

UDC 811.163.6'367.62

*Marko Jesenšek*

Faculty of Arts, Maribor

## PARTICIPIAL AND GERUNDIVAL CONSTRUCTIONS IN -Č AND -ŠI IN SLOVENIAN

The Central Slovenian literary language between the 16<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> cc. did not make good use of the expression with participial and gerundival forms in -č and -ši, in fact, they were nearly forgotten. They were brought back to life in the 19<sup>th</sup> c. under the influence of the Prekmurje literary language and following the example of OCS. In the uniform Slovenian literary language of the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> c., the forms in -č and -ši became fashionable and extremely literary, but at the end of the century with the arrival of the Slovenian Moderna they again retreated to the linguistic periphery, where they survive in expository and journalistic language as an effective syntactic condenser and means for the hierarchization of actions.

Deležniško in deležijsko izražanje z oblikami na -č in -ši je bilo v osrednjeslovenskem knjižnem jeziku od 16. do 19. stoletja slabo izkoriščeno in skoraj pozabljeno, pod vplivom prekmurskega knjižnega jezika in po vzgledu stare cerkvene slovanščine pa je v 19. stoletju ponovno oživel. Oblike na -č in -ši so v enotnem slovenskem knjižnem jeziku druge polovice 19. stoletja postale modne in izrazito knjižne, konec stoletja pa so se z nastopom slovenskih modernistov ponovno umaknile na jezikovno obrobje, kjer so se obdržale v znanstvenem in tudi publicističnem jeziku kot učinkovit skladenjski strnjevalec in sredstvo za hierarhizacijo dejanj.

**Key words:** history of the Slovenian language, Old Church Slavic, Central and Eastern Slovenian literary languages, uniform Slovenian literary language, syntactic condensation, participles and gerunds in -č and -ši

**Ključne besede:** zgodovina slovenskega jezika, stara cerkvena slovanščina, osrednje- in vzhodnoslovenski knjižni jezik, enotni slovenski knjižni jezik, skladenjsko strnjanje, deležniki in deležja na -č in -ši

0 Slovenian adopted participial and gerundival constructions in -č and -ši from Old Church Slavic (OCS), but the question remains whether the (gerundival) forms in -ši were ever spoken in Slovene or they were already at the time of Cyril and Methodius only literary solution for expressing temporal relations, and as such, a sign of linguistic sophistication and used by writers to intellectualize their language. This reasoning was prompted by the fact that the forms in -ši were preserved in Eastern Slovenian Protestant and Catholic religious translations and secular texts of the 18<sup>th</sup> and first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> cc., which display a high degree of agreement with OCS translations of the Gospels. In the Slovenian Pannonian area, this points to the direct link between the archaic Prekmurje literary language and Eastern Slovenian ritual language with the Freising Manuscripts and through them, with Old Church Slavic (Jesenšek 2005). Compared to OCS, the Prekmurje literary language,<sup>1</sup> like other Slavic languages

---

<sup>1</sup> Martina Orožen, »Prekmurski knjižni jezik« *Poglavja iz zgodovine slovenskega knjižnega jezika*. Ljubljana 1996, 356–372. This is the most thorough Slovenian study on the Prekmurje literary language to date. It presents in detail its historic origins and area, distinctive structures, and the relation towards the Central Slovenian literary language. It also disambiguates the complex relationship with the Kajkavian literary language.

(Tomšič 1955: 66), limited the use of participial and gerundival forms. However, it was not entirely rid of them like »neo-Slovenian«, which purged its syntactic system particularly of gerunds in *-ši* and retained very few participles as adverbial forms already known in Bohorič's grammar,<sup>2</sup> or as adjectives such as, for instance, in the contemporary Standard Slovenian the form *bivši*, *-a*, *-e* (*Bivša jugoslovanska republika*; *bivši fant*, *bivša žena*) 'former'. In the Prekmurje literary language of the second half of the 18th and the first half of the 19th cc. these linguistic processes were not present, as it almost entirely preserved the rich inventory of expressive means from OCS, that is to say, the verbal-nominal diversity of forms in *-č* and *-ši*, i.e., the gerunds expressing coordination of time, while the participles are used in attributive, nominalized, predicative and adverbialized functions.

1 The use of gerunds in semi-predicative constructions to express actions that are simultaneous and antecedent in relation to the action of the verbal clause is common in OCS (Večerka 1961: 127). The comparison with Küzmič's *Nouvi zakon*<sup>3</sup> shows that their original function was preserved in the Prekmurje literary language.

1.1 Semi-predicative constructions with gerunds in *-č* expressing simultaneous actions are common in OCS and the Prekmurje literary language. Both systems display the rules that prove that the Prekmurje literary language in this respect continued the OCS tradition of shortening long and complex sentences: OCS (Mat. 12,25): *vědy že is. mysli imъ i reče imъ*. Števan Küzmič: *Znajoucsi pa Jezus mészli nyihove ercsé nyim*. OCS (Mat. 14,25): *въ четвъртъкъ же стражъ ношти. иде къ нимъ is. chode po morju*. Števan Küzmič: *Ob firtoj firá'zi pa te noucsi priľao je knyim Jezus hoděcsi po mourji*. There are some noticeable differences, but they are mainly the result of the translators' personal styles and the time difference in the conception of the Gospels. It would be unrealistic to expect the translations to agree entirely, as there is nearly a thousand years between them; also, Števan Küzmič did not use any other sources<sup>4</sup> besides the Greek original and the Hungarian translation (Bajzek 2005). This answers the question as to why Küzmič disambiguated into coordinating constructions or subordinated clauses those places that are in OCS condensed with the gerund: OCS (Mat. 2,18): *rachilъ плачѣши сѣ чједъ svoichъ. i ne chotěše utěšit sѣ*. Števan Küzmič: *Rachel je joukala ľzvoje szini, i nej sze je ľeila obeszeliti záto, kaj ji je nej bilou*.

1.2 While the use of gerunds for expression of antecedent actions agrees fairly well in both languages, the frequency of gerunds in *-ši* compared to the gerunds in *-č* declines in Števan Küzmič's writing (he replaces the OCS gerund with coordinating or subordinating constructions): OCS (Mat. 27, 60): *i vъzvalъ kamenъ velii na dvъri groba i otide*. Števan Küzmič: *i priváľavsi kamen veliki k dveram toga groba, odíde*.

<sup>2</sup> Adam Bohorič: *Arcticae horulae succisivae*. Witenberg 1584. On p. 154 he cites among deverbal adverbs the form in *-ši*: *skrivši* (Derivata sunt /.../ 3. A Verbo, ut: ľkriulhi, ľkrivaje, Clam. Furtim, à ľkrivam).

<sup>3</sup> Števan Küzmič, *Nouvi Zakon*, Halle 1771.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. the Latin Foreword to the publication of *Nouvi zakon* of 1771 and M. Küzmič's *Predgovori Štefana Küzmiča*, Ljubljana 1981.

OCS (Mar. 7,8): *ostavěše bo zapovědъ bъžjō drъžite prědaaniě čska*. Števan Küzmič: *Ár, tá niháte zapovid Bo'zjo, i zdr'zavate tadánke lüdi prajoucsi mažline i peháre*. In Mar. 7.8 the OCS gerund expresses an antecedent action in the present, which Števan Küzmič expressed with a finite verb: *ta nihate*. OCS had known the active past participle (gerund in -ši) for the verbs *iti*, *govoriti* (and their derivatives), and *videti*; Küzmič in this constructions expressed antecedent actions with the gerund in -č or with the periphrastic form *gda bi*: OCS (Mar. 13,36): *da ne prišedъ vъ nezačrō obrěšetъ vy sьpěšetъ*. Števan Küzmič: *Da nagyagno pridoucsi ne nájde váž lъpajoucse*. OCS (Mat. 9,8): *i viděvšē že narodi. divišē sę*. Števan Küzmič: *Gda bi pa tou lüftvo vidilo: csüdivalo lę je*.

2 The participial use of forms in -č and -ši is even more common than the gerundival use.

2.1 In OCS the participial forms in -y (-č) and -s (-ši) are often used as attributes.

2.1.1 The most common are the forms that take various cases, in which the OCS and Prekmurje use usually agrees: OCS (Mat. 8,17): *da sъbōdetъ sę rečenoє prorokotъ isaiemъ gljōštemъ*. Števan Küzmič: *Da bi lę lъpünilo, ka je povejdano po E'ziáfi proroki govorécsem*.

2.1.2 Števan Küzmič consistently replaced the Greek nominative absolute with the nominative absolute, which is attested in OCS translations, albeit rarely. In the oldest Slavic literary language Večerka found a few examples with the nominative absolute (Večerka 1961: 108), but Küzmič has this form in different places (e.g., *I idoucsi odnut Jezus, nažledüvala lęta ga dvá lęlepcza*. Mat. 9,27); instead of the OCS equivalent he has a specialized form for expressing pluperfectivity (*gda bi* and *-l*-participle): OCS (Mat. 8,5): *vъ ono v. prišedъ is vъ kapernaumъ. pripade emu sъtъnikъ*. Števan Küzmič: *Gda bi pa Jezus notri v Kapernaum lou, prižtoupō je k nyemi eden lętotnik profžęcsi ga*.

2.1.3 Števan Küzmič did not use the dative absolute, which is a feature of the OCS morphological-syntactic system. In the oldest Slavic language it has temporal, causal, conditional, and consequential meanings;<sup>5</sup> in these places, Küzmič has the participle in -č, past tense, specialized form for pluperfectivity, and rarely the series of coordinating constructions with the conjunction *i* (in the OCS translation the conjunction *i* connects the dative absolute with the predicative sentence): OCS (Mar. 8,1): *mnogu narodu sōštju. i ne imōštemъ česo čsti. prizvavъ is učeníky svoje gla imъ*. Števan Küzmič: *Vu oni dněvi, da bi jáko vnogo lüftva bilou, i nebi melo kaj jefžti, prizvajoucsi Jezus*

<sup>5</sup> On this topic see the exhaustive study by L. Nečásek, »Staroslověnské dativní vazby participiální a jejich předlohy v řeckém textu evangelíí«, *Slavia* 26, 1957, 13–30. He compared OCS translations with the Greek original, where the dative object often appears with certain verbs, i.e., the participial construction in the dative case often depends on *verba dicendi*.

*vucsenike ľzvoje ercsé nyim.* OCS (Mat. 26,47): *i ešte gl̑jostju emu. se i juda edinъ. otъ oboju na desete pride.* Števan Kūzmič: *I, gda bi eľcse on gucsao, ovo Judas eden ľztí dvanáľzet je priláo i 'znyim ľľľtva vnougo.* OCS (Mar. 2,23): *i bystъ mimo chodeľtu emu. vъ sôboty skvêžě sěňniě. i načěęę učenci ego pôtъ tvoriti.* Števan Kūzmič: *I prigoudilo ľze je; da bi on ľou vľzoboto po ľzvitváji: i zácsali ľzo vucseníccke nyegovi po pouti idoucsi menoti vlatovjé.*

**2.1.4** The participle with the auxiliary verb *biti* is used more often in the OCS translation than by Kūzmič. While Miklošič showed that such a usage, adopted from Greek, is not typically Slavic (MIKLOŠIČ 1883: 822), Večerka found several examples in *Codex Suprasliensis* where the construction with *biti* and the participle in *-č* appears, while the Greek source has different solutions, or the OCS translation uses different syntactic means in place of the Greek predicative construction (Jesenšek 1989: 245–246).<sup>6</sup> In Števan Kūzmič's translation the predicative construction with the participle appears as well, but his use only rarely corresponds with the OCS use, i.e., the participle is used as a predicative or subject, and sometimes he has the construction with *biti* and *-n*-participle in coordination with the participle in *-č*: OCS (Mat. 11,3): *ty li esi grědy. ili inogo čaemъ.* Števan Kūzmič: *Erkao nyemi je: tí ľzi te pridoucsi, ali pa drűgoga mámo csakati.* OCS (Mar. 7,15): *ischodeľtaa sôtъ skvrňňęšta čka.* Števan Kūzmič: *nego ta vöidoucsa od nyega; ona ľzo, ľiera olkrunio csloveka.* OCS (Mar. 14,4): *Běachô že etrii negodujôšte. vъ sebě. i gl̑jôšte.* Števan Kūzmič: *Bilí ľzo pa niki nemirovni vu ľzebi i govorěcsi.* Also interesting is the OCS example with the aorist of the auxiliary *biti* and the participle in *-č*. In those places Kūzmič preserved the participle, but replaced the aorist – which was lost in Slovene after the Freising Manuscripts – with the past tense of *biti*: OCS (Mar. 1,4): *bystъ ioanъ krъstę vъ pustyni. i propovědaje krъštenie pokaaniju.* Števan Kūzmič: *Bio je pa Ivan krľtsávajoucsi vu pűľcsavi i predgajoucsi krľt pokoure na odpűľcsanye grejhov.*

**2.2** Similarly, the nominal function of the forms in *-y* (*-č*) and *-s* (*-ši*) is well attested in both languages. The material contains numerous examples showing the similarities of the two linguistic systems. In OCS nominalized participles appear in various syntactic functions, i.e., as subject, object, attribute, vocative (Večerka 1961: 12–31). They are also very common in the Prekmurje literary language, which might indicate that they were alive in the spoken language in Eastern Slovenia. It is important to note that both the OCS and Prekmurje translations contain the same places where the Greek participle is disambiguated with a clause or replaced by a noun, i.e., the examples demonstrate original Slavic solutions: GR (Mat. 7,14): ὀλίγοι εἰσὶν οἱ εὐρίσκοντες αὐτήν. OCS: *malo ichъ estъ iže i obrětajotъ.* Števan Kūzmič: *i malo ji je, ľeri jo nájdejo.* GR (Mat. 24,49): ἐσθίη δὲ καὶ πίνη μετὰ τῷ μεθυνόντων. OCS: *ěsti že i piti. sъ pűňicami.* Števan Kūzmič: *I zacsne biti te ľebom ľľľ'zécse, jeľti pa i piti ľpiánczi.* Despite the common use and tradition that was preserved in the

<sup>6</sup> Cf. the Greek imperative or the Greek periphrastic form vs. OCS predicative participle (Jesenšek 1989: 245–246).

Slavic world (Večerka 1961: 15), the material shows that the use of the nominalized participle somewhat dwindled in the Prekmurje literary language. The differences occur particularly when the participle in -č expresses future tense in OCS: OCS (Mat. 3. 11): *grjedy že po mně krěplei mene estъ*. Števan Küzmič: *kī pa za menom pride, mocsnejli je od méne*.

**2.3** The adverbial function of the forms in -y (-č) and -s (-ši) shows a close connection between both morphological-syntactic systems. In OCS writing, the participles are commonly used with the accusative object. The construction with the object next to the verb *videti* is typically Slavic (Miklošič 1883: 823–824) and was largely preserved by Števan Küzmič: OCS (Mar. 1,10): *i vidě razvoděšta sę nbsa. i dchъ ěko golobъ sьchodeštъ na nъ*. Števan Küzmič: *I preczi gori idoucsi od vodé vido je odprta neběfza; i Dūha, liki golouba, doli idoucsega na nyega*. Mar. 1,10 is an interesting example, as it shows that the translations of the Gospels include only few variants with the participle and the verb of perception, which takes the accusative.

It is typical of Küzmič's translation that the participles in the constructions with the object always appear as right attributes, while in OCS they occasionally, if rarely, appear as left attributes. The examples in which the participle appears before the object in OCS, Küzmič translated periphrastically: OCS (Mat. 8,14): *vidě tьštq ego ležqštq*. Števan Küzmič: *I gda bi priľao Jezus vu Petrovo hi'zo, vido je puniczო nyegovo le'zēcso vu trésliki*.

**3** The Prekmurje use of participial-gerundival expressions is supported by the Slavic linguistic tradition, which is clearly evident from the comparison above. Števan Küzmič did not use OCS sources in his translation, but the comparison of the material nevertheless shows that the Prekmurje literary language of the second half of the 18th c. preserved a similar participial-gerundival morphological-syntactic system as it was attested in OCS. In *Nouvi zakon* gerunds in -č mainly express simultaneity of action and are as a rule derived from imperfective verbs, while participles in -č mostly occur in the functions of the right or left attribute, nominative absolute, nominalized and adverbial participle. Most differences occur in the use of the predicative participle with the auxiliary *biti*, as OCS translations use this syntactic solution, which is calqued from Greek, in several cases, while Küzmič as a rule disambiguated them. The predicative use (predicate attribute) of the participles was not Slovenian (Slavic), therefore in this function, identical syntactic solutions of both translations are only coincidental. Another apparent difference is in the use of the dative absolute, which was no longer known to the Prekmurje translator. A similar derivation and range of participial and gerundival constructions in -č in -ši is present in the writing of Števan Küzmič's Prekmurje Catholic contemporary, Mikloš Küzmič, which shows that Catholic writers also embraced the language of Števan Küzmič's *Nouvi zakon* as the Prekmurje literary standard, hence the gerunds clearly became a supradialectal, literary means for the expression of simultaneous and antecedent actions. The forms in -ši were preserved in the literary language because the influence of the Slavic tradition was sufficiently strong, but they were less frequently used because they were

not based in the existing spoken language. In the Eastern Styrian literary language of the first half of the 19th c., the participial-gerundival constructions in *-ši* had even lesser presence, i.e., they were replaced by the Central Slovenian syntactic solutions (coordinating constructions, clauses, infinitive).

4 The participles and gerunds in *-č* and *-ši*, which were common in OCS texts, were greatly reduced in the Freising Manuscripts (*imy*, *imont'i*, *prijeml'onti*) and the Central Slovenian literary language was largely rid of them until Ravnika, i.e., the forms in *-ši* ceased to be productive, while the gerunds in *-č* were limited mainly to cliché use and rare examples in writing by Trubar and writers that followed. Oblak's research of OCS placed its origin in the vicinity of Thessaloniki, however, this does not negate the thesis about the Slovenian Pannonian linguistic territory that was for centuries developing separately and differently from the Central-Slovenian Alpine territory. Oblak was convinced of that when he recorded dialects in »Hungarian« (*ogrski*) and by the Prekmurje translations of the Gospels and the *Bible* (Jesenšek 1998); among other things, also by the frequent use of the gerunds and participles in *-č* in *-ši*, which are not attested from Trubar to Ravnika in similar Central Slovenian translations. Oblak no longer found forms in *-ši* in dialects of »Ogrsko« Slovenes nor in Eastern Slovenian Styrian dialects, but they were preserved in the books by Prekmurje (Temlin, Sever, Števan in M. Kūzmič, Borovnjak, Košič ...) and Styrian (Dajnko, Kreml, Šerf ...) writers. The comparison with the Kajkavian lectionary (Krajačević) showed (Jesenšek 1989: 384–414) that in the Pannonian linguistic territory in all three literary variants (Prekmurje, Eastern-Styrian, Kajkavian) the same participial-gerundival system was preserved as it is attested in OCS.

Central Slovenian writers did not know such syntactic condensation. Trubar, Dalmatin, Kastelec, Svetokriški, and Japelj expressed antecedent actions primarily periphrastically, while for simultaneity they used mainly the cliché form of the gerund *rekoč*, and, besides a few other solutions, they were familiar mostly with attributive use of the participles in *-č*. The only exception was Ravnika, who in the 19th c. became interested in the Prekmurje syntactic condensation with participles and gerunds. However, the so-called Wolf translation of the Bible in the 1850s already reverted to Trubar's and Dalmatin's tradition of use of these forms in the Central Slovenian linguistic region (Jesenšek 1998).

The exclusion of gerundival-participial constructions is also typical of the second complete Slovenian translation of the *New Testament*, published two-hundred years after Dalmatin's *Bible* (1584–1784). Japelj did not use the forms in *-ši*, as he consistently expressed antecedent actions periphrastically with coordinate constructions and clauses. At the same time, he greatly limited the forms in *-č*: the antecedent actions are expressed (with a few exceptions) only by the cliché use of the participle *rekoč*; participles are mostly used in attributive and nominal functions. Because of the long and complex sentences, Japelj introduces a new syntactic condenser, i.e., the infinitive (Jesenšek 1991).



5 The structural duality of Slovenian with respect to the use of forms in -č and -ši, grounded in the dialectal orientation and division of Slovenes between the Alpine and Pannonian territories,<sup>7</sup> was at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> and at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> cc. reflected in two Slovenian literary standards. In the 19<sup>th</sup> c. the forms in -č and -ši as an effective syntactic condenser unexpectedly spread from the Eastern Slovenian religious literature to the entire Slovenian linguistic territory, i.e., to all functional styles of the Central and Eastern Slovenian literary languages. There were several reasons for that. Among them the most important were: (1) the »discovery« of the archaic Eastern Slovenian (Prekmurje) literary language, which preserved elaborate participial-gerundival expression, attested in the Protestant and Catholic prints of the 18<sup>th</sup> and first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> cc. (e.g., Temlin, Sever, Števan and M. Kuzmič, Borovnjak, Košič, etc.); (2) the search for Slovenian national identity and those linguistic options that would bring Slovenes closer to the common Slavic territory; (3) the absence of effective syntactic means for condensation in the Central Slovenian literary language; (4) the standardization of the common-Slovenian literary language after 1825, when after the previously diminishing differences and mutual exchange of morphological, syntactic, and lexical elements, the Central and Eastern Slovenian literary variants became uniform; and (5) the forms in -č and -ši were fashionable in the 19<sup>th</sup> c. (Jesenšek 1998a: 137–214, 316).

At the same time, there were growing tendencies in the Central Slovenian literary language that the literary language be rid of all foreign elements. Ravnikar went furthest in these efforts. He wanted to remove all foreignisms and calques from the language, which he substituted with the originally Slovenian, Slavic, and OCS words. He followed the example of the Eastern Slovenian literary language. He adopted participial and gerundival constructions in -č and -ši, which were no longer productive in the Central Slovenian literary language after the Freising Manuscripts, from Kuzmič's *Nouvi zakon*. He liked the forms that effectively shortened complex sentences and started using them in his *Zgodbe svetega pisma za mlade ljudi* (1815–17). However, he did not revive the forms in -č and -ši systematically; instead, he adopted them into the Central Slovenian language too much like an »amateur« and used them in a stilted, artificial manner, without paying attention to the morphological derivation and without being aware of all their functions<sup>8</sup> (Jesenšek 1990: 175). He accepted participles in -č and -ši as original Slavic and Slovenian morphological-syntactic solutions, as archaic forms with which he replaced calqued German syntactic patterns. Although

<sup>7</sup> The Alpine-Slovene territory was divided between the Salzburg and the Aquileia patriarchies. The proto-parishes became the centers of the dialectal units, which took their final shape after the emergence of provincial languages (Carniolan, Carinthian, and Styrian; Carniolan literary language covers the so-called Central dialectal groups – Lower and Upper Carniolan, Rovte, »which opens the hypothesis that the ritual language was to a certain degree established«.

The Eastern-Slovene territory belonged to Salzburg archdiocese (Styria), Győr diocese (northern Prekmurje), and Zagreb diocese (southern Prekmurje); in the 18<sup>th</sup> c. Prekmurje was united in the Szombathely diocese. Martina Orožen, *Molitveni obrazci starejših obdobij v osrednjeslovenskem in vzhodnoslovenskem knjižnem jeziku. Poglavlja iz zgodovine slovenskega knjižnega jezika*. Ljubljana 1996, 70–79.

<sup>8</sup> Prešeren poked fun at Ravnikar's linguistic error in his epigram: *Slovincov jezik potujčvavši, si kriv, da kolne kmet, molitve bravši*, in which he is playing with the incorrectly derived gerunds in -ši.

his contemporaries did not embrace his attempt to make the language more archaic (nor did they later accept Levstik's similar efforts), his significance was nevertheless considerable: he contrasted two different syntactic systems, pointed out the original Slovenian character of the Eastern Slovenian language, and, above all, he showed that the revival of the forgotten archaic Slovene syntactic patterns is a reasonable strategy to reverse excessive Germanization and to acquire a more economical means of expression. This should apply at least to the literary religious and secular texts and to those typical structures that are heavily present in the closely related Eastern Slovenian literary language and seem appropriate for the Central literary norm; this would also decrease the differences between the two literary systems of Slovenian and later foster uniformity.

Ravnikar's uncritical adoption and revival of participial-gerundival expression were improved upon and corrected by Metelko in his grammar of 1825, where he defined their derivation and classification. Metelko's basic presentation of forms and, most of all, the linguistic openness during the time before the March Revolution, were the main reasons that the forms in *-č* and *-ši* entered the Slovenian literary language in the 19<sup>th</sup> c. (Jesenšek 1998a: 206, 199–214). It was thus necessary to broaden and deepen the knowledge about their use in the Slovenian literary language and develop reliable normative rules for the Slovene writers to follow. The standardization was not a smooth process, as it involved the gradual adaptation and mutual enrichment of the Central and Eastern Slovenian expressions of simultaneous and antecedent actions. Although Janežič in his Slovene grammar of 1863 defined the syntactic functions of the participial-gerundival constructions and standardized their use, the writers only gradually became accustomed to them. The only exceptions were Levstik and, under his influence, Jurčič. Levstik, who wanted to Slavicize (Orožen 1996c) Slovenian and purge it of German words, quickly embraced gerundival constructions (Orožen 1996c: 323),<sup>9</sup> and in the 1870s the forms in *-č* and *-ši* became very fashionable, as they were used by the authors participating in the almanac *Vaje*, Trdina, Tavčar, Kersnik, etc., who learned the language style from Janežič's grammar. They accepted participles and gerunds as a typical literary device and a token of higher linguistic sophistication, which encouraged other, less talented, authors and writers of non-literary texts to imitate this style of expression. Levstik's and Janežič's normativity was replaced by the desire to be fashionable at any cost and the forms in *-ši*, which had had a positive literary connotation since Metelko and were supposed to show the author's linguistic sophistication, became increasingly negative and characteristic of writers with a bad sense of style. Abandonment and disappearance of these forms began after 1897, when Cankar's manifesto (*»Naša lirika«, Slovenski narod 1897*) declared a new literary direction among Slovenes and the end of *»romantic realism«* and unsuccessful belated naturalism. New criteria of literary evaluation emerged and new literary poetics demanded that artistic language be adapted to the *»rules of the ongoing reality«* and thus be rid of lifeless participial-gerundival constructions.

<sup>9</sup> »In Levstik's text, the OCS participial system is masterfully carried out. The participles in *-eč/-oč*, *-el*, *-aje*, *-v/-vši*, and *-Ø* appear in declinable as well as non-declinable (i.e., gerundival) forms and by their semantic function correspond to the use in the old manuscripts (e.g., Freising).« (Orožen 1996c: 323–324).



Sket's grammars (1894, 1900) already gave priority to synchrony in language and the archaic participial-gerundival forms in -ši quickly disappeared from the literary language. Only rare forms in -č in were preserved in similar functions and distribution as in Japelj's Central Slovene translation of the *New Testament*. Slovenian modernists replaced gerunds in -ši with clauses, and participles in -č and -ši with passive -n/-t and active -l-participles, i.e., at the turn of the century they were relegated to the linguistic periphery (Jesenšek 1998a: 199–214). Shortly after that Slovene linguists confirmed that participial-gerundival constructions in -ši were dead. The first to claim this was Stanislav Škrabec (Škrabec 1995: 565).<sup>10</sup> This was then repeated in 1916 by Breznik when he wrote in his grammar that Slovenian »was spoiled by too many gerunds« (in -ši) and he discouraged their use. Toporišič 1976 introduced in Slovenian grammar the terms *deležje* (gerunds in -č, -aje, and -e, gerund in -ši) and *deležnik* (participles in -č, -ši).<sup>11</sup> The term *deležje* denotes the verbal function of the forms in -č and -ši, while *deležnik* has an adjectival function. In the grammar he quotes examples from Levstik, Jurčič, Detela, Gregorčič, Prešeren (19th c. authors) saying: »As is the case with participles and gerunds in general, one derives semi-predicative constructions from predicative sentences with the gerunds in -ši; the former are often stylistically simpler than the latter« (Toporišič 1976: 339–340). The forms were withdrawn from common use, but did not entirely disappear.

6 The current situation confirms Martina Orožen's findings that the forms in -č retained the verbal meaning and that they express simultaneity of action with the action expressed by the finite form (Orožen 1977: 139). They are mostly used in expository language, particularly with *verba dicendi*, cogitative verbs, verbs of perception and movement as an efficient syntactic condenser and to express the hierarchic value of actions. They are less common in artistic language (historical topics, comedic texts), while cliché use is typical in journalism, in rare cases even of forms in -ši. The expression of antecedent actions with forms in -ši is very limited, i.e., in the contemporary standard language this temporal relation is expressed periphrastically or new, different, options are arising.

As in the 19<sup>th</sup> c., participial-gerundival constructions in -č in -ši are a narrowly literary morphological-syntactic category, but much less widespread and clearly retreating (particularly forms in -ši). The forms were ousted at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> c. from the Standard Slovenian, but one could not claim that they are dead even today. Although they are rare in the contemporary standard language, particularly the participles and gerunds in -č are well established in expository and journalistic language, where gerunds, from the functional point of view, are an effective syntactic condenser and means for the hierarchization of actions.

V angleščino prevedla  
Marta Pirnat Greenberg.

<sup>10</sup> Cf., Marko Jesenšek, *Deležniki in deležja na -č in -ši v Škrabčevem jezikoslovju. Škrabčeva misel I*. Nova Gorica 1995, 93–102.

<sup>11</sup> The term *deležje* is first found in Vodnik's grammar of 1811 as *deleshje sdajnika in pretekliga zhasa*. Cf. Marko Jesenšek, *Deležniki in deležja na -č in -ši*. Maribor 1996, 80.

#### REFERENCES

- Marija BAJZEK, 2005: Madžarske izposojenke v prevodu Novega zakona Števana Küzmiča. *Knjižno in narečno besedoslovje slovenskega jezika*. Zbirka Zora 32. Maribor.
- Adam BOHORIČ, 1584: *Arcticae horulae succisivae*. Witenberg.
- Emil DVOŘÁK, 1970: *Vývoj přechodníkových konstrukcí ve starší češtině*. Praha.
- 1978: *Přechodníkové konstrukce v nové češtině*. Praha.
- Marko JESENŠEK, 1989: *Skladenjski sistem aktivnih deležnikov sedanjega in preteklega časa I v vzhodnoslovenskem knjižnem jeziku in njihovi skladenjski ustrezniki v osrednjeslovenskem knjižnem jeziku konec 18. stoletja*. Ljubljana.
- 1990: *Pomenske funkcije aktivnih deležnikov sedanjega in preteklega časa v prekmurskem knjižnem jeziku konec 18. stoletja*. Tudományos közlemények: 10 éves a szlovén nemzetiségi tanárképzés a szombathelyi Berzsényi Dániel Tanárképző Főiskolán. Znanstvene publikacije, 10 let Katedre za slovenski jezik in književnost na Visoki učiteljski šoli v Szombathelyu. *Pomenske funkcije aktivnih deležnikov sedanjega in preteklega časa v prekmurskem knjižnem jeziku konec 18. stoletja*. Berzsényi Dániel Tanárképző Főiskola. Szombathely-Maribor, 175–187.
- 1991: Deležniško-deležijski skladi v Küzmičevem in Japljevem prevodu Nove zaveze. *Slavistična revija*. 215–233.
- 1992: Raba deležijskih in deležniških oblik na -oč/-eč v vzhodnoštajerskem knjižnem jeziku. *Časopis za zgodovino in narodopisje*. 60–72.
- 1994: Deležniško-deležijski skladi na -č in -ši v zvrstnih besedilih slovenskega knjižnega jezika 19. stoletja. *Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture*. 35–51.
- 1995: Deležniki na -č in -ši v Škrabčevem jezikoslovju. *Škrabčeva misel I*. Nova Gorica. 93–102.
- 1995a: Zur Entwicklung der Partizipial- und Gerundialkonstruktionen auf -č und -ši in der slowenischen Schriftsprache des 19. Jahrhunderts. *Linguistica* (Ljubljana). 37–89.
- 1995/96: Poskus periodizacije razvoja oblik na -č in -ši v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku 19. stoletja. *Jezik in slovstvo*. 179–198.
- 1998a: *Deležniki in deležja na -č in -ši*. Zora 5. Maribor.
- 1998: *Deležniško-deležijski skladi na -č in -ši v slovenskih prevodih evangelijev*. Obdobja 17. Ljubljana, 273–286.
- 2000: Greek, Latin and German syntactic influence on Slovene gospel translation in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. *Studia Slavica Savariensia*. 77–87.
- 2004: Skladenjsko strnjanje v Murščevem Bogočastju sv. katoliške cerkve. *Časopis za zgodovino in narodopisje*. 633–644.
- 2005: Nastanek in razvoj prekmurskega knjižnega jezika. *Slavistična revija*. 1–12.
- Mihael KÜZMIČ, 1981: *Predgovori Štefana Küzmiča*. Ljubljana.
- Števan KÜZMIČ, 1771: *Nouvi Zakon*. Halle.
- Fran MIKLOŠIČ, 1883: *Vergleichende Syntax*. Wien. 822.
- Majda MERŠE, 1995: *Vid in vrstnost glagola v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku 16. stoletja*. Aspect and aktionsart in the 16th century Slovene literary language. Ljubljana: SAZU.
- 2001: Glagolski vid v povezavi z načinom in naklonom v Trubarjevih in Dalmatinovih biblijskih prevodih. *Jezikoslovni zapiski*. 113–128.
- 2002: *Upoštevanje glagolskega oblikoslovja 16. stoletja v jezikoslovnih delih 19. in prve polovice 20. stoletja*. Obdobja, 18. Ljubljana. 165–179.
- L. NEČÁSEK, 1957: Staroslověnské dativní vazby participiální a jejich předlohy v řeckém textu evangelíí. *Slavia* 26. 13–30.
- I. NĚMEC, 1957: K Otázce staroslověnských participií praes. act. sloves dokonovaných. *Slavia* 26, 1957. 1–12.

- Irena OREL, 2002: Historizem v sinhronih oblikoslovnih opisih 19. in 20. stoletja. *Obdobja*, 18. Ljubljana. 201–217.
- Martina OROŽEN, 1974: O vzhodnoslovenskem knjižnem jeziku. *Zbornik Štefana Küzmiča*. Murska Sobota. 114–122.
- 1977: Aktivne participske konstrukcije (primer srpskohrvatske interferencije u slovenačkom književnom jeziku). *Naučni sastanak salvista u Vukove dane*. Beograd. 123–143.
- 1996: Molitveni obrazci starejših obdobij v osrednjeslovenskem in vzhodnoslovenskem knjižnem jeziku. *Poglavja iz zgodovine slovenskega knjižnega jezika*. Ljubljana. 70–79.
- 1996a: Prekmurski knjižni jezik. *Poglavja iz zgodovine slovenskega knjižnega jezika*. Ljubljana. 356–372.
- 1996b: Vprašanje prekmurskega knjižnega jezika ob osrednjeslovenskem in kajkavskem hrvaškem. *Poglavja iz zgodovine slovenskega knjižnega jezika*. Ljubljana. 372–381.
- 1996c: Levstikovi pogledi na jezik. *Oblikovanje enotnega slovenskega knjižnega jezika v 19. stoletju*. Ljubljana. 207–228.
- 1996č: Arhaizacija jezika v Jurčič-Levstikovem Tugomerju. *Oblikovanje enotnega slovenskega knjižnega jezika v 19. stoletju*. Ljubljana. 313–328.
- Stanislav ŠKRABEC, 1995: *Jezikoslovna dela* 3. Ponatis platnic časopisa iz Cvetje z vertov sv. Frančiška. Nova Gorica.
- France TOMŠIČ, 1955: Poglavlje iz slovenske historične sintakse. *Slavistična revija*. 56–67.
- Jože TOPORIŠIČ, 1976: *Slovenska slovnica*. Maribor.
- Radoslav VEČERKA, 1961: *Syntax aktivních participií v staroslověnině*. Praha.

#### POVZETEK

Deležniško-deležijsko izražanje (-č, -ši) je prišlo v osrednji slovenski jezikovni prostor z vzhoda Slovenije, kjer je imelo v prekmurskem knjižnem jeziku 18. in prve polovice 19. stoletja ohranjeno bogato panonsko tradicijo; ta je uzakonjala njihovo rabo, čeprav v živem govoru oblike niso bile prisotne. Ko sta se osrednje- in vzhodnoslovenska različica knjižnega jezika v 19. stoletju začeli približevati in sta se končno tudi združili v skupen »novoslovenski« knjižni jezik, so oblike na -č in -ši le za kratek čas postale vseslovenske in knjižne. S prehodom prekmurske književne ustvarjalnosti v narečne okvire se je pretrgala večstoletna tradicija arhaičnosti in izvornoslovenskosti, v jeziku so se kot norma in predpis začele postavljati le tiste slovenske oblike in rešitve, ki so se uveljavile po 16. stoletju, tj. po normiranju osrednjeslovenskega knjižnega jezika. Oblike na -č pa so slovenski protestanti v 16. stoletju uporabljali redko, predvsem klišejsko, medtem ko oblik na -ši skoraj niso poznali. Oživljanje starih oblik na -č in -ši v osrednjeslovenskem knjižnem jeziku prve polovice 19. stoletja in njihov vdor v oblikoslovno-skladenjski sistem enotnega slovenskega knjižnega jezika druge polovice 19. stoletja sta posledica soočanja različnih skladenjskih sestavov dveh tipov slovenskega knjižnega jezika in normiranja skupnega slovenskega knjižnega jezika sredi 19. stoletja, in sicer ob razvojno-zgodovinskem upoštevanju rezultatov glasoslovno-oblikoslovno-skladenjskih zakonitosti slovenskega knjižnega jezika, upoštevajoč arhaičen starocerkvenoslovanski deležniško-deležijski sestav in posnemovalno skladenjsko podobo vzhodnoslovenskega knjižnega jezika na prelomu 18. in 19. stoletja. Pri Ravnikarju je sicer šlo za sorazmerno nesrečen poskus »aplikacije«, vendar pa je Metelko v slovnici (1825) popravil vse oblikoslovne in funkcijske nespretnosti svojega sodobnika, tako da so se še pred sredino 19. stoletja oblike razširile na celotno slovensko ozemlje. Njihova pogostost se je v 19. stoletju spreminjala in je bila v primerjavi z rabo v središčnem tipu knjižnega jezika od Trubarja do Japlja ter razsvetljenskih in romantičnih leposlovnih prizadevanj ves čas zelo visoka, vendar pa z izjemo Levstika nikoli taka kot v prekmurskem knjižnem jeziku 18. in prve polovice 19. stoletja.