incorporation of VN into the further study of the Prekmurje dialect as well as Slovene dialectology and historical grammar in general.\textsuperscript{3}

0.1 The present study has a twofold purpose. The primary goal will be to evaluate VN as a source of comparative material for the Prekmurje dialect by comparing the language of VN with that of living Prekmurje dialects, particularly with reference to the dialect of Cankova whenever possible.\textsuperscript{4} In order to be concise, we shall limit our discussion to selected topics in the phonology and morphology.\textsuperscript{5} Secondly, an attempt will be made to convey the scope and organization of the work itself in order to acquaint the reader with the content of the manuscript.

0.2 The manuscript

0.2.1 The text of VN contains 178 typewritten pages, divided into 455 numbered paragraphs, each of which deals with a single grammar point. The text is entirely in Hungarian, though individual sections are titled also in Prekmurje Slovene (grammar terms are clearly adapted from those in use by Slovene grammarians). The work is divided into the following sections: §1–§4: The people and their language. Dialects (Nép és nyelv. Nyelvjárások); §5–§94: Phonology (Hangtan – Glászoszlóvje); §95–§106: Punctuation (Irásjelek – Locsila); §107: Abbreviations (Rövidítések – Kratice); Morphology (Alaktan – Oblikoszlóvje) §108–§110: Parts of speech, sentence elements (Szófajok, mondatrészek – Beszéde vrszte, sztávko csléni); §111–§113: Inflection (Ragozás – Pregibanje); §114–§173: Noun (Főnév – Szamosztálnik); §174–§200: Adjective (A melléknév – Priděvnik); §201–§204: Article (A néveló – Cslen, spólnik); §205–§230: Pronoun

\textsuperscript{3} One of Rigler's many linguistic concerns included the investigation and analysis of the Slovene Pannonian dialects, of which the Prekmurje dialect makes up the northeastern peninsula, and their relationship to the Croatian kajkavian dialects (1973, 1976, 1977). In the earliest of his three major articles devoted to this area, Rigler noted the disparity between the relatively large number of works devoted to the Pannonian dialects and what is actually understood about them: «Med ne preveč poznana področja lahko stojemo tudi panonske dialekte, čeprav po drugi strani ne moremo reči, da spadajo med slab poznane slovenske dialekte, vsaj relativno ne. [...] Vendar vse to objavljeno in neobjavljeno gradivo še ni dovolj sistematično pregledano in obdelano. Ni pa tudi zadostno, saj zmanjka gradiva skoraj za vsak problem, ki ga skuša človek pojasniti» ([1973] 1986: 117). Taking up Rigler's agenda, I hope that the present study will make a step toward a more complete treatment of the Pannonian dialects.

\textsuperscript{4} Pável's data from the Cankova dialect will be cited from Pável 1909, 1917 and 1918. This material will be marked by two numbers following the token, the first number referring to the page, the superscript number to the line number, counting from the top. The three separate sources can be easily indentified since the page numbers of the items do not overlap: 1909 = pp. 1–148; 1917 = pp. 165–187; 1918 = pp. 263–282.

As a point of departure for a larger work on Prekmurje dialects, I first checked Pável's data for Cankova. Thus, observations on the Cankova dialect and some of the data is from my own field notes taken during a one week stay in Pável's village in April 1988. It is clear that Pável was familiar with, aside from his own dialect, the local variation of Prekmurje, as attested by his fieldwork (albeit ethno graphic) in Northern Prekmurje and Porašje (Pável 1927 [= 1930–31], 1942a) as well as by the lengthy criticism of Kúhar's Southern Prekmurje material (“A markók nyelve” [The language of the Markí], written in 1912 but never published, presumably remains in the possession of Pável's heirs, according to Novak 1970: 22–23).

\textsuperscript{5} Moreover, I intend to elaborate on the material in VN in further studies.
1 Orthography: vowels and prosody

1.1 As Rigler has pointed out, the vowel system of the dialect of Cankova represents a conservative Prekmurje system from which innovative Prekmurje dialects may be derived (Rigler [1963] 1986: 171). The stressed vowel system distinguishes long (including diphthongs) and short vowels. Long vowels occur, as elsewhere in Slovene, only under ictus. The following vowel inventory obtains: long l i, u, e, o, a l, short and unstressed l i, u, e, o, á, á l; ő occurs as a positional variant of several vowels, primarily in the neighborhood of sonorants, e.g., hőni (CMG) (Pával has hőni [169]) 'to shop', kőriti (C: 729) 'to light, heat', véter/véter 'wind', zogo (C: 8519) 'took (Msg)'; r, l and n may also form syllables. For the diachrony leading to this system see Rigler loc. cit.

---

6 To date, no exceptions to this statement have been found.
7 The transcription used here differs somewhat from that traditionally used for Prekmurje dialects. For the stressed "open" front mid-vowel the symbol e replaces the traditional a. The dot marking the "closed" midvowels /el/ and /el/ has been abandoned; it should be understood that, under ictus, the symbols e, o refer to closed mid vowels, similar to those in Standard Slovene. Unstressed /el/ in all Prekmurje material should be read as [ɛ], unless otherwise marked. The lax unstressed [i] will be written merely as i; the lax realization is a predictable feature that Pával and others mark i. It should be noted that this vowel reduction is found strongly and consistently in Gorščko (Francophile, GPe, Gš, Mk, Mt, Št, Ve) and Ravensko (C) dialects, though to a much lesser degree or not at all in the Dolinsko dialects (Br, Br, Go, MP, Re). I noted weak or no reduction in Bi, MP, and Re; Br and Go have reduction marked in the students' works, perhaps as an artifact of their expectations based on their familiarity with the literature, while Ftičar and Benedik 1981 note no reduction in Go. A phonetic distinction a: à occurs in
1.1.2 The conservative vowel system just described is very nearly represented in the orthography of VN, which employs the following conventions for vowels, based on the Hungarian alphabet (according to the practice of Prekmurje writers of the preceding two centuries): long monophthongs (under stress only) are marked by acute (two acutes in the case of front round vowels): \( \hat{a}, \hat{e}, \hat{i}, \hat{o}, \hat{u}, \hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\alpha} \). Diphthongs (under stress only) are marked by the pointed circumflex \( \hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\theta} \) (\( \hat{a} \) = lei, lou). Short stressed \( \acute{l} \) (< \*e) and \( \acute{e} \) (< \*e, \*\varepsilon) are not distinguished: both phonemes are represented simply by \( \hat{e} \), e.g., leto, zselezo, zsen, pesz, cf. C lêto, želêzo vs. žêna, pêz. 8 Short variants of \( \acute{l} \) before the nasals in closed syllables are not reflected in VN, e.g., C dê̅n–dê̅n 'day' (C: 3939), nesên–nesên 'I carry' (C: 3938), mënši–mënši 'smaller' (Msg) (C: 3937), VN dë̅n, nesë̅m, mënši. The distribution of length in this position is in free variation in Cankova, according to Pál's note (1909: 39).

1.1.2.1 All long vowels and diphthongs are concomitantly stressed and marked by the diacritic signs mentioned above. The place of short stress, which is not marked in VN, can be predicted in disyllabic accentogenic words, since short ultima stress (except as a positional variant of long final stress) does not occur. Thus, disyllabic words with no long vowel mark must be short prima-stressed, e.g., zsen (=žen) 'wife', radoszt (=râdosyt) 'happiness'. Otherwise the place of stress is often clear from statements about accentuation in VN, e.g., "stress is the same in the infinitive as in the present simple" (§285), e.g., râñiti, rânim, vnicasit, vnicasim (=râñiti, rânim, vnicasit, vnicasim) 'feed (inf, lsg), 'destroy (inf, lsg)' Where the place of short stress can be thus deduced, the grave diacritic (\( \acute{\} \)) will be placed over the appropriate vowel in the present paper, e.g., râñiti, rânim, vnicasit, vnicasim.

2 Orthography: consonants

2.1 The inventory of consonantal segments in Cankova corresponds roughly to that of Standard Slovene (though, naturally, the distribution differs significantly) with the following exceptions: \( {\acute{l}}d' \) (used in Pál 1909, 1916, 1916a, 1917, 1918) stands for the reflex of Common Slavic *j before a stressed vowel or after

---

8 Neither had earlier Prekmurje writing systems distinguished closed and open mid-vowels. For details see Novak's chart of Prekmurje alphabets (1988: 14–15). The graphic distinction is absent from most alphabets devised for other areas of Slovenia and Slovenia as a whole, the exceptions being "metelčina" and representations of Slovene phonology for pedagogical purposes.
3 Sound change

3.1 Innovative sound change in VN is discussed in the sections dealing with phonology (§5–§94). As was mentioned above, Pável does not deal with morpho-phonological alternation as such, but rather treats change pan-chronically and, with some exceptions, without regard to its geographical distribution. The sound changes described in the first section of the grammar are not, generally speaking, those reflected in the normative language of VN itself. In cases where the innovation is not general in all of Prekmurje, the conservative situation is actually reflected in the grammar. A few examples are given here to illustrate.

3.1.1 Three geographically distributed reflexes of long (stressed) *e (from the merger of *e, *ā/ā in certain morphological environments, *ē and * ē) are found in Prekmurje dialects: lel (SW), lel (SE), and lej (N), e.g., lel (C): vēs (41) 'village', pēn (47) 'tree stump', noj(jēt, noj(jēta (46) 'fingernail (NGsg)', dēska 'board (46)', mēd (41) 'honey', bēdra (41) 'thighs', fēča (41) 'bee', veseld'ēl veseld'ēl (41) 'joy', zelēni 'green', d'esēn (41) 'autumn', berēn (42) 'I pick', nesēn (42) 'I carry', mozgē (42) 'brain', meglē (46) 'clouds, fog (Npl) 'télétebě (42) 'you (AGsg)', imē (42) 'name', zēli (167) 'took (mpl); lel (Re): viēs, miēt, nüiēt, rīebra 'ribs', zelēni, jesiēn, uriēmu 'we plow', živeš 'lives', nesēte, tebē, muzgē, zēši; lej (Mt): viēs, pēn, dēn, mēt, josesēnd'ēsēn, pēčē, fēčēla, podnēbšīb 'climate (borrowed from St Sln), havčēn, pozbērēmo, spēči 'he/she bakes', ot sasrēj 'from [my] sister (Gsg); glavēi 'heads (Npl), imē, imēna, zēli. In VN the conservative situation (as reflected in Cankova) is represented in the orthography: the reflex is written ē: vēs (§129), dēn (§155), nojēt, nojānojētā (§149), rēbra (§161), bēdā (§161), mēd (§155), pēc (§129), jēsēn (§129), nesēn, nesēs, nesēte

9 Pável was aware of the reflex el as the long variant in the environment before a nasal (cf. above 1.1.2), which he claimed is spoken by the Bakard'e (NW), Goričani (NE) and Marki (C): (C: 40): dēn/dēn 'day', sēn/sēn 'dream', korēn/korēn 'root', šešēmsēn 'I read'. The picture is clearly quite simplified: cf. dēn 'day', šit/n 'flax', nesēn, nesēs, nesēmo 'carry (1.2sg, 1pl), šēn, šēši, šēšmo 'want (1.2sg, 1pl)' (Ve = Pável's Bakard e). Here the relationship iěN+/C: eć reflects the original situation iěN+/iěC: eć after the diphthongization of ē > īe accompanying the loss of quantitative oppositions, as is also the case in Martine (e.g., lētō 'year', lēřēka 'person (Gsg)', zelēd'ē 'cabbage' < lētō, uč(o)-vējēka, zelēd'ē). The conservative reflex is found also elsewhere, e.g., dēn, lēn, nojēt, lēkēt, fēčēla, pēč, lēd, zobgē 'teeth', sarć 'heart', zāmē 'I recap', bārēm (GS).

10 In Martine the reflex has merged with that of *ē, e.g., brēk 'hill', snēk 'snow', stēna 'wall', méšac 'month'. 
The characteristic N and W Prekmurje (Goričko, Ravensko) innovation $j > d'$ before a stressed vowel or after a consonant ($§46$), is dealt with in the text, though not reflected in the language of VN. The conservative situation, which is found in Dolinski Prekmurje (and the rest of Slavic), is represented instead: zobije, dojitii, jëszti, cf. zabijë, dujitii, jëtti (Re). Pável treats the development, as in earlier works (1909: 93–95, 117–128; 1916a: 102–103), as a two-stage innovation: $j > gijë (= [r']/[d']) > g/k : zobije > zobgie > zobge 'teeth', vlasije > vlastijë > vlaste 'hair', dojitii > dogitii > dogi 'to milk', jëszti > gieszti > gészti.11

In word-final position before a full stop, /m/ and /n/ are distinguished in VN; in Cankova they are neutralized as $n$, e.g., VN pëszem 'song', z bratoom 'with brother (Isg)', szräm 'shame', odprëm 'I open', sztërem 'I break', kážsem 'I show', vrëmen 'weather', szëmen 'seed'; cf. pësen (C: 38), z bràdon (C: 128), optrën (C: 2240), stëren (C: 2426), kážen (C: 1218), vrrëmen (C: 3821). The retention of -$m# ≠ -n#$ is found in northern Prekmurje dialects, as Logar notes in Gornji Senik (Porabje) d'arem 'yoke', pečëm, rastëm 'I grow', sëmen (1974: 55–56). A similar situation has been recorded in a dialect in Yugoslavia close to Porabje: piësam, z broàtom 'with brother (Isg)', pačëm 'I bake', bobëm 'drum' (Ml), though here the distinction may be optionally neutralized. The innovation is treated in the text of VN ($§47$).

4 Morphology: Noun

4.0 Nouns in VN are divided, following the traditional classification, into four declension classes: I. a-stem feminine and masculine ($§117–128$), II. i-stem feminine ($§129–140$), III. o-stem masculine ($§141–158$), IV. o-le-stem neuter ($§159–172$). Classes II and III he terms consonant stems. Each class is exemplified by a full paradigm, while alternations and exceptions are treated in the subsequent sections.

4.1 The mobile accentual paradigm in the a-stem feminine class presents a number of peculiarities in Prekmurje dialects. Proto-Slavic accentual mobility (c-

11 In Cankova the following allophonic distribution of $d'$ holds: [g]/[k] before front vowels gëzditi (C: 1254) 'to ride a horse', bõgë se (CMG) 'you are afraid (2sg)', vlasëk (C: 12814, G) 'hair', [ð] before back vowels bodžëti se (CMG) 'to be afraid'. I found this distribution most consistent in the younger generations, 65 and below. Older informants had $d'$ more consistently, if not exclusively. I noted a similar situation in the village Martinje, though here the younger generations produced $g/k$, $d$ as occasional optional variants of $d'$. In light of this observable diachronic development, Pável's two-stage treatment seems quite reasonable.

The development $j > d'$ is also found in neighboring Hungarian dialects, pointing to a contact innovation, e.g., gyár (St Hung jár) 'to walk', gyëg (St Hung jeg) 'ice', borgyu (St Hung borjij) 'call' (Asbóth 1908). It is interesting to note that the area of the innovation in Hungarian extends further south than the Slovene innovation, which roughly covers a territory north of a line drawn between Gederovci in the west to Filovci in the east. The Hungarian dialects in Prekmurje, which encompass most of the easternmost villages along the Hungarian border, have the change from the northernmost village (gyövök [St Hung jövök] 'I come' [Hódos/Hodos]) extending southward to the Mura (gyöjök [Petesháza/Peteseovci]) (Penavin 1966: map 21).
paradigm, in Stang’s classification) is well preserved, and the distribution of case endings and quantity differs strikingly from that of Slovene as well as South Slavic in general. We may illustrate this paradigm as reflected in VN with comparative material from Cankova (as far as they are attested) and other Prekmurje dialects in a common noun of this type, (*rōkā, rōkō >) rōka, rokō (§118):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VN</th>
<th>Attestations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ngs</td>
<td>rōka</td>
<td>rōuka (C: 227)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asg</td>
<td>rokō</td>
<td>rokōu (C: 1628)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gsg</td>
<td>rōkērōke</td>
<td>rokē (CMG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dsg</td>
<td>rōkirokē</td>
<td>rōuki (CMG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lsg</td>
<td>rōkirokē</td>
<td>rōki (C: 758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lsg</td>
<td>rokōv</td>
<td>rokōuf (CMG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NApl</td>
<td>rokē</td>
<td>rokē (C: 3528)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gpl</td>
<td>rōk</td>
<td>rōuk (CMG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dpl</td>
<td>rokām</td>
<td>rokān (Ve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lpl</td>
<td>rokājrōkaj</td>
<td>rokājrökai (C: 1515)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lpl</td>
<td>rokāmi</td>
<td>rokāmirokāmi (C: 1315)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAdu</td>
<td>rōkirokē</td>
<td>rōukirukē (Br, Go)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdu</td>
<td>rōkirokērōk</td>
<td>rōukirukē (Br, Go)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLLdu</td>
<td>rokāma</td>
<td>rukāma (Br, Go)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1 The desinence {-ouv} is given as the regular lsg ending for a-stem nouns in VN. The desinence {-om}, analogized with the masculine and neuter, is attested on the southeastern periphery of Prekmurje: z rukūn ‘with one’s hand’, z vihūn ‘with one’s ear’, pud zemliūn ‘under the ground’, s krāvon ‘with a cow’ (Bi). This seems most likely an innovation in common with kajkavian dialects, given the proximity of the village Bistrica to the Croatian border.

4.1.2 The stressed DL singular desinence -ē (OCS *fūk) is attested in northern Prekmurje, e.g., na vodēi, ‘on the water (Lsg)’, per sinēi ‘at [my] son’s (Lsg)’, (Mt); nudēi (Dsg), nō nudēi, nō ruiēi ‘on one’s leg, on one’s hand (Lsg)’ (Št), na nodēi (Mk); however, I find no examples of this in Cankova data. The archaism is found also in Trubar’s language, e.g., Dushei ‘soul (Dsg)’, morvei ‘sea (Lsg)’, okei ‘eye (Lsg)’ (Rigler: 1968: 65–66, with references to the original location).

4.1.3 In VN Pável excludes the short variant of the Lpl doublet, in accordance with the principle established elsewhere (cf. lsg present of verbs, where we would expect nesžeml/neszēm, but only the first occurs in VN, cf. 1.1.2). Length in the Lpl is amply attested na nugāj (Bi), na nugāj, v rukāj (Re), rukāj (Št); na nogāj (GS).

4.1.4 The archaic NAG dual forms in -iə (cf. OCS vošk, pʃuʃ [NAVdu]) are

12 In my notes I find two tokens with metathesis (z orkōuf) and one without (z rokōuf), from the same informant.
attested, e.g., nòugilnugèi, ròukilrukèi (Br, Go). The Gpl in -φ extended to the Gdu appears to be gaining ground, e.g., ròuk (CMG, Re, MP, V) ràok (Mt).

4.1.5 Pável asserts shortness in the DLIdu of the a-stem mobile-stressed type (rokámì): “[…] rokámì has a short a: in th[is] instance forms with long a are rarer)” (§119). The opposition of length (in the Ipl) vs. shortness (in the DLIdu) is found in z goszpámi, goszpámì 'ladies (Ipl, DLIdu)’ (§121), while length only is found elsewhere, e.g., nocsmáimiscsmi, nocsmáma 'nights (Ipl, DLIdu)’ (§130), sz cserámì, cserámì 'daughters (Ipl, DLIdu)’ (§133). Shortness is attested in the local dialects, e.g., rukámì, nugámì, rukámì, nugàmì (Br, Go); rókámì, rókámì (GPe). However, elsewhere I have found only length in, e.g., rókámì, rókámì (Fi, Ve), z rukámì, na nugámì, na rukámì (Bi, Re), which may be due to analogy with the Ipl. In Standard Slovene we find neo-circumflex in both case forms (rokámi, rokáma), implying length in the final syllable *-âmû, *-âmá (cf. Jaksche: 1965: 53–55; and particulary Toporišič 1988: 175). Shortness (in the final syllable) is, however, attested (and probably general) in other South Slavic dialects, e.g., Standard Serbo-Croatian brâdâma 'beards (Ipl)’, rükâma, stîgâma 'servants (Ipl)’ (Daničić 1925: 5); Posavian Serbo-Croatian (Župaša) rûkâma, grêdâma 'flower beds (Ipl)’, stîgâma, ovćâma (Ivšić 1913: 28). The shortness reflecting the absence of neo-circumflex length in the DLIdu in mobile paradigm nouns has the look of an archaism (implying an earlier presence of desinences *-âmá alongside *-âmá) in Prekmurje Slovene and is accordingly preserved in VN.

5 Morphology: Verb

5.0 Verb morphology in VN is classified according to the suffix vowel in the infinitive, thus: 1. (§258–§275) ð-suffix (nèszûi), 2. (§276–§277) -no-theme (zdignoti 'to raise'), 3. (§278–§282) -e-theme (goretû 'to burn'), 4. (§283–§289) -i-theme (molûi 'to pray'), 5. (§290–§298) -a-theme (kálatû 'to chop'), 6. (§299–§300) -iva/- ûava- (kühpûvati 'to buy, prememvûvati 'to turn over, upset'), 7. (§301) present tense athematic verbs (dàti: dàm 'give [inf, lsg]’, jëszûi: jèm 'eat [inf, lsg]’). This classification is further subdivided into stem types, e.g. 1.1 (§260–261) dental stems (szèszûi: szèdem 'sit [inf, lsg]’, bitû: bòdem/bòm 'be [inf, lsg]’), 1.2 (§262–263) hissing fricative stems (trèszûi: treszêm 'shake [inf, lsg]’, grîszûi: grinêm 'bite [inf, lsg]’), 1.3 (§264) labial stems (dubûzûi: dubûm 'chisel [inf, lsg]’, plèti: plevûm 'weed [inf, lsg]’, szûti: szpèm 'pour [inf, lsg]’), 1.4 (§265–266) velar stems (szècestûi: szécesem 'cut down [inf, lsg]’, mòcestûi: mòrem 'be able [inf, lsg]’), 1.5 (§267–268) nasal stems (vèzûi: vëzemem 'take [inf, lsg]’, ozûzêti: ozsmém 'wring [inf, lsg]’), 1.6 (§269–270) liquid stems (mlèti: mleem 'mill [inf, lsg]’, mrêti: merjêm 'die [inf, lsg]’), 1.7 (§271–275) vocalic stems (bitû: bûjem 'beat [inf, lsg]’, bûjûti: bûjem 'kill [inf, lsg]’).

5.0.1 Each subsection includes a paradigm in tabular form and a list of the verbs belonging to the subclass. To illustrate, Pável's table for the verb plèszûi 'to spin, weave' (§261) is summarized here: present indicative: 1sg pletè-ì, 2sg -s, 3sg -ø 1du -va (M)/-ve (F, N), 2, 3du -ta (M)/-te (F, N), 1pl -mø, 2pl -te, 3pl -jo;

11 Short stressed a is regularly raised to ð before a nasal in Gornji Petrovec.
imperative 2sg plè-ti 1du -va (M)/-ve (F, N), 2, 3du -ta (M)/-te (F, N), 1pl -mo, 2pl -te; ininititive plèszti; supine plèsz; present active participle plet-élô-csi (-a, -elô); l-participle plè-o, -la, -lo, (-li); past passive participle pletêmí. The table is an abbreviated form of a larger, master table, in which the verb lúbíti 'to love' (§257) is presented in all its complexity. Here, in addition to the categories listed in the above chart, the analytic forms that may be easily predicted are given (past: szam lúbó, lúbila, lúbilo, szi lúbó...; future: bodem/bôm/mo lúbo, lúbila, lúbilo...; conditional: bi lúbó...; past conditional: bi bió lúbó, bi bila lúbila, bi bilo lúbilo...; optative: naj lúbim/naj bi lúbó...), as well as participial forms (gerund and present active participle: lúbécs, lúbécsi [lezsecski]; past active: lúbivsi; past passive: lúbêni [fzasiti]) and the deverbal noun (lúbêni [mislenje]).

5.1 A diacritic feature of Prekmurje dialects, separating them from the rest of South Slavic, is the long (stressed) theme vowel in the present tense of e-theme c-paradigmic verbs, e.g., pleten/pleten 'I spin, weave' (39⁰) merd 'di'es' (37⁴), cveté 'bloom's' (37⁴), cvetjé 'bloom' (CMG), ordé 'plow's' (16¹), orgémo 'we plow' (CMG), požené 'pushes' (18⁵), opré 'opens' (16⁷), nesé 'carries' (41⁴), neséte 'you (pl) carry' (CMG), deré 'skins' (41⁴), peré 'cleans' (41⁴), kucé 'strikes' (41⁴), zivé 'lives' (41⁴), pecé 'bakes' (41⁴), pecémo 'we bake' (CMG), tecé 'runs, flows' (42¹), teticé (CMG); nesé, neséte, urjétem, pečé, pečému, rasté, uperiên, vličé, ziviému (Re), pasé, pasémi, pasémo, platei, pradéimo, zrastéi, zvíčé, zvíčémo (Mt).¹⁴ These correspond to short and retracted stress in Standard Slovene and other Slovene dialects (cveté [Upper Carniola], nésem, srcem < *nèsem, *orjém). The type is amply, if not exhaustively, attested in VN: preséti: predém, cvézéti: cvetém, plézéti: plétém, rásztém (§260), nészté: nesztém, pászté: paszém, trészté: treszém (§262), dübzszté: dúbém, zébszté: zebém, szkábszté: szkátem, tészté: tepém (§264), rócszté: rócsrem/cercsém, pécsté: pecsém, vlécszté: vlecsém, tecszté: tcsént/kúcsté: tucstém/kucstém (§265), etc. Non c-paradigmic verbs are, of course, root stressed in the present: szécsté: szécsém, mócsté: mórem, vrócszté: vřózem, lécsté: lézem, prisézcsté: prisézem (§265), vzéti: vzém, zacséti: zácsem (§266), tréti: têrem, mléti: melém. (§269), etc.

¹⁴ The pattern, as Rigler has pointed out, is found also in Ziliža, Carinthia ([1967] 1986: 198): názem, násé, násémo (the list includes also zadáste: *zahôdes-émo 'poke [inf, 2sg, 1pl]'; grásbáste: *grábáš-émo 'rake [inf, 2sg, 1pl]'; pomnášté: *pomnádes-émo 'sweep [inf, 2sg, 1pl]'; pléstáste: *plátés-émo 'weave [inf, 2sg, 1pl]'; řepesté: *topes-émo 'beat [inf, 2sg, 1pl]'; lejé: *lozéš-émo 'lie, redline [inf, 2sg, 1pl]'; pejé: *pečés-émo 'bake [inf, 2sg, 1pl]'; lejé: *lozéš-émo 'say [inf, 2sg, 1pl]'; lejé: *lozéš-émo 'run, flow [inf, 2sg, 1pl]') (Grafenauer 1905: 209–210). Vermeer, following Boutelje’s and Stang’s observation that Central Slovak alone in the Western Slavic group has length in the same group of verbs (nésé, tečé, vedié, pleté, beré, zovié, orem, pasié etc.), has stated that “[i]t is worthwhile to consider the possibility that generalization of length in (c)-stressed e-precents is a common innovation of Central Slovak and Prekmurski, which would fit in with the position of Central Slovak within the Czecho-Slovak block” (1984: 383). Given the absence of evidence for general lengthening and its subsequent loss in c-stressed e-precents in the rest of Slovene, and the further evidence of length in at least one other Slovene dialect on the northern periphery, it seems likely that Vermeer’s hypothesis will prove true.

¹⁵ The list includes also the normally b-stressed verb ęti in Porabje, e.g., ędě, ędémő (Vratuša 1939: 227) and in a few villages SE to Šalovec (idémő) (ibid.: 220). The isogloss falls east of Mt (e.g., ęli ęti, ęde, ędémő, nědě 'isn’t going,’ náti, nãdan, nãde 'find [inf, 1sg, 3sg],’ as elsewhere in Prekmurje); so Vratuša’s isogloss should be corrected (ibid.: 227).
5.2 Active participles (excluding the I-participle) are rare in Prekmurje, as well as the rest of Slovene, if not virtually extinct. However, in Pávél’s dialect the present active participle was probably still productive, at least in certain lexemes, e.g., goréči -a, -o (-e) ’burning’; skrbéči -a, -o (-e) ’worrying,’ klečéč -a, -o (-e) ’kneeling’; noseči -a, -o (-e) ’carrying’; bežéčil/pobižéčki ’running’ (C: 43\textsuperscript{10-17}); dačouči -a, -o (-e) ’giving’; vedouči -a, -o (-e) ’knowing’; delajouči -a, -o (-e) ’working’ (C: 76\textsuperscript{14-17}). Only one past active participle is attested in Pávél 1909: zádav ’having hit’ (14\textsuperscript{4}); it is rather doubtful that the past active participle attested in VN continues actual Slovene forms except in certain lexical items (Ramovš 1952: 148). An important contribution of VN is that these and other verb forms that are alive in the dialect and notoriously difficult to elicit reliably in the field (supine, imperative, past passive participle) are methodically attested in VN, allowing us to fill gaps in the comparative material available.

6 Comparison of VN with data from living Prekmurje dialects reveals a system very close to that actually spoken in Prekmurje. Faced with internal variation among the local Prekmurje dialects, it is clear that, generally speaking, Pávél opted for the conservative situation in the language of VN. Nevertheless, phonological variation is thoroughly discussed in the lengthy treatment of sound change. Though this variation is discussed in VN without regard to its geographic distribution, the information presented may now be related to more recently collected data, which can tell us about the actual isoglosses of individual features. The novelty of VN lies in its rich, well-structured presentation of Prekmurje Slovene morphology. A brief examination of noun morphology in VN, for example, gives a full array of inflectional doublets, revealing both archaic and innovative forms. In verb morphology we find detailed information about forms that are rarely attested in field material. Moreover, since thorough paradigmatic information is combined with presumably exhaustive lists of lexical items belonging to each morphological type, it is possible to generate a very large amount of material not explicitly attested in the grammar. The overall consistency with which Pávél treats Prekmurje Slovene in VN allows us to consider the language a coherent linguistic system. Consequently, the grammar, though normative, is an invaluable source of data on the Prekmurje dialects.
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POVZETEK

Prispevek obravnava neobjavljeno normativno slovnič ne prekmursčine Avgusta Pavla Vend nyelvtan (VN) ter skuša prikazati razmerje njenega jezika do žive prekmursčine. Primerjava te slovnice s terenskimi zapisni in opisi posameznih govorov kaže, da je Pavel za normativne oblike izbral pretežno starinske poaje, tako, da je jezik VN enoten in dosleden konzervativni sistem. Fonološke razlike znotraj prekmurskega narečja so obravnavane v poglavju, posvečenem glasovnim spremembam. Te so sicer prikazane ne glede na njihovo zemlješno razporeditev, vendar z novejšimi podatki o narečju lahko določimo izoglose posameznih pojavov. Novost VN je v njeni obširni in urejeni predstavitvi prekmurskega oblikoslova, ki poleg tega nudi tudi bogato primerjalno gradivo. Pri sklanjatvi najdemo dvojnica, ki kaže starinsko, pa tudi novejše stanje. Pri glagolskem oblikoslovju so izpričane oblike, ki jih le redko najdemo v terenskih zapisih. Ker so podane paradigmne in po vsej verjetnosti izčrpite seznami leksemov, ki pripadajo tem vzorcem, je načelno možno tvoriti veliko gradiva, ki v slovnici ni izrecno izpričano.