

ÁGOST PÁVEL'S PREKMURJE SLOVENE GRAMMAR

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

Ágost Pável's unpublished Vend nyelvtan was ostensibly written as a normative grammar of literary Prekmurje Slovene.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 Pável'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 Pável's earliest works, *A vashidegkúti 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 Študijska 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, Pável took on the job reluctantly with the justification that it would be better he write the book than someone unqualified to do so. Pável 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.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.⁴ In order to be concise, we shall limit our discussion to selected topics in the phonology and morphology.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 – Glászoszlövje); §95–§106: Punctuation (Írásjelek – Locsila); §107: Abbreviations (Rövidítések – Kratice); Morphology (Alaktan – Oblikoszlövje) §108–§110: Parts of speech, sentence elements (Szófajok, mondatrészek – Beszédne vrszte, sztávkovi cslêni); §111–§113: Inflection (Ragozás – Pregibanje); §114–§173: Noun (Főnév – Szamosztálnik); §174–§200: Adjective (A melléknév – Priděvnik); §201–§204: Article (A névelő – Cslen, spólnik); §205–§230: Pronoun

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 štejem tudi panonske dialekte, čeprav po drugi strani ne moremo reči, da spadajo med slabo 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.

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 identified 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 ethnographic) in Northern Prekmurje and Porabje (Pável 1927 [= 1930–31], 1942a) as well as by the lengthy criticism of Kühar's Southern Prekmurje material ("A markók nyelve" [The language of the Marki], written in 1912 but never published, presumably remains in the possession of Pável's heirs, according to Novak 1970: 22–23).

⁵ Moreover, I intend to elaborate on the material in VN in further studies.

(Névmás – Zaimek); §231–242: Numeral (Számnév – Stévník); §243–§311: Verb (Ige – Glágol); §312–§325: Adverb (Határozószó – Priszlov); §326–§340: Preposition (Elöljáró – Predlog); §341: Conjunction (Kötőszó – Vézник); §342: Interjection (Felkiáltó szó – Medmet); §343–§385: Lexicon (Szótan – Beszédoszlóvje); §386–§455: Syntax (Mondattan – Sztávkoslóvje). Subdivisions will be discussed, where relevant, in the corresponding sections of this paper.

0.2.2 As is clear from this list, a considerable share of the work deals with sound change (90 sections or twenty three pages of the manuscript), primarily in the form of pan-chronic statements based closely on those that had appeared previously in Pável 1916 and 1916a. Sections 16 through 36 deal with vocalic change (A magánhangzók változásai), sections 41 through 91 with consonantal change (A mássalhangzók változásai). Several layers of innovation may be distinguished, though Pável treats them as belonging to a single historical plane. Underlying forms may be Common Slavic (*svet-ja* > *svěcsa* 'candle', *med-ja* > *měja* 'border' [§44]; *zem-ja* > *zemla* 'land', *mrav-ja* > *mravla* 'ant' [§45]) as well as dialectal Common Slovene (*vem da zse* > *vendar* 'however' [§68]) and pre-Prekmurje ("Pannonian") Slovene (*tushti* > *kushti* 'fat' [§73]). This imprecision may be overlooked in the context of the popular and pedagogical aim of the work, not to mention Pável's prestructural background. Regardless, the historical references seem to attest to a more ambitious goal, namely, that Pável aspired to write a descriptive grammar of Prekmurje Slovene.

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).⁶ 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 *li, ü, u, ei, ou, e, o, a, l*, short and unstressed *li, ü, u, e, o, ε, â, l*; *ö* occurs as a positional variant of several vowels, primarily in the neighborhood of sonorants, e.g., *hòñati* (CMG) (Pável has *hèñati* [169³²]) 'to shop', *kòriti* (C: 72³⁹) 'to light, heat', *vòter/vèter* 'wind', *zògo* (C: 85¹⁹) 'took (Msg)'; *r, l* and *n* may also form syllables.⁷ 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 *ε* replaces the traditional *ä*. The dot marking the "closed" midvowels *le/* and *lo/* 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 *le/* in all Prekmurje material should be read as [ε], unless otherwise marked. The lax unstressed [i] will be written merely as *i*; the lax realization is a predictable feature that Pável and others mark *i*. It should be noted that this vowel reduction is found strongly and consistently in Goričko (Fi, GPe, GS, Mk, Mt, Št, Ve) and Ravensko (C) dialects, though to a much lesser degree or not at all in the Dolinsko dialects (Bi, 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: ä* 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): ⟨á⟩, ⟨é⟩, ⟨í⟩, ⟨ó⟩, ⟨ú⟩, ⟨ő⟩, ⟨ű⟩. Diphthongs (under stress only) are marked by the pointed circumflex ⟨ê⟩, ⟨ô⟩ (= *leil*, *loul*). Short stressed *lel* (< *ĕ) and *lel* (< *e, *ĕ) are not distinguished: both phonemes are represented simply by ⟨e⟩, e. g., *leto*, *zselezo*, *zsena*, *pesz*, cf. C *lèto*, *želèzo* vs. *žèna*, *pès*.⁸ Short variants of *lêl* before the nasals in closed syllables are not reflected in VN, e. g., C *dèn-dén* 'day' (C: 39²⁰), *nesèn-nesén* 'I carry' (C: 39³⁸), *mènši-ménši* 'smaller (Msg)' (C: 39²⁷), VN *dén*, *nesém*, *ménsi*. The distribution of length in this position is in free variation in Cankova, according to Pável'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., *zsena* (= *žèna*) 'wife', *radoszt* (= *ràdost*) '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., *raniti*, *ranim*, *vnicsiti*, *vnicsim* (= *ràniti*, *rànim*, *vničiti*, *vničim*) 'feed (inf, lsg)', 'destroy (inf, lsg)'. Where the place of short stress can be thus deduced, the grave diacritic (˘) will be placed over the appropriate vowel in the present paper, e. g., *ràniti*, *rànim*, *vnicsiti*, *vnicsim*.

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: *ldʹ* (used in Pável 1909, 1916, 1916a, 1917, 1918) stands for the reflex of Common Slavic *j before a stressed vowel or after

Prekmurje dialects. The distribution of *a* and *ā* may be described as follows: in Goričko, Ravensko and northern Dolinsko dialects (Br, Go, Re) long stressed *ál* is realized as [a], short stressed *âl* as [ā]; in southern Dolinsko dialects (Bi, MP) the opposite is true; *ál* → [ā] and *âl* → [a]. Unstressed *al* is labialized in C, Go. The symbol *y* represents a high central vowel, not unlike Russian *bl*, that is found in Mt as the reflex of *ī, e. g., *syn* 'son', *líp* 'lindens (Gpl)'. Diphthongs, which should be regarded as single phonemes in Prekmurje, are written without the customary non-syllabic markers, thus *lièl*, *lèil*, *lòul*, etc. should be read [iè], [èi], [òu]. Phoneme sequences retain the non-syllabic mark, e. g., Lpl *na nogái* ← *lna=nog-á-jl*. The articulation of the first part of the diphthong *lèil* has a low realization and should be read [èi] in GS, Mt and Št. In order to minimize the prosodic symbols used, in all Prekmurje material the acute (˘) and grave (˘) stand for length and shortness under stress, respectively, as these dialects have no tonemic distinctions. The local dialects Mt, Št and Ve have no quantitative distinctions, so that here prosodic markers stand for place of stress only.

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 "metelčica" and representations of Slovene phonology for pedagogical purposes.

a consonant (*d'àgoda* 'berry' [C: 117³²], *zèld'e* 'cabbage' [C: 122³⁸]); the dialect has a true palatal nasal [ɲ] from proto-Slavic and dialectal Slovene simplification of the cluster *nj* (*kòñ* [C: 23³³], *kaméne* [C: 116¹¹]). Consonantal graphemes in VN correspond to those in Standard Slovene, with the following exceptions: ⟨*cs*⟩ = /č/, ⟨*dzs*⟩ = /dž/, ⟨*nj*⟩ = /ɲ/, ⟨*s*⟩ = /s/, ⟨*sz*⟩ = /s/, ⟨*zs*⟩ = /ž/. The graphemes ⟨*gj*⟩ and ⟨*tj*⟩ are used for the variants of /dʲ/, where applicable (see below, 3.1.2). The diagraphs for palatal consonants, written with the second element ⟨*j*⟩, depart from Hungarian and earlier Prekmurje practice, i.e., ⟨*gy*⟩, ⟨*ty*⟩, ⟨*ny*⟩, (cf., Novak 1986: 125–126; 1988: 14–15).

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 morphological 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 **ǣ*, **ǣ*/**è* in certain morphological environments, **ǣ* and **ē*) are found in Prekmurje dialects: *lel* (SW), *liel* (SE), and *lei* (N)⁹, e.g., *lel* (C): *vés* (41³³) 'village', *pén* (47³²) 'tree stump', *no(j)ét*, *no(j)éta* (46¹⁹) 'fingernail (NGsg)', *déska* 'board' (46¹⁷), *méd* (41⁴) 'honey', *bédra* (41¹) 'thighs', *fčéla* (41⁵) 'bee', *veseld'é/veseld'e* (41⁷) 'joy', *zeléni* 'green', *d'esén* (41¹²) 'autumn', *berén* (41²⁰) 'I pick', *nesén* (41²⁰) 'I carry', *mozgé* (42⁵) 'brain', *meglé* (46²⁹) 'clouds, fog (Npl)', *tébeltebé* (41²¹) 'you (AGsg)', *imé* (42²⁰) 'name', *zéli* (167¹) 'took (Mpl)'; *liel* (Re): *viès*, *mièt*, *nuièt*, *rièbra* 'ribs', *zelièni*, *jesièn*, *urièmu* 'we plow', *živìe* 'lives', *nesiète*, *tebiè*, *muzgiè*, *zièli*; *lei*¹⁰ (Mt): *vèis*, *pèin*, *dèin*, *mèit*, *jàsèin/d'èisàn*, *pèič*, *fčèila*, *podnèibia* 'climate (borrowed from St Sln)', *barèin*, *pobarèimo*, *splàčèi* 'he/she bakes', *ot sàstrèi* 'from [my] sister (Gsg)', *glavèi* 'heads (Npl)', *imèi*, *imèinla*, *zèili*. In VN the conservative situation (as reflected in Cankova) is represented in the orthography; the reflex is written *é*: *vés* (§129), *dén* (§155), *nojét*, *nojtá/nojéta* (§149), *rèbra* (§161), *bédra* (§161), *méd* (§155), *pécs* (§129), *jeszén* (§129), *neszém*, *neszés*, *neséte*

⁹ Pável was aware of the reflex *ei* 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), *Goričanci* (NE) and *Marki* (SE) (C: 40¹⁻⁷): *dèin/dén* 'day', *sèin/sén* 'dream', *korèin/korén* 'root', *stèim/stén* 'I read'. The picture is clearly quite simplified: cf. *dièn* 'day', *lièn* 'flax', *nesièn*, *nesèis*, *nesèimo* 'carry (1.2sg. 1pl)', *ščèin*, *ščèis*, *ščèimo* 'want (1.2sg. 1pl)' (Ve = Pável's *Bakard'e*). Here the relationship *ièN#*/C : *èiC* reflects the original situation *èN#*/C : *èiC* after the diphthongization of *è* > *iè* accompanying the loss of quantitative oppositions, as is also the case in Martinje (e.g., *lièto* 'year', *člièka* 'person (Gsg)', *zièld'e* 'cabbage' < **lèto*, **čl(o-v)èka*, **zèld'e*). The conservative reflex is found also elsewhere, e.g., *dén*, *lén*, *nojét*, *lakét*, *fčéla*, *péč*, *léd*, *zobgé* 'teeth', *sàrcé* 'heart', *rastém*, *žaném* 'I reap', *barém* (GS).

¹⁰ In Martinje the reflex has merged with that of **ē*, e.g., *brèik* 'hill', *snèik* 'snow', *stèinla* 'wall', *mèisac* 'month'.

(§263), *mozgé* (§125), *roké* (§118), *tebé* (§206), *imé*, *iména* (§167), *vzéla*, **vzéli* (§268).

3.1.2 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 Dolinsko Prekmurje (and the rest of Slavic), is represented instead: *zobjé*, *dojiti*, *jészti*, cf. *zubjiè*, *dujiti*, *jésti* (Re). Pável treats the development, as in earlier works (1909: 93–95, 117–128; 1916a: 102–103), as a two-stage innovation: $j > gj/tj (= [t']/[d']) > g/k$: *zobjé* > *zobjgé* > *zobge* 'teeth', *vlaszje* > *vlastjé* > *vlaské* 'hair', *dojiti* > *dogjiti* > *dogiti* 'to milk', *jészti* > *gjészti* > *gészti*.¹¹

3.1.3 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 *pèszem* 'song', *z bràtom* 'with brother (Isg)', *sžrànm* 'shame', *odprém* 'I open', *sžtèrem* 'I break', *kázsem* 'I show', *vrèmen* 'weather', *szèmen* 'seed'; cf. *pèsen* (C: 38³), *z bráton* (C: 13⁸), *otrén* (C: 22⁴⁰), *sžèren* (C: 24²⁶), *kážén* (C: 12¹⁸), *vrèimen* (C: 38²¹). The retention of *-m#* ≠ *-n#* is found in northern Prekmurje dialects, as Logar notes in Gornji Senik (Porabje) *d'árem* 'yoke', *pečém*, *rastém* 'I grow', *sèmen* (1974: 55–56). A similar situation has been recorded in a dialect in Yugoslavia close to Porabje: *pièsam*, *z broàtom* 'with brother (Isg)', *pačèim* 'I bake', *bobèim* 'drum' (Mt), 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. *ø*-stem masculine (§141–158), IV. *o*-/*e*-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 *gèzditi* (C: 125³⁴) 'to ride a horse', *bogš se* (CMG) 'you are afraid (2sg)', *vlaské* (C: 128¹⁴, G) 'hair', [dž] before back vowels *bodžàti 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*, *dž* 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', *gyég* (St Hung *jég*) 'ice', *borgyu* (St Hung *borjú*) 'calf' (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/Hodoš]) extending southward to the Mura (*gyöjök* [Petesháza/Petešovci]) (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, (**rəkà*, *ròkə* >) *ròka*, *rokô* (§118):

	VN	Attestations
Ngs	<i>ròka</i>	<i>ròuka</i> (C: 22 ⁷)
Asg	<i>rokô</i>	<i>rokòu</i> (C: 16 ²⁸)
Gsg	<i>rokél/ròke</i>	<i>roké</i> (CMG)
Dsg	<i>ròkil/rokê</i>	<i>ròuki</i> (CMG)
Lsg	<i>ròkil/rokê</i>	<i>ròki</i> (C: 75 ⁸)
Isg	<i>rokôv</i>	<i>rokòuf</i> (CMG) ¹²
NApl	<i>roké</i>	<i>roké</i> (C: 35 ²⁶)
Gpl	<i>ròk</i>	<i>ròuk</i> (CMG)
Dpl	<i>rokám</i>	<i>rokán</i> (Ve)
Lpl	<i>rokáj/ròkaj</i>	<i>rokàj/ròkaj</i> (C: 15 ³⁵)
Ipl	<i>rokámi</i>	<i>rokámil/rokàmi</i> (C: 13 ¹⁵)
NAdu	<i>ròkil/rokê</i>	<i>ròukil/rukèi</i> (Br, Go)
Gdu	<i>ròkil/rokêl/ròk</i>	<i>ròuk</i> (CMG), <i>ròukil/rukèi</i> (Br, Go)
DLIdu	<i>rokàma</i>	<i>rukàma</i> (Br, Go)

4.1.1 The desinence {-*ouv*} is given as the regular Isg 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 rukún* 'with one's hand', *z vihún* 'with one's ear', *pud zemlún* 'under the ground', *s kràvon* '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 -*ê* (OCS *rouk*) is attested in northern Prekmurje, e.g., *na vodèi*, 'on the water (Lsg)', *per sinèi* 'at [my] son's (Lsg)', (Mt); *nud'èi* (Dsg), *nə nud'èi*, *nə rut'èi* 'on one's leg, on one's hand (Lsg)' (Št), *na nod'èi* (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)', *moryei* '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. Isg present of verbs, where we would expect *neszém*/**neszèm*, but only the first occurs in VN, cf. 1.1.2). Length in the Lpl is amply attested *na nugái* (Bi), *na nugái*, *v rukái* (Re), *rukái* (Št); *na nogái* (GS).

4.1.4 The archaic NAG dual forms in -*ilê* (cf. OCS *nosk*, *rouk* [NAVdu]) are

¹² In my notes I find two tokens with metathesis (*z orkòuf*) and one without (*z rokòuf*), from the same informant.

attested, e.g., *nòugi/nugèi, ròuki/rukèi* (Br, Go). The Gpl in $-\emptyset$ 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 (*rokàma*): "[...] *rokàma* has a short *a*: in th[is] instance forms with long *á* are rarer" (§119). The opposition of length (in the Ipl) vs. shortness (in the DLIdu) is found in *z goszpàmi, goszpàma* 'ladies (Ipl, DLIdu)' (§121), while length only is found elsewhere, e.g., *nocsàmi/nocsmi, nocsàma* 'nights (Ipl, DLIdu)' (§130), *sz cseràmi, cseràma* 'daughters (Ipl, DLIdu)' (§133). Shortness is attested in the local dialects, e.g., *rukàmi, nugàmi, rukàma, nugàma* (Br, Go); *rokàmi, rokòma*¹³ (GPe). However, elsewhere I have found only length in, e.g., *rokàmi, rokàma* (Fi, Ve), *z rukàmi, na nugàma, na rukàma* (Bi, Re), which may be due to analogy with the Ipl. In Standard Slovene we find neo-circumflex in both case forms (*rokàmi, rokàma*), implying length in the final syllable $*-àmī, *-āmā$ (cf. Jaksche: 1965: 53–55; and particularly Toporišič 1988: 175). Shortness (in the final syllable) is, however, attested (and probably general) in other South Slavic dialects, e.g., Standard Serbo-Croatian *bràdama* 'beards (Ipl)', *rùkama, slùgama* 'servants (Ipl)' (Daničić 1925: 5); Posavian Serbo-Croatian (Župaña) *rukàma, grědàma* 'flower beds (Ipl)', *slùgàma, ovčàma* (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 desinenes $*-āma$ alongside $*-āmā$) 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) $\emptyset$ -suffix (*něszti*), 2. (§276–§277) $-no$ -theme (*zdignoti* 'to raise'), 3. (§278–§282) $-e$ -theme (*goreti* 'to burn'), 4. (§283–§289) $-i$ -theme (*moliti* 'to pray'), 5. (§290–§298) $-a$ -theme (*kálati* 'to chop'), 6. (§299–§300) $-üva/-áva-$ (*küpvati* 'to buy', *premetávati* 'to turn over, upset'), 7. (§301) present tense athematic verbs (*dàti: dàm* 'give [inf, lsg]', *jěszti: jèm* 'eat [inf, lsg]'). This classification is further subdivided into stems types, e.g. 1.1 (§260–261) dental stems (*szěszti: szédem* 'sit [inf, lsg]', *biti: bòdem/bòm* 'be [inf, lsg]'), 1.2 (§262–263) hissing fricative stems (*trěszti: treszém* 'shake [inf, lsg]', *gríszti: grizém* 'bite [inf, lsg]'), 1.3 (§264) labial stems (*dűbszti: dubém* 'chisel [inf, lsg]', *plėti: plevém* 'weed [inf, lsg]', *szűti: szpém* 'pour [inf, lsg]'), 1.4 (§265–266) velar stems (*szěcsti: szēcsem* 'cut down [inf, lsg]', *mòcsti: mòrem* 'be able [inf, lsg]'), 1.5 (§267–268) nasal stems (*vzėti: vžémem* 'take [inf, lsg]', *ozsėti: ozsmém* 'wring [inf, lsg]'), 1.6 (§269–270) liquid stems (*mlėti: mèlem* 'mill [inf, lsg]', *mrėti: merjém* 'die [inf, lsg]'), 1.7 (§271–275) vocalic stems (*biti: bújem* 'beat [inf, lsg]', *bűti: bűjem* '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 *plěszti* 'to spin, weave' (§261) is summarized here: present indicative: 1sg *pleté-m*, 2sg $-s$, 3sg $-\emptyset$ 1du $-va$ (M)/ $-ve$ (F, N), 2, 3du $-ta$ (M)/ $-te$ (F, N), 1pl $-mo$, 2pl $-te$, 3pl $-jo$;

¹³ Short stressed $\grave{a}$ is regularly raised to $\acute{o}$ before a nasal in Gornji Petrovci.

imperative 2sg *plèt-i* 1du *-va* (M)/*-ve* (F, N), 2, 3du *-ta* (M)/*-te* (F, N), 1pl *-mo*, 2pl *-te*; infinitive *plèszti*; supine *plèszt*; present active participle *plet-élô-csi* (*-a*, *-el-o*); *l*-participle *plè-o*, *-la*, *-lo*, (*-li*); past passive participle *pletèni*. The table is an abbreviated form of a larger, master table, in which the verb *lûbiti* '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 lûbo*, *lûbila*, *lûbilo*, *szí lûbo*...; future: *bodem/bom/mo lûbo*, *lûbila*, *lûbilo*...; conditional: *bi lûbo*...; past conditional: *bi bio lûbo*, *bi bíla lûbila*, *bi bilô lûbilo*...; optative: *naj lûbim/naj bi lûbo*...), as well as participial forms (gerund and present active participle: *lûbécs*, *lûbécsi* [*lezsecski*]; past active: *lûbivsi*; past passive: *lûbléni* [*zasiti*]) and the deverbal noun (*lûblénje* [*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-paradigm verbs, e.g., *pletèn/pletén* 'I spin, weave' (39³⁹) *merd'é* 'dies' (37⁴²), *cveté* 'blooms' (37³⁶), *cvetéjo* 'bloom' (CMG), *ord'é* 'plows' (16³¹), *orgémo* 'we plow' (CMG), *požené* 'pushes' (185⁵), *otpré* 'opens' (169⁷), *nesé* 'carries' (41⁴⁴), *neséte* 'you (pl) carry' (CMG), *deré* 'skins' (41⁴⁴), *peré* 'cleans' (41⁴⁴), *kučé* 'strikes' (41⁴⁵), *živé* 'lives' (41⁴⁴), *pečé* 'bakes' (41⁴⁵), *pečémo* 'we bake' (CMG), *tečé* 'runs, flows' (42¹), *tečéte* (CMG); *nesièš*, *nesiète*, *urjièmu*, *pečìè*, *pečìèmu*, *rastiè*, *uperiè*, *vlièè*, *živìèmu* (Re), *pasèi*, *pačèim*, *pačèimo*, *plàtèi*, *pradèimo*, *zràstèi*, *živèièš*, *živèimo* (Mt).¹⁴ These correspond to short and retracted stress in Standard Slovene and other Slovene dialects (*cvàtè* [Upper Carniola], *nésem*, *órzem* < **nesèm*, **orjèm*). The type is amply, if not exhaustively, attested in VN: *prèszti*: *predém*, *cvèszti*: *cvetém*, *plèszti*: *pletém*, *ràszti*: *rasztém* (§260), *nèszti*: *neszém*, *pàszti*: *paszém*, *trèszti*: *treszém* (§262), *dúbszti*: *dubém*, *zébyszti*: *zebém*, *szkúbszti*: *szkúbém*, *tèpszti*: *tepém* (§264), *rècszti*: *rècsem/ercsém*, *pècszti*: *pecsém*, *vlècszti*: *vlecsém*, *tècszti*: *tecsém*, *túcstì/kúcszti*: *tucsém/kucsém* (§265),¹⁵ etc. Non c-paradigm verbs are, of course, root stressed in the present: *szècszti*: *szècsem*, *mòcszti*: *mòrem*, *vřcszti*: *vřzem*, *léczti*: *lèzsem*, *priszècszti*: *priszèzsem* (§265), *vzèti*: *vzèmem*, *zacszèti*: *zacsнем* (§266), *trèti*: *tèrem*, *mlèti*: *mèlem*. (§269), etc.

¹⁴ The pattern, as Rigler has pointed out, is found also in Zilja, Carinthia ([1967] 1986: 198): *nàsén*, *nàsés*, *nàsémo* (the list includes also *zòbòastè*: **zòbòdés* -émo 'poke [inf, 2sg, 1pl]'; *grèabstè*: **grèabés* -émo 'rake [inf, 2sg, 1pl]'; *pòmèastè*: **pòmàdés* -émo 'sweep [inf, 2sg, 1pl]'; *plèastè*: **plàtés* -émo 'weave [inf, 2sg, 1pl]'; *tèapstè*: **tèpés* -émo 'beat [inf, 2sg, 1pl]'; *lèjècè*: **lèžés* -émo 'lie, recline [inf, 2sg, 1pl]'; *pèjècè*: **pèčés* -émo 'bake [inf, 2sg, 1pl]'; *rèjècè*: **rèčés* -émo 'say [inf, 2sg, 1pl]'; *tèjècè*: **tèčés* -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 (*nesièš*, *tečìèš*, *vedìèš*, *pletìèš*, *berìem*, *zovìem*, *oriem*, *pasìèš* etc.), has stated that "[i]t is worthwhile to consider the possibility that generalization of length in (c)-stressed [e]-presents is a common innovation of Central Slovak and Prekmurški, 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*-presents 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 *iti* in Porabje, e.g., *ìdèi*, *ìdèimo* (Vratuša 1939: 227) and in a few villages SE to Šalovci (*idèimo*) (ibid.: 220). The isogloss falls east of Mt (e.g., *iti/iti*, *ìde*, *ìdemo*, *nèìde* 'isn't going', *nàiti*, *nàidàn*, *nàide* 'find [inf, 1sg, 3sg]', as elsewhere in Prekmurje); so Vratuša's isogloss should be corrected (ibid.: 227).

5.2 Active participles (excluding the l-participle) are rare in Prekmurje, as well as the rest of Slovene, if not virtually extinct. However, in Pável'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'; *klečéči -a, -o (-e)* 'kneeling'; *noséči -a, -o (-e)* 'carrying'; *bežéči/pobižèčki* 'running' (C: 43¹⁰⁻¹⁷); *dajòuči -a, -o (-e)* 'giving'; *vedòuči -a, -o (-e)* 'knowing'; *delajòuči -a, -o (-e)* 'working' (C:76¹⁴⁻¹⁷). Only one past active participle is attested in Pável 1909: *zádav* 'having hit' (14⁴); 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, Pável 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 Pável 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.

Bibliography

- Asbóth, Oszkár, 1908: *A j > gy változás a hazai szlovének nyelvében és a dunántúli magyar nyelvjárásokban* [The Change *j > gy* in the Dialect of the Slovenes in Hungary and the Hungarian Dialects Beyond the Danube]. *Értekezések a MTA nyelv- a széptudományi osztálya köréből* 20, pp. 461–521.
- Daničić, Đuro, 1925: *Srpski akcenti* (= Posebna izdanja Srpske kraljevske akademije 58, *Filozofski i filološki spisi* 16). Belgrade: Srpska kraljevska akademija.
- Fonološki opisi srpskohrvatskih/hrvatskosrpskih, slovenačkih i makedonskih govora obuhvaćenih opšteslovenskim lingvističkim atlasom (Pavle Ivić, ed.) (= *Odjelenje društvenih nauka*; 55/9), 1981. Sarajevo: ANU BiH.
- Ftičar, Jože and Francka Benedik, 1981: *Gomilice* (= OLA 21). *Fonološki opisi*..., pp. 179–182.
- Grafenauer, Ivan, 1905: *Zum Accente im Gailthalerdialekte*. *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 27, pp. 195–228.

- Ivšić, Stjepan, 1913: Današnji posavski govor (Svršetak). Rad JAZU 197/83, pp. 9–138.
- Jaksche, Harald, 1965: Slavische Akzentuation II. Slovenisch. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Logar, Tine, 1966: Prispevek k dialektologiji Goričkega. Panonski zbornik (Franc Zadravec, ed.), pp. 29–30. Murska Sobota: Pomurska založba.
- , 1974: Govor Slovencev v Porabju na Madžarskem (Glasovna skica). X. seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture (Tine Logar, ed.), pp. 53–57. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- Logar, Tine and Péter Király, 1981: Gornji Senik (Felsőszőlők) (= OLA 149). Fonološki opis..., pp. 213–218.
- Novak, Vilko, 1970: Življenje in delo Avgusta Pavla. Razprave: dissertationes 7/7, pp. 295–341.
- , 1986: Über die Phonetik des Dialekts von Prekmurje in der Volks- und Schriftsprache. *Linguistica* 11, pp. 111–131.
- , 1988: Slovar stare knjižne prekmurščine. Poskusni snopič. Ljubljana: Znanstvenoraziskovalni center SAZU.
- Pável, Ágost (= Avgust Pavel), 1909: A vashidegkúti szlovén nyelvjárás hangtana [The Phonetics of the Slovene Dialect in Cankova] (= A Magyar szláv nyelvjárások 1, Oszkár Asbóth, ed.). Budapest: A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
- , 1916: A legújabb vend irodalom nyelve [The Most Recent Prekmurje Slovene Literary Language]. *Nyelvtudomány* 6/1, pp. 1–27.
- , 1916a: A legújabb vend irodalom nyelve (cont.). *Nyelvtudomány* 6/2, pp. 103–116.
- , 1917: Vend szöveggyűjtemény s az eddigi gyűjtések története [A Collection of Prekmurje Slovene Texts and the History of their Collection to Date]. *Nyelvtudomány* 6/3, pp. 161–187.
- , 1918: Vend szöveggyűjtemény s az eddigi gyűjtések története (cont.). *Nyelvtudomány* 6/4, pp. 263–282.
- , 1927: Nyíltűzhelyű konyhák a hazai szlovénoknál [Open-Hearth Kitchens of the Slovenes in Hungary]. A Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum Néprajzi Tárának Értesítője 19, 129–144.
- , 1930–1931: Odprta ognjišča v kuhinjah rabskih Slovencev (Slovene trans. of Pável 1927). *Etnolog* 4, pp. 125–145.
- , 1942: Vend nyelvtan [Prekmurje Slovene Grammar]. Unpublished manuscript, located in Študijska knjižnica, Murska Sobota. (Ms. prepared in Szombathely and Cankova.)
- , 1942a: Rigászás a Vendvidéken és az Őrségben [Stalking the Fieldfare in Porabje and Őrség]. Néprajzi Értesítő, pp. 141–163.
- Penavin, Olga, 1966: A Jugoszláviai Muravidék magyar tájnyelvi atlasza [Atlas of Prekmurje Hungarian Dialects in Yugoslavia] (= A magyar nyelvtudományi társaság kiadványai 116). Budapest: A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság.
- Ramovš, Fran 1952: Morfológija slovenskega jezika. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.
- Rigler, Jakob, 1963: Pregled osnovnih razvojnih etap v slovenskem vokalizmu. *Slavistična revija* 14/1–4, pp. 25–78. Reprinted in Rigler 1986, pp. 139–186.
- , 1967: Pripombe k Pregledu osnovnih razvojnih etap v slovenskem vokalizmu. *Slavistična revija* 15/1–2, pp. 129–152. Reprinted in Rigler 1986, pp. 187–207.
- , 1968: Začetki slovenskega knjižnega jezika (= Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti, Razred za filološke in literarne vede 22, Inštitut za slovenski jezik 10). Ljubljana: SAZU.
- , 1973: Smeri glasovnega razvoja v panonskih govorih. Študije o jeziku in slovstvu, pp. 113–128. Reprinted in Rigler 1986, pp. 116–128.
- , 1976: Junkovičeva kajkavska teorija in slovenščina. *Slavistična revija* 24/4, pp. 437–465.
- , 1977: O slovensko-kajkavskih jezikovnih razmerjih. XIII. seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture. Zbornik predavanj, pp. 29–38. Reprinted in Rigler 1986, pp. 129–138.
- , 1986: Razprave o slovenskem jeziku (Franc Jakopin, ed.). Ljubljana: Slovenska Matica.
- Toporišič, Jože, 1988: Tvorbeni model slovenskega knjižnega naglasa. *Slavistična revija* 36/2, pp. 133–180.
- Vermeer, Willem R., 1984: On Clarifying some Points of Slavonic Accentology: the Quantity of the Thematic Vowel in the Present Tense and Related Issues. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 5/2, pp. 331–395.
- Vratuša, Anton, 1939: Jezikovne razmere v severnem Prekmurju in slovenskem Porabju. *Slovenski jezik* 2: pp. 213–228. Republished with minor adjustments, though without dialect map: 1966, Panonski zbornik (Franc Zadravec, ed.), pp. 20–28. Murska Sobota: Pomurska založba.

Material

(References not listed above in the bibliography are to students' bachelor's theses, consisting of answers to the field questionnaire for the Slovene Linguistic Atlas Project; they are available in the Slavic Library of the Filozofska fakulteta, Ljubljana University. A complete list of these appears in Slavistična revija 34/2, 1986, pp. 228-232.) **Bi** = Bistrica: my material; **Br** = Brattonci: Majda Jeneš 1983; **C** = Cankova: Pável 1909, 1917, 1918; **CMG** = Cankova: my material; **Fi** = Filovci: Marjan Kulčar 1985; **Go** = Gomilice: Ftičar and Benedik 1981, Irena Lebar 1986; **GPe** = Gornji Petrovci: Janez Glažar 1967; **GS** = Gornji Senik: Logar 1974, Logar and Király 1981; **Mk** = Markovci: Logar 1966; **Mt** = Martinje (stress only): my material; **MP** = Mala Polana: my material; **Re** = Renkovci: my material; **Št** = Števanovci (stress only): Mária Horváth 1985; **Ve** = Večeslavci (stress only): Majda Domijan 1983.

POVZETEK

Prispevek obravnava neobjavljeno normativno slovnico knjižne prekmurščine Avgusta Pavla Vend nyelvtan (VN) ter skuša prikazati razmerje njenega jezika do žive prekmurščine. Primerjava te slovnice s terenskimi zapisi in opisi posameznih govorov kaže, da je Pavel za normativne oblike izbral pretežno starinske pojave, 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 zemljepisno razporeditev, vendar z novejšimi podatki o narečju lahko določimo izoglose posameznih pojavov. Novost VN je v njeni obširni in urejeni predstavitvi prekmurskega oblikoslovja, ki poleg tega nudi tudi bogato primerjalno gradivo. Pri sklanjatvi najdemo dvojnice, ki kažejo starinsko, pa tudi novejšo stanje. Pri glagolskem oblikoslovju so izpričane oblike, ki jih le redko najdemo v terenskih zapisih. Ker so podane paradigme in po vsej verjetnosti izčrpn seznam leksmov, ki pripadajo tem vzorcem, je načelno možno tvoriti veliko gradiva, ki v slovnici ni izrecno izpričano.