Majda Merše
Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language, Ljubljana

VERBAL ASPECT IN CORRELATION WITH OTHER VERBAL CATEGORIES IN THE 16th-CENTURY SLOVENIAN LITERARY LANGUAGE

The paper discusses the interactive relationship between verbal categories (aspect as point of departure, and time, voice, and mood) in the 16th-century Slovenian literary language. The findings are based on the analysis of examples of aspect-time, aspect-voice, and aspect-mood agreement or disagreement, established by comparing sample texts (particularly Trubar's (1557) and Dalmatin's (1584) translations of the Gospels). In addition, the comparison with Luther's translation of the Bible (1545) as Dalmatin's primary translation source, helped to illuminate the causes of this situation and phenomena. The author also points out several characteristic differences between the practices of Trubar's and Dalmatin's literary language, limited primarily to the verbal derivation and morphology.

V sestavku je predstavljeno sočinkovalno razmerje med glagolskimi kategorijami (vidom kot izhodiščno kategorijo ter časom, načinom in naklonom) v knjižnem jeziku 16. stoletja. Ugotovitve so oprte na analizo primerov vidsko-časovne, vidsko-načinovne in vidsko-naklonske ujemalnosti in neujemalnosti, ugotovljenih s primerjavo vzorčnih besedil (zlasti Trubarjevega (1557) in Dalmatinovega (1584) prevoda evangelijev). K vzročni osvetlitvi stanja in pojavov je prispevala tudi primerjava z Lutrovim prevodom Biblije (1545) kot Dalmatinovo osnovno prevodno prelogo. Hkrati je opozorjeno tudi na več primerjalno odkritih, značilnih razlik med Trubarjevo in Dalmatinovo knjižnojezikovno prakso, omejenih predvsem na glagolsko besedotvorje in oblikoslovje.

Key words: verbal categories, verbal aspect, verbal aspect in correlation with time, voice, and mood, derivation, sixteenth-century Slovenian literary language
Ključne besede: glagolske kategorije, glagolski vid, glagolski vid v povezavi s časom, načinom in naklonom, besedotvorje, slovenski knjižni jezik 16. stoletja

0 The research of aspect, i.e., verbal aspect and *Aktionsart*, in the works of Slovene 16th-century Protestant writers (Merše 1995b) has shown that at the beginning and through the initial normative stabilization of Slovenian literary language, verbal aspect was well established and systematically fairly stable grammatical category. Compared to the contemporary language, the 16th-century language displays mainly a different frequency distribution of derivational and aspect-expressing means (their inventory only insignificantly differs from the contemporary stock) and greater derivational variation (e.g., *raztresati/raztresovati*, *pogubljati/pogubljavati*, *razmišljati/razmišljovati/razmišljavati*,[1] *predajati/predavati*, *utrdovati/utrjovati*, *preklinjati/pre-*

---

[1] On the relationship between the suffixes *-ova-* in *-ava-*, which present one of the most noticeable derivational alternations in the language of the Slovenian 16th-century Protestant writers, cf. Merše 2005; before that also Orožen 1974: 18–19 and Vidovič-Muha 1984: 255. The analysis (Merše 2005), based on the entire corpus collected by the complete excerption of all works by the Slovene 16th-century Protestant writers, confirmed the previous findings about the frequency correlations, but it complemented them with new

kolnovati; *obveseliti se/obeseliti se/oveseliti se*, *raztreti/streti*, *obrisati/ubrisati*[2], etc.).
The latter is clearly the consequence of the early phase of the literary language. The
analysis also shows several examples of disagreement between the forms and ex-
pected aspectual content,[3] which can be often explained with the influence of the
foreign-language translation sources, particularly German, as German does not have
verbal aspect as a derivationally developed, binary grammar category, particularly
characteristic of Slavic languages.[4]

0.1 It is a generally accepted fact that there is correlation between the grammar
categories of aspect, time, voice, and mood, and that their mutual relationship is in-
teractive, and, particularly on the functional level, also fairly complex. Aspectolo-
gists continuously pose questions about the nature of this relationship, what is the
level of interaction of the four categories, and at the same time, what is the correla-
tion between the lexical and grammatical meaning of the verb used in the context.[5]
Slavic aspectologists studying the interaction of these categories use various methods.
Among the more common ones are finding and analyzing the cross-sections of the
verbal categories and deriving from one of the analyzed categories, which then serves
as the basis for the analysis of the functioning of the other. Pupynin (1995: 161), for
instance, treats the category of voice as a unity of two semantic plains, i.e., active and
passive, which display the semantic functions of aspect.

0.2 The findings about the structure and function of the aspectual system in the
16th-century literary language offered an appropriate starting point for the research of
the correlation between the aspect and other verbal categories. The present treatment
attempts to outline the extent and typology of disagreement discovered through com-
parison (but also to point out the examples and extent of the agreement in usage) that

---

findings about the realized aspectual semantics. The survey of the concrete usage showed a fairly even
spectrum of realized meanings (the so-called partial meanings) of imperfect aspect. Among the most com-
monly realized meanings of verbs derived with the suffixes *-ova-* and *-ava-* (in the case of synonymous use
also verbs with the suffix *-a-*, e.g., *domišljati se – domišljavati se – domišljovati se*) are the following: limi-
ted and unlimited iterative, concrete-processual and durative (state) meanings. Both also display the mea-
ning of general validity/currency, which emphasizes the action, but does not actualize (countable) repetition
of action. The most commonly realized meaning of the imperfect aspect in the derivatives with both suffixes
is unlimited iteration, i.e., action repeated unlimited number of times. This is indicated simultaneously or
individually by the use of present tense with the meaning of general validity, plural subject or/and object,
allowing multiple realization of action, i.e., the first one as the agent, the other as patient (or as recipient),
typical circumstantial determinants, e.g., adverbials of time (*ponoči*) or place (*povsod*), providing a tempo-
ral or spatial framework that is wide enough for numerous repetitions of the action, series of similar actions
expressed with imperfect verbs.

   [2] The verb was used by Dalmatin. The prefix, which is not clear in terms of pronunciation, is consis
ently written with *v*: e.g., *ta poshre inu **vbriſhe** ſvoja úſſta* (DB 1584: I, 328a)).

   [3] E.g., ***inu ſo sazheli** byti inu **raniti** nekotere od tiga folka* (DB 1584: I,146a) – *vnd **fiengen an** zu schla-
hen / vnd **zuuerwunden** vom Volck* (LB 1545: 495); c.f. Merše 1998: 61.

   [4] The grammatical category of aspect is substituted by another verbal category, i.e., *Aktionsart*. Cf.
Helbig/Buscha 1990: 72–7; also Merše 1993, 2003: 82 and elsewhere.

   [5] Cf. Rasudova 1968, Bondarko 1971, *Russkaja grammatika* 1980: 641–645, Hrakovskij 1990, Pupynin
1995, etc., for Slovene Plotnikova 1975: 12–17, Orešnik 1994 (several places), Dickey 2003: 188–205.

refers to the co-appearance of verbal categories, i.e., aspect as the starting category, and time, voice, and mood in Trubar's (1557) and Dalmatin's (1584) translations of the Gospels.[6] In the cause-consequence analysis of the differential examples, the author considered the function of verbal form, lexical meaning of the verb, the action situation (its component is also the action and/or occurrence or state expressed with a concrete verbal form), context, and the chosen syntactic pattern.

1 The correlation between aspect and time

1.1 Considering the essence and function of individual verbal categories, the categories of aspect and time are most closely related. Since they are as a rule expressed by the same verbal form, Slavic aspectology speaks of aspectual-temporal forms.[7] Mood and voice are expressed by the same form as well, but if the former is indicative, because it only states the verbal event (Toporišič 1992: 119), and the latter is active, i.e., if both categories appear in their basic, semantically unmarked roles, they remain in the shadow of the correlation between aspect and time.

1.2 The analysis of the differences found by comparing sample texts, confirmed the previously known findings about Trubar's and Dalmatin's use of temporal forms (Merše 1997 and 2000). The majority of them were discussed and illustrated by examples in several studies by Martina Orožen.[8] The major difference is that the present-tense form is functionally more loaded in Trubar's language than in Dalmatin's. With regard to the more common use of the complex forms for past tense, Dalmatin continued Krelj's practice. The wider selection of temporal forms indirectly indicates that their use was less established in Trubar's language than in Dalmatin's. The common use of the historical present consequently limited Trubar's use of the past tense, which was in its usual role, i.e., in expressing the antecedent action, freed of some load, and was able to take on other roles. Trubar often uses it to express past antecedent actions, which is one of the meanings characteristic of pluperfect, which is also used by Trubar.

1.3 Despite the synonymy of the historical present and past tense and their interchangeability, confirmed in Trubar's and Dalmatin's practice, the concrete examples of usage of the present tense in Trubar's language often indicate additional functional meaning. Trubar often uses the historical present in showing connected series of actions, which are often also causally linked. Most of the two- and three-part series consist of completed actions, expressed with the perfective verbs. Also possible are combinations of completed and lasting actions and multi-part series of lasting ac-

---

[6] Comparison of Trubar's and Dalmatin's translations of Gospels revealed the essential differences in their use of aspect in relation to time (Merše 2000) as well as voice and mood (Merše 2001). Determining the characteristics of Trubar's, Krelj's, and Dalmatin's use of the conditional required examination of a wider variety of works and complete excerption of the material (Merše 2002).

[7] Cf. Zaliznjak, Šmelev 1997: 31–32.

[8] Cf. Orožen 1970: 225; 1977: 90; 1986a: 33; 1986b: 110; 1987: 32;

tions, processes, or states expressed by the imperfective verbs. By using the historical present, Trubar internally connects and completes realistic action situations. This way he separates them from other situations that are presented in the neighboring contexts, i.e., they either come before or after, or they are related to different place of action or different agent or carrier of occurrence/state. Examples: *Inu on ſapouei tim ludem doli ſeſti na to trauo. Inu uſame te pet kruhe /.../ pogleda gori unebeſa, ſahuali, inu reslomi tar da te kruhe tim Iogrom ti Iogri pag dado tim ludem. Inu ſo ieili vſi inu ſo ſyti bili, Inu ſo uſdignili kar ie zhes oſtalu od koſſou* (TT 1557: 42) – *Inu on je rekàl timu Folku doli ſeſti na travo, inu je vsèl te pet Kruhe /.../ je gori pogledal v'Nebu, inu je sahvalil, inu reslomil, inu je dal te Kruhe Iogrom, Inu Iogri ſo je dali timu Folku. Inu ony ſo vſi jédli, inu ſo ſiti poſtali. Inu ſo pobrali, kar je bilu oſtalu Koſceu* (DB 1584: III,10a).

1.3.1 A common component of series composed of imperfective and perfective verbs in historical present are ***verba dicendi***. The verb introducing direct speech is in Trubar's language commonly expressed with the historical present. Examples: *Peter tedai odgouori inu knemu praui, Pole, mi ſmo uſe ſapuſtili inu ſmo hodili ſa tebo /.../ Ieſus pag praui knim* (TT 1557: 57) – *Tedaj je Peter odguvoril, inu je djal k'njemu: Pole, my ſmo vſe sapuſtili, inu ſmo ſhli sa tabo /.../ Iesus pak je djal k'nym* (DB 1584: III,12b). Similarly, Dalmatin often switches into historical present from past tense. For introducing direct speech they both as a rule chose perfective verbs (e.g., *djati*, *odgovoriti*, *reči*; *praviti* used as perfective); if they used imperfectives, these imperfectives can often be considered to have perfective aspectual meaning (cf. Merše 1993: 230; 1995a: 496–497; 2000: 24).

1.3.2 Trubar's language is also characterized by examples of rapid transitions from one form to another, which are realized within the same series of actions. Although the likely cause of these changes is the fact that the use of temporal forms was not yet stable, numerous examples lead us to the conclusion that Trubar used the formal duality, created by the historical present and past tense as synonymous forms, to increase the information value of the text. He often pointed out a new series of concrete actions by expressing the first action with historical present, while using past tense in the continuation, or vice versa. By choosing a synonymous form, which discontinues formally unified series, he sometimes pointed out actions that did not belong to ongoing, actual series of actions, or actions that belong to another action plane. That something belongs to a different action plane is often additionally indicated by mood or voice marking of the action, i.e., the comparison of Trubar's and Dalmatin's translation of the same text reveals the passive in Trubar's translation and the active in Dalmatin's, or the conditional in Trubar's translation and the indicative in Dalmatin's, or vice versa. Examples: *Tedai Erodesh poklizhe ſcriuaie te Modre, inu ſſliſſom is nih iſuprasha ta zhas, vkaterim ſe ie ta ſueisda prikaſala. Inu nee poshle Vbetleem, inu praui* (TT 1557: 3) – *Tedaj je Erodesh te Modre ſkrivaje poklizal, inu je ſkèrbnu is nyh isvpraſhoval, kadaj bi ſe ta Svésda bila pèrkasala: Inu je nje poſlal v'Betlehem, inu je rekal* (DB 1584: III,3b).

1.3.2.1 Trubar also used the synonymous temporal forms to distinguish concrete, completed actions expressed with perfective verbs from lasting actions, occurrences, or states (e.g., of cognitive-emotional nature) expressed with imperfective verb, as well as for distinguishing the acts and states related to the outside world from the ones limited to the inside of human beings. With the contrastive use of synonymous forms he also emphasized, delimited, and contrasted causal and consequential series of actions. Examples: *KAdar* **ie** *on pag* **vidil** *to Mnoshizo tih ludi* **gre** *on gori na eno Goro, inu doli ſede, knemu* **perſtopio** *nega Iogri* (TT 1557: 9) – *KAdar* **je** *on pak ta Folk* **vidil**, **je** *gori ſhàl na eno Gorro, inu* **je** *doli ſedèl, inu njegovi Iogri* **ſo** *k'njemu* **ſtopili** (DB 1584: III, 4b).

1.3.2.2 Since the historical present does not require the choice of imperfectives, which is characteristic of the actual and also of the expanded or general present tense, the compared biblical translations – despite the polarized choice of synonymous temporal forms – usually agree in aspect. Occasional use of aspectually opposite verbs, accompanying the contrasting of the synonymous temporal forms, might have been affected by the individual author's effort to more clearly form the series of actions, either in terms of its dynamism or in terms of the sequencing of actions (occurrences, states) by their value, taking into account their actuality. Both translators were aware of the fact that stringing together several perfective verbs rendered the narration more compact and intense, while including imperfective verbs slowed it down, and at the same time, pointed out and emphasized individual phases of actions, represented by lasting actions, processes and states.

The choice of aspectually different verbs is often clearly contextually coordinated or even conditioned. In the example *Tedai Erodesh* **poklizhe** *ſcriuaie te Modre, inu ffliſſom is nih* **iſuprasha** *ta zhas, vkaterim ſe ie ta ſueisda prikaſala. Inu nee* **poshle** *Vbetleem, inu* **praui** (TT 1557: 3) – *Tedaj* **je** *Erodesh te Modre ſkrivaje* **poklizal**, *inu* **je** *ſkèrbnu is nyh* **isvpraſhoval**, *kadaj bi ſe ta Svésda bila pèrkasala: Inu* **je** *nje* **poſlal** *v'Betlehem, inu* **je** **rekal** (DB 1584: III,3b) Trubar's perfective **iſuprasha** and Dalmatin's imperfective **je isvpraſhoval** are counter-posed.

The thoroughness of execution of the action is indicated by the adverbials of manner *ffliſſom* and *ſkèrbnu*. Trubar's use of the perfective is coordinated with the focus on the final information about the time of appearance of the star, while Dalmatin's imperfective shows the iteration, prompted by the three adressees on the one hand and the uncertainty about the time of the appearance of the star, which is emphasized by the conditional, on the other.

1.3.2.3 When the compared texts feature the past tense on the one side and the non-historical present tense on the other, the differentiation is most commonly multi-faceted, but, most of all, it concerns the content.[9] With respect to the use of the present

---

[9] Examples: *Koku ie de ui ne sastopite, de ieſt* **ne ſem** *od kruha uom* **gouuril***, kadar* **ſem dial***, Varuite ſe pred Fariſèiskim inu Saduceiskim quaſſsum?* (TT 1557: 47) – *Koku je tu, de nesaſtopite, de vam jeſt* **nepravim**

tense for the atemporal meaning the compared texts mostly agree. Because of the possibility of numerous iterations, which is opened to the completed as well as to lasting actions by the atemporality, special, aspect-neutralizing positions arise.[10] In these positions, because of the equalization of partial aspectual meanings,[11] the original difference in grammatical meaning between aspectually opposite verbs fades away.

1.3.3 The consequence of the basic principles in which Trubar and Dalmatin structured the temporal system is also the difference in the expression of the past antecedent action and remote past. Dalmatin often expresses these meanings with pluperfect (Merše 1997: 11–14), while Trubar uses past tense or historical present, occasionally also pluperfect. His past tense usually emphasizes actions that within the series of actions stand out because of their early or earliest realization, or actions that are not a component of the series of actions. Trubar often indicated the sequence of actions with syntactic and lexical means, particularly with the selection of the syntactic pattern, while Dalmatin used to a larger extent the combination of temporal forms (and verbal aspect), as he often emphasized the temporal primariness of actions expressed in the temporal clauses, by using pluperfect (and perfective verbs).[12] Examples: *Natu kadar ſo oni tiga krala ſaslishali, gredo tiakai. Inu pole, ta ſueiſda katero ſo oni vti Iutroui deſheli vidili, gre nim naprei, dotle ona pride inu oſgorai obſtoy* (TT 1557: 3) – *Kadar ſo ony vshe tiga Krajla bily saſliſhali, ſo ſhli tjakaj. Inu pole, ta Svésda, katero ſo ony v'Iutrovi desheli vidili, je pred nymi ſhla tjakaj, dokler je priſhla inu osgoraj obſtala* (DB 1584: III,3b). The frequency and functional expanse of pluperfect in Dalmatin's Bible offers clear evidence that the form was a solid component of his temporal system, used with careful consideration. Particularly noticeable is its use in expressing the state following a completed action (Merše 1997: 14), which Trubar expressed in a simpler, more evident way, e.g., with a participle or with semantically appropriate imperfective. The peculiarity of Dalmatin's use is also indirectly evident from the comparison with Luther's translation (Dalmatin's source), as the verified places in it often have the state expressed with verb or description.[13] Examples: (1) *Natu kadar ſo oni tiga krala ſaslishali, gredo tiakai. Inu pole, ta ſueiſda katero ſo oni vti Iutrovi*

---

od Kruha (kadar pravim:) Varite ſe pred Qvaſsom téh Fariseerjeu iny S̄adduceerjeu? (DB 1584: III,11a). Trubar mentions an action completed in the past, while in DB 1584 the same action became atemporal, meaning that it can be executed several times and that the content of what is said is essential, while the distance from the time of the utterance is not important.

[10] On the neutralization of the aspectual meaning cf. Bondarko – Bulanin 1967: 72–75.

[11] The term partial aspectual meanings particularly in Russian aspectology refers to the types of the contextual realizations of the categorial meanings of the perfective and imperfective aspects (Zaliznjak – Šmelev 1997: 17). They are presented as the result of the interaction between the lexical meaning of the verbs, verbal categories (time, mood, voice), context, and situation (Bondarko – Bulanin 1967: 52–61). Hrakovskij (1990: 25) speaks of grammemes of the perfective and imperfective aspects. On the definitions of the aspectual meanings by the leading Russian aspectologists cf. Merše 1995: 47.

[12] Dalmatin did not limit pluperfect only to the use with perfective verbs, but also used it with the imperfective verbs such as *govoriti, iti, piti, jesti, bežati, kraljovati, zašpotovati*, etc.

[13] The comparison of the sample Old Testament texts (SAMVELOVE BVQVE in BVQVE TEH KRAI-LEV) showed that in about half of the cases Dalmatin's use of pluperfect agreed with Luther's (Merše 1993: 233 in 1997).

desheli vidili, gre nim naprei, dotle ona pride inu oʃgorai obʃtoy (TT 1557: 3) – *Kadar*
*ʃo ony vshe tiga Krajla **bily saʃliʃhali**, ʃo ʃhli tjakaj. Inu pole, ta Svésda, katero ʃo ony*
v'Iutrovi desheli vidili, je pred nymi ʃhla tjakaj, dokler je priʃhla inu osgoraj obʃtala
(DB 1584: III,3b); (2) *Kadar **ie** pag Erodesh **bil mertou**, pole, ta angel tiga Goʃpudi ʃe*
prikashe Ioshefu (TT 1557: 5) – *KAdar **je** pak Erodesh **bil vmèrl**, pole, tedaj ʃe je GO-*
SPODNI Angel Iosephu v'ʃajni perkasal (DB 1584: III,3b); (3) *VND das Weib gieng*
*hin ein zu Saul / vnd sahe / das er seer **erschrocken war*** (LB 1545: 564) – *Inu ta Shena*
*je notèr ʃhla k'Saulu, inu je vidila, de **ʃe je** on **bil** silnu **preʃtraʃhil*** (DB 1584: I,166b).

Another characteristic of Dalmatin's use of pluperfect is its incorporation into the
standard combination, intended for expression of the absolute completion of the ac-
tion. It includes an appropriate prefix (e.g., **od-**), pluperfect, and temporal clause as
the most appropriate syntactic pattern, e.g., *Vnd **da** sie **gessen hatten** / stunden sie auff*
(LB 1545: 564) – *Inu **kadar ʃo bily odjédli**, ʃo vʃtali* (DB 1584: I,166b).

1.3.4 Both authors expressed future with the same (traditional) means (descriptive
future tens, the construction *imeti/hoteti* + infinitive, (perfective) present tense),[14] they
only differed in the frequency of use of individual means. The wide selection dictated
carefully considered usage. The selection of one or the other possibility could be af-
fected by the reasons of content or style, the former ones particularly depending on the
need to express future and to modally nuance the utterance. The first two expressive
possibilities allowed the selection of aspectually different verbs. Besides the differ-
ence in the chosen expressive possibilities that were noticed in the compared transla-
tions, the analysis also showed aspectual difference, which is often a consequence of
the meaning of the chosen verb, and semantic, which is due to the modification of the
completion of the action (in one or both authors) or the difference in its *aktionsart*
(e.g., one-sided exposure of the beginning of the action: *pregovoriti – govoriti*, which
could be the result of relying on the translation source or distancing from it). In both
respects the compared translations can also differ in expression of other tenses, e.g.,
the past.

2 The correlation between aspect and voice

2.1 Among the differences affecting simultaneously and primarily the aspect and
voice, the most common one is Dalmatin's replacement of the passive with the ac-
tive voice.[15] It was recorded in almost half of the examples with such disagreement.
This replacement causes the expected rearrangement of information, as the agent or
the carrier of the course of action or the state appears in the role of subject instead
of being relegated on the syntactic periphery (in the adverbial expressing the agent)
or not being mentioned at all. The adverbial of agent is usually expressed with the
prepositional phrase *od koga* 'by whom' or *od koga skuzi koga* 'by whom through
whom', if in addition to the actual agent, which is usually God, an intermediary is

---

[14] Cf. Orožen 1970: 226.

[15] It was pointed out in several places by M. Orožen (e.g. 1986b: 110).

also mentioned. Examples: (1) *Letu ie pag vſe ſturienu, de bode dopolnenu tu, kar ie gouorienu od Goſpudi skuſi tiga preroka, kir pravi* (TT 1557: 2) *– Letu ſe je pak vſe sgodilu, de bi ſe tu dopolnilu, kar je GOSPVD ſkusi Preroka govuril, kateri pravi* (DB 1584: III,3b); *DAS ist aber alles geschehen / Auff das erfüllet würde / das der HERR durch den Propheten gesagt hat / der da spricht* (LB 1545: 1968).

Dalmatin replaces both passive constructions with active voice: the more common one, consisting of the finite form of the auxiliary verb *biti* and *-n* participle[16] (the form in *-t* is rare), and the less commonly used forms with *se*. A great majority of replaced participle passive constructions included the participle of the perfective verb (usually the same, less commonly synonymous or semantically changed) that Dalmatin used in active voice (e.g., *Inu kadar ſe Ioshef is ſna obudi, ſturi on, koker ie nemu bilu ſapouedanu od angela tiga Goſpudi* (TT 1557: 2) – *Kadar ſe je pak Ioseph is ſna bil obudil, je ſturil, kakòr je njemu GOSPODNI Angel bil sapovédal* (DB 1584: III,3b). Similarly, Dalmatin's replacements of Trubar's passive, expressed with *se*, are most of the time realized with the same verb. Although several replacements concern imperfective verbs, imperfectivity of the passive form with *se* certainly is not a rule.

In some cases the partial aspectual meaning contained in Trubar's translation, is also preserved in the active form in Dalmatin's Bible, but in most cases the replacement of construction also meant the shift from the state, which is the consequence of the previous completion of action, to the completion of a concrete action, course of action, or process. The latter previously approached or developed toward the end point, which is at the same time also inner boundary of action (e.g., *Kadar ie pag ta ſad naprei perneſſen, taku on sdaici ta ſerp kiakai poshle, ſakai ta shetou ie tukai* (TT 1557: 106) *– Kadar pak ſad pèrneſſe, taku on sdajci Sèrp tjakaj poſhle, sakaj shetou je tu* (DB 1584: III,21a). By replacing passive voice with active voice, Dalmatin usually accomplishes informational equalization of the translation, but often with different means than Trubar. The state, which Trubar expressed with passive forms, Dalmatin often presents in a different way (e.g., descriptively, with verbs of state, or with the previously mentioned pluperfect (cf. 1.3.3)). In the case of passive voice with participle the differentiation between past tense and pluperfect fails, which means that the form is paradigm-wise inferior to the active form.

The differences in the selection (and expression) of voice most often do not affect aspectual semantics of the imperfectives. In both cases, frequently (often even with the same verb) iterative (unlimited repetitions or general validity) and durative, and less frequently concrete-processual meanings are preserved. The difference between the compared translations that include the contrasting passive vs. active voice may be augmented by the use of aspectually opposite verbs (example (1)); by the contrast between transitive verb used by Trubar and intransitive verb used by Dalmatin or vice

---

[16] *-n*-participle is often used in places when now the participle in *-t* (e.g., *bijen*), is used, which has been previously mentioned (Ramovš 1952: 148–149, Orožen 1977: 97–98 etc.). Ramovš (1952: 148) explains the confusion of the two endings as the consequence of the analogy between verbal classes. M. Orožen (1977: 97–98) noticed the difference in Trubar's and Dalmatin's use of the passive participle in *-t*: it is less frequent in Trubar's writing, while Dalmatin under the influence of his dialect comes closer to the modern usage, although he still uses it rarely.

versa (cf. example (2)); and by the contrast between the state following the completion of action and the unfinished process aiming to achieve the same state (example (1)). Examples: (1) *ty slepci uidio, ty hromi hodio, **ty gobouci bodo ozhiszheni** /.../ ty mertui gori uſaieio* (TT 1557: 183) – *Slépci vidio, Hromci hodio, **Gobouci zhiſti poſtajejo** /.../ Mèrtvici gori vſtajejo* (DB 1584: III,34b); (2) *Kateru ie pag umei tu Terne palu, ſo lety, kir /.../ **bode ſadushenu**, inu obeniga ſadu ne perneſſo* (TT 1557: 187) – *Kateru je pak mej tèrnje padlu, ſo ty, kir /.../ **sadahneo**, de obeniga ſadu nepèrneſſó* (DB 1584: III,35a).

The comparative analysis of concrete usage of both voices has shown that both authors had a good practical command of the two categories. The evidence of Dalmatin's mastery are also the cases when he departed from Luther's translation.[17] The individuality of Dalmatin's translation is also evident from the examples where a mechanical exchange of syntactic positions of the agent and the patient in selecting the opposite voice (usually because of the ellipsis of one of the actants) was not viable. Even more indicative are the cases when Dalmatin, by changing the voice, also replaced incomplete syntactic structures from Luther's Bible with complete ones. Examples: (1) *DA **gieng alles Fleisch vnter*** (LB 1545: 36) – *Tedaj **je konzhanu bilu vſe meſſu*** (DB 1584: I,5b); (2) *DA nu Samuel alle stemme Jsrael erzu bracht / **ward getroffen der stam BenJamin*** (LB 1545: 524) – *Kadar je vshe Samuel vſe Israelſke Roduve bil ſemkaj pèrpelal, **je ta Loſ padèl na BenIaminou Rod*** (DB 1584: I,155a).

2.2 Trubar and Dalmatin used both types of formation of passive, but Dalmatin favored the formation with the passive participle in *-n*. The choice of this form was prompted by the translation source (Luther) and the different possibility in expressing partial aspectual meanings, which was related to the need to emphasize the completion of action or express the state following the completion of action (example (1)). One of the consequences of choosing another form of passive is the change in the expressed situation. Since the state is the consequence of the previously completed action, the choice of the passive formed with *-n* participle involves skipping of one phase of action and consequently a different account of the action sequence. The second, later, phase is actualized, which is often also emphasized with the choice of temporal forms (example (2)). Examples: (1) *Ona prauita knemu, Goſpud de **ſe** naiu ozhi **odpro*** (TT 1557: 60) – *Ona ſta k'njemu djala: GOSPVD, de **bodo** naju ozhy **odpèrte*** (DB 1584: III,13a) – *HERR / das vnsere augen **aufgethan werden*** (LB 1545: 2008); (2) *ena Dezhla bode /.../ rodyla eniga Synu inu nega ime bode imenouanu Emanuel, kateru **ſe isloshi**, Bug ſnami* (TT 1557: 2) – *ena Dezhla bo /.../ eniga Synu rodila, inu bodo njegovu ime, Emmanuel, imenovali, kateru **je ſtolmazhenu**, Bug s'nami* (DB 1584: III,3b) – *EINE JUNGFRAW WIRD SCHWANGER SEIN / VND EINEN SON GEBEREN / VND SIE WERDEN SEINEN NAMEN EMANUEL HEISSEN / DAS **IST VERDOLMETSCHET** / GOTT MIT VNS* (LB 1545: 1968). In the latter example, Trubar's passive of the perfective verb (*ſe isloshi*), expressing temporally unbound

---

[17] While the replacements took place in both directions (Merše 1993: 232–233; 1995a: 509), the replacements of passive with active forms are more common (Merše 1998: 69).

action with a possibility of unlimited repetitions,[18] is in Dalmatin's Bible logically replaced with a passive expressed with the participle. This participle is based on another perfective verb (*je ſtolmazhenu*), expressing the state after a completed action.

Neither of the forms expressing passivity used by Trubar and Dalmatin is particularly linked to one aspect. However, they differ in the frequency of expressing individual partial aspectual meanings. Among atypical uses, usually explainable by analogy, are the use of passive with *se* of the perfective verbs with the atypical meaning of state (example (1)), which is otherwise characteristic of the passive expressed with participle of perfective verbs, and the use of passive expressed with participle of imperfective verbs with perfective meaning (example (2)); this use has been preserved in the contemporary standard Slovenian.[19] Examples.: (1) *En kamẽ na tim drugim nekar ne oſtane, kir **ſe ne resbye*** (TT 1557: 139) – *En kamen nebo na drugim oſtal, kateri bi resbyen nebil* (DB 1584: III,26b); (2) *leta ie ta kir ie poleg tiga potu uſeian* (TT 1557: 37) – *Inu tu je ta, kateri **je ſejan** raven pota* (DB 1584: III,9b).

The comparison also revealed some cases of disagreement, which is the result of Dalmatin's choice of passive in place of Trubar's active. Dalmatin introduced the passive for similar reasons that led him to abandon it. He used it to achieve the desired information quality of the clause or even longer sentence, particularly to emphasize the state arising with the completion of action and for distancing from the iterative action, which is actualized in Trubar's translation (example 1)). He also introduced the passive when he wanted to front the patient while moving the agent or the cause for a particular action into the periphery or even conceal it (example 2)). These choices in some places rendered greater stylistic effect, particularly if the replacement established structural coherence, which was also rhythmically effective (cf. example (1)). The diminished presence of the passive in Dalmatin's language was also prompted by his employment of the aforementioned, more widely used forms expressing the state, to which he was often directed by Luther's translation. Examples: (1) *Inu kadar ſo ga sketinami ſueſali, inu ute pote ſaklenili, taku ie uſe ſueſe reſtergal, inu **ta Hudizh ga ie poial po puſzhauah*** (TT 1557: 188) – *Inu on je bil s'ketinami svesan, inu v'ſpringarje vklenjen, inu je reſtèrgal te svese, inu **je bil od Hudizha gnan v'puſzhavo*** (DB 1584: III,35b); *Vnd er war mit Ketten gebunden / vnd mit Fesseln gefangen / vnd zureis die Bande / vnd **ward getrieben von dem Teufel in die wüsten*** (LB 1545: 2092); (2) *Inu kadar **ſo zhes nega ty Viſshifary** /.../ **toshyli**, nishter nei odguuoril* (TT 1557: 87) – *Inu kadar **je on bil satoshen od Viſhih farjeu** /.../ nej on niſhtèr odguvoril* (DB 1584: III,17b).

---

[18] The aforementioned (partial aspectual) meaning of the perfective verb creates conditions for competition with the imperfective verb with the same meaning (Bondarko 1967: 59–60). The cases of aspectual competition, which are the result of the realization of partial aspectual meanings of perfective and imperfective aspects, in contemporary standard Slovenian were noted by Plotnikova 1975: 13–14 (e.g., *Sem že malical – Sem že pomalical* and *Mislim, da smo mu prinesli tudi vedno sonca – Mislim, da smo mu prinašali tudi vedno malo sonca*).

[19] This type is discussed by Orešnik (1994: 36). He cites the examples *sin je bil tepen* and *krompir bo pečen v desetih minutah*.

3 The correlation between aspect and mood

3.1 The most noticeable difference is the one between Trubar's use of the indicative and Dalmatin's parallel use of the conditional mood. This type of differentiation is evident in one third of all differential examples (Merše 2001: 121–124 in 2002: 302–303). One can conclude that in Dalmatin's language the conditional has proportionally much larger share vis-à-vis the indicative than the active voice has vis-à-vis the passive voice. Dalmatin expressed conditionality with specialized forms still in use today, while in Trubar's texts in comparable places one can often find syntactic and lexical substitutes, such as conditional clauses and modal verbs.

3.1.1 The opposition between the indicative and conditional moods in their basic functions (example (1)) accounts for the greatest semantic difference when comparing Trubar's and Dalmatin's texts.[20] The two basic functions are ascertaining for the indicative mood and rendering of a hypothetical action depending on the possibility and conditions of its realization for the conditional mood (Toporišič 2000: 329). The differences can usually be found in the same type of clause (in subordinate clauses, main clauses, or coordinate clauses); less commonly they are connected with the choice of a different type. Compared to Trubar, Dalmatin used the conditional more consistently in the conditional hypotactic sentences, fairly often also in final and object clauses (in concrete realizations illustrating the content of the previously expressed command, prohibition, request, desire, etc.) and in interrogative sentences. The differentiation is occasionally augmented by Dalmatin's simultaneous use of modal verbs (example (2)). The changes show that Dalmatin's introduction of conditional is often closely tied to the repetitiveness of action (example (3)). They are usually realized with the same, less often with a synonymous or aspectually opposite verb. Examples: (1) *ſſliſſom is nih iſuprasha ta* **zhas, vkaterim ſe ie ta ſueisda prikaſala** (TT 1557: 3) – *je ſkèrbnu is nyh isvpraſhoval,* **kadaj bi ſe ta Svésda bila pèrkasala** (DB 1584: III,3b); (2) *ſakai ona ie ſama ſebo diala,* **De ſe ieſt le nega guanta dotagnem taku bom ieſt ſdraua** (TT 1557: 24) – *ona je ſama ſabo djala:* **De bi ſe jeſt mogla le njegoviga Gvanta dotekniti, taku bi jeſt sdava poſtala** (DB 1584: III,7a); 3. *te ie on* **vpraſhal, kei Criſtus ima biti royen** (TT 1557: 3) – *inu* **je** *nje* **isvpraſhoval: Kej bi imèl Criſtus rojen biti?** (DB 1584: III, 3b).

3.1.2 Within conditional feasibility or even non-feasibility of the actions, occurrences, or states denoted by the verbs in conditional mood, the selection remains aspectually unlimited. In addition, the spectrum of attested partial meanings of perfective and imperfective aspect is wide, despite the fact that the differences in the frequency of individual meaning in reality narrow it down (e.g., *govoriti*; *hoditi*; *videti*, *slušati*; *imeti pomagati*, *moči soditi*, *smeti govoriti*; *imeti*; *znati*; *gospodovati,* etc.).

---

[20] The comparison also found several examples of the reverse contrasts (conditional mood in Trubar's text > indicative mood in Dalmatin's text), which, like all similar non-central substitution tendencies, show that the authors were fully familiar with various possibilities of expressing conditionality and that they were well aware of the functional range of individual forms and modes of expression.

Examples: *Inu de **bi** jeſt **vmèl prerokovati**, inu **bi vejdil** vſe ſkrivnoſti, inu **bi** vſe **snal**, inu **bi imèl** vſo vero, taku, de **bi** Gorre **preſtaulal**, inu **bi** lubesni **neimèl**, taku **bi** jeſt niſhtèr **nebil*** (DB 1584: II, 94a). Among the most common partial aspectual meanings are the expression of repetition (mostly with unlimited number of repetitions), duration, and general validity of action.

3.1.3 Trubar's and Dalmatin's languages also differ in the ways in which they express intention. The following forms are used in this capacity: final clause with indicative mood, infinitive, and final clause with conditional, which was used more commonly by Dalmatin than by Trubar. In this case, the differentiation is more commonly than with other functions of conditional accompanied by the choice of the aspectually opposite verbs. Among them there are cases of aspectual competition, e.g., *hlapez, kateriga ie ta Goſpud poſtauil zhes ſuio drushino, **de on tei per prauim zhaſu da nee ſpisho*** (TT 1557: 75) – *Hlapez, kateriga je Goſpud poſtavil zhes ſvojo Drushino, **de bi nym ob pravim zhaſſu ſhpisho dajal*** (DB 1584: III,5b). In the quoted example the verbs *dati* (Trubar) and *dajati* (Dalmatin) are used with the same partial aspectual meaning. They both denote action that allows numerous repetitions. The context points out the iterative meaning with the adverbial of time (*per prauim zhaſu / ob pravim zhaſſu*).

3.2 In terms of correlation with aspect, the imperative seems to be the most complex among the mood categories. Aspectologists have found that particularly in negated imperatives, i.e., in prohibitions, in some Slavic languages the mood prevails over aspect.[21]

3.2.1 The morphological difference in the expression of the imperative mood particularly stands out. In place of regularly formed imperative used by Trubar, Dalmatin's language synonymically uses constructions made of the auxiliary verb *imeti* and the infinitive (e.g., (1) *Leta ie mui lubi Syn /…/ Tiga **ui poslushaite*** (TT 1557: 50) – *Leta je moj lubesnivi Syn /…/ letiga **imate vy poſluſhati*** (DB 1584: III,11a); *DIS IST MEIN LIEBER SON /…/ DEN **SOLT JR HÖREN*** (LB 1545: 2000)). The construction is a calque, which is clearly evident from the comparison with the translation source, Luther. The parallel replacement of the expressive mode was carried out in second person singular and in first and second person dual (cf. the example above) and plural. Trubar expresses the command for the third person of all numbers periphrastically with the particle *naj* and the indicative present tense third person, and Dalmatin with the imperative forms for second person of all numbers (e.g., *ie li mogozhe, **nai gre** leta kelih od mene* (TT 1557: 82) – *je li mogozhe, taku **pojdi** leta Kelih od mene* (DB 1584: III,43a)).

Trubar's and Dalmatin's literary practice shows that in expressing prohibitions the same rule applies in the 16th century as it does today, i.e., that instead of negated imperative of perfective (and definite) verbs usually the imperative of imperfective

---

[21] Cf. Hrakovskij 1990: 27.

(and indefinite) verbs is used (Toporišič 1992: 348).[22] Trubar's and Dalmatin's occasional deviations from the common norm give evidence that there was not yet clear awareness of the rule. Dalmatin's corrections of this kind of violations in Trubar's writing and Trubar's own efforts for uniformity show that in choosing the aspect in the negated imperative, the rule was to use the imperfective, but the obligatory transformation of non-negated imperative of perfective verb into negated imperative of imperfective verb was ignored. The permanent validity of most prohibitions, particularly the prohibitions made by God (cf. example (1)), stimulated the use of imperfectives with the meanings of generally validity, durability, and iteration. A prohibition referring to a particular action might have prompted the choice of perfective verb instead of the expected imperfective (example (2)). (1) *Ne preshuſtuai, Ne vbyai, Ne kradi Ne prizhui kriuu, Poshtui* tuiga ozheta inu tuio mater (TT 1557: 227) – *Ti némaſh preſhuſhtvati*: *Ti némaſh vbyati*: *ti némaſh kraſti*: *Ti némaſh falſh prizhovanja govoriti*: *Ti imaſh* tvojga Ozheta inu tvojo Mater *poſhtovati* (DB 1584: III,42a); (2) *Letu Videne nikomer **ne poueite*** (TT 1557: 50) – *Vy **némate** lete prikasni nikomàr **povédati*** (DB 1584: III,11b).

<div align="right">
V angleščino prevedla
Marta Pirnat Greenberg.
</div>

Sources and References

Kr. Bidem, 1988: Vidovoe značenie konstrukcii bit' + »stradatel'noe pričastie«. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* (1988) 6. 63–68.

A.V. Bondarko, 1971: *Vid i vremja russkogo glagola.* Moskva.

A.V. Bondarko – L.L. Bulanin, 1967: *Russkij glagol.* Leningrad.

DB 1584 = Jurij Dalmatin, 1584: *BIBLIA.* Wittenberg.

Stephen M. Dickey, 2003: Verbal aspect in Slovene. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 56/3 (2003). Berlin: Akademie Verlag. 182–207.

Gerhard Helbig, Joachim Buscha, 1996: *Deutsche Grammatik.* 17. Auflage. Leipzig, Berlin, München, Wien, Zürich, New York: Langenscheidt, Verlag Enzyklopädie.

V.S. Hrakovskij, 1990: Vzaimodejstvie grammatičeskih kategorij glagola. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* (1990) 6. 18–36.

LB 1545 = Martin Luther, 1545: *Biblia, Das ist die gantze Heilige Schrifft Deudsch auffs new zugericht.* Wittenberg. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag. 1974.

Majda Merše, 1993: Glagolski vid v Dalmatinovi Bibliji ob naslonitvi na Lutrov prevodni zgled. *Rječnik i društvo. Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa o leksikografiji i leksikologiji održanog 11–13. X. 1989. u Zagrebu.* Znanstveni skupovi razreda za filološke znanosti 2. Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti. 227–236.

– – 1995a: Kongruenz und Divergenz der Übersetzung von Verben in der Dalmatinschen und Lutherschen Bibelübertragung. *Ein Leben zwischen Laibach und Tübingen : Primus Truber*

---

[22] The comparison between Dalmatin's translation and its source, Luther's translation, also shows the incongruence between the imperfective form and perfective meaning in negated commands in Slovenian translation, which indirectly underscores yet another characteristic of aspect in the 16th-century Slovenian literary language. Examples: *Du **solt** meinem Son kein Weib **nemen** von den töchtern der Cananiter* (LB 1545: 64) – ***Nejemli** mojmu Synuvi obene Shene od Kananiterskih hzhery* (DB 1584: I,15b).

und sein Zeit : Intentionen, Verlauf und Folgen der Reformation in Württemberg und Innerösterreich. Sagners slavistische Sammlung 24. München: O. Sagner. 492–510.

– – 1995b: *Vid in vrstnost glagola v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku 16. stoletja.* Dela Razreda za filološke in literarne vede SAZU 44. Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti.

– – 1997: Predpreteklik v Dalmatinovi Bibliji. *Jezikoslovni zapiski* 3. 9–24.

– – 1998: Vrste glagolskega dejanja v delih slovenskih protestantskih piscev 16. stoletja in tuje prevodne predloge. *Slavistična revija* 46/1–2. Zbornik slovenskih prispevkov za XII. mednarodni slavistični kongres v Krakovu. 55–71.

– – 2000: Vid in čas v Trubarjevih in Dalmatinovih biblijskih prevodih. *Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture* 36. Ljubljana. 21–34.

– – 2001: Glagolski vid v povezavi z načinom in naklonom v Trubarjevih in Dalmatinovih biblijskih prevodih. *Jezikoslovni zapiski* 7/1–2. 113–128.

– – 2002: Raba pogojnika v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku 16. stoletja. *Med dialektologijo in zgodovino slovenskega jezika. Ob življenjskem in strokovnem jubileju prof. dr. Martine Orožen.* Zora 18. Maribor: Slavistično društvo. 285–305.

– – 2003: Glagolski kalki v zgodovini slovenskega knjižnega jezika (prevzemanje, raba in primerjava s stanjem v slovanskih jezikih). *Slavistična revija* 51, Posebna številka, Zbornik referatov za trinajsti mednarodni slavistični kongres. 81–103.

– – 2005: Glagolski priponi *-ova-* in *-ava-* v jeziku slovenskih protestantskih piscev 16. stoletja. *Knjižno in narečno besedoslovje slovenskega jezika*, Zora 32. Maribor: Slavistično društvo. 353–379.

Janez Orešnik, 1994: *Slovenski glagolski vid in univerzalna slovnica.* Dela Razreda za filološke in literarne vede SAZU 40. Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti.

Martina Orožen, 1970: Razvojne tendence in realizacije futuralno-modalnih sistemov v knjižni slovenščini od 16. do 19. stoletja. *Prace filologiczne* XX. 223–233.

– – 1974: Razvoj iterativov v slovenskem jeziku. *Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture* 10. Ljubljana. 15–29.

– – 1977: Prisotnost dialektizmov v jeziku Jurija Dalmatina. *Krško skozi čas.* Krško. 87–98.

– – 1984: Gramatična in leksikalna preobrazba Dalmatinovega knjižnega jezika ob Japljevem prevodu Biblije (1584–1784–1802). *Protestantismus bei den Slowenen / Protestantizem pri Slovencih.* Wiener Slawistischer Almanach, Sonderband 13. Wien. 153–177.

– – 1986a: Stilni problemi Trubarjevega jezika. *Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture* 22. Ljubljana. 27–47.

– – 1986b: Vprašanja sintaktične interference v Dalmatinovem prevodu Biblije 1584. *Slovenci v evropski reformaciji.* Ljubljana. 105–123.

O.S. Plotnikova, 1975: *Glagol'noe vidoobrazovanie i nekotorye osobennosti funkcionirovanija vidov v slovenskom literaturnom jazyke.* Avtoreferat. Moskva.

J. A. Pupynin, 1995: Vzaimnye svjazi grammatičeskih kategorij vida i zaloga v russkom jazyke. *Semantika i struktura slavjanskogo vida* I. Krakov: Wydavnictvo Naukove WSP. 159–174.

Fran Ramovš, 1952: *Morfologija slovenskega jezika.* Ljubljana: Univerzitetna študijska komisija.

O. P. Rassudova, 1968: *Upotreblenie vidov v russkom jazyke.* Moskva: Izdatel'stvo moskovskogo universiteta.

Russkaja grammatika, Tom I, 1980. Moskva.

Jože Toporišič, 1992: *Enciklopedija slovenskega jezika.* Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.

– – 2000: *Slovenska slovnica*, Četrta, prenovljena in razširjena izdaja. Maribor: Založba Obzorja Maribor.

TT 1557 = Primož Trubar, 1557: *TA PERVI DEIL TIGA NOVIGA TESTAMENTA.* Tübingen.

Ada Vɪᴅᴏᴠɪč Mᴜʜᴀ, 1984: Struktura glagolskih tvorjenk v Trubarjevi Cerkovni ordningi. *Slavistična revija* 32/3 (1984). 245–256.

A. A. Zᴀʟɪᴢɴᴊᴀᴋ, A. D. Šᴍᴇʟᴇᴠ, 1997: *Lekcii po russkoj aspektologii.* Slavistische Beiträge 353. München: Verlag Otto Sagner.

Listkovno gradivo Sekcije za zgodovino slovenskega jezika Inštituta za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša, ZRC SAZU, zbrano s popolnimi izpisi del slovenskih protestantskih piscev 16. stoletja.

Pᴏᴠᴢᴇᴛᴇᴋ

Raziskovanje aspektualnosti, to je glagolskega vida in vrstnosti, v delih slovenskih protestantskih piscev 16. stoletja (Merše 1995) je pokazalo, da je bil glagolski vid v obdobju nastanka in začetnega normativnega ustaljevanja slovenskega knjižnega jezika uveljavljena in sistemsko dokaj trdna slovnična kategorija. Spoznanja o strukturiranosti in delovanju vidskega sistema v knjižnem jeziku 16. stoletja so ponudila primerno izhodišče tudi za raziskavo razmerij med vidom in drugimi glagolskimi kategorijami: časom, načinom in naklonom. Součinkovalna razmerja med naštetimi glagolskimi kategorijami, ki jih je mogoče odkrivati s primerjavo vzorčnih besedil, so se na funkcionalni ravni pokazala kot dokaj zapletena.

Najtesnejšo povezavo sta izkazovala vid in čas. Osnovno razliko med Trubarjevim in Dalmatinovim izborom časovnih oblik ustvarja večja pomenska obremenjenost sedanjika pri Trubarju kot pri Dalmatinu ter posledično pogostejša raba opisnih oblik (zlasti preteklika in predpreteklika) pri Dalmatinu. Analiza rab zgodovinskega sedanjika kaže, da je Trubar obliko skušal dodatno funkcionalno osmisliti in jo z namenom širjenja besedilne obvestilnosti uporabljal tako pri prikazu sklenjenih dogajalnih nizov kot pri izpostavljanju in poudarjanju posameznih členov niza. Zgodovinski sedanjik in preteklik nista postavljala omejitev glede izbora dovršnih ali nedovršnih glagolov, predpreteklik pa se je pogosteje povezoval z dovršnimi glagoli kot z nedovršnimi. Razlike glede izbora časovnih oblik stopnjujejo hkratne vidske razlike, v primeru vidske usklajenosti pa aktualizacija različnih delnih vidskih pomenov. V vidsko nevtralizacijskih položajih razlike lahko zbledevajo.

Znotraj problemskega območja, ki ga ustvarja povezava vida in načina, izstopa Dalmatinov izbor tvornika namesto Trubarjevega trpnika. Med predvidljive posledice spada obvestilna prerazporeditev. Večinoma gre za pretvorbo istega, lahko pa tudi sopomenskega ali pomensko spremenjenega dovršnega glagola. Zgradba s *se* kaže izrazitejšo vezanost na nedovršni glagol, ki se ohranja tudi pri pretvorbi. Pogosto izpričan je hkrati opravljen premik od stanja, ki je posledica predhodne dovršitve dejanja, k dovršitvi konkretnega dejanja ali procesa.

Razlike v izboru (in izražanju) glagolskega načina praviloma ne povzročajo spreminjanja vidske semantike. Isti delni vidski pomeni se pogosto pojavljajo obojestransko (npr. neomejeno-kratni, posplošeno-faktični in trajnostni oz. stanjski pomen, redkeje pa konkretno-procesni). Trubar in Dalmatin sta uporabljala obe tvorbeni različici trpnika (zgradbo, sestavljeno iz osebne oblike pomožnega glagola *biti* in deležnika *-n,* in obliko s *se*), prednost pa je Dalmatin vendarle dajal zgradbi s trpnim deležnikom *-n*. Na njen izbor je poleg Lutrove prevodne predloge lahko vplivala tudi različna možnost izražanja delnih vidskih pomenov, povezana s potrebo po poudarjanju dovršitve dejanja ali po izražanju stanja, ki sledi dovršitvi dejanja. Pri nobeni od obeh izraznih oblik trpnosti, ki sta ju uporabljala Trubar in Dalmatin, ni mogoče zaznati izrazite vezanosti na en sam vid. Obstajajo pa razlike med njima glede pogostosti izražanja posameznih delnih vidskih pomenov.

Opazovanje razmerja med vidom in naklonom je kot najočitnejšo razlikovalno potezo izločilo nasprotje, ki ga ustvarjata Trubarjeva raba povednega naklona ter Dalmatinova vzporedna raba pogojnika. V okviru pogojne uresničljivosti ali celo neuresničljivosti dejanj, do

gajanj ali stanj, ki jih označujejo glagoli v pogojniku, ostaja izbor vidsko nezamejen. Tudi spekter izpričanih delnih pomenov dovršnega in nedovršnega vida je širok, čeprav ga razlike glede pogostosti pojavljanja posameznega pomena realno krčijo. Trubarjev in Dalmatinov jezik se razlikujeta tudi glede načinov izražanja namere. Neujemalnost glede izraznega načina pogosteje kot pri drugih funkcijah pogojnika spremlja izbor vidsko nasprotnih glagolov. Izmed naklonskih kategorij se je glede odvisnostne povezave z vidom kot najbolj zapleten pokazal velelni naklon. Pri izražanju prepovedi je bilo že v 16. stoletju upoštevano še danes veljavno pravilo, da se namesto zanikanega velelnika dovršnega glagola navadno rabi velelnik nedovršnih glagolov.