

NANCY S. SMITH

**PRELIMINARY REMARKS
ON THE *GRAMMATICAE BOHEMICAE...* (1603)
OF VAVŘINEC BENEDIKT NUDOŽERSKÝ¹**

Vavřinec Benedikt Nudožerský was a professor of Classics and Mathematics at Charles University in Prague. He was born in Western Slovakia, in Nedožery u Prievidze. This fact becomes important in light of certain aspects of the grammar under investigation which will be discussed later in this article. Nudožerský's grammar of Czech, the *Grammaticae bohemicae ad leges naturalis methodi conformatae et notis numerisque illustratae ac distinctae libri duo*, was published in 1603 and no new editions have been published since. The importance of Nudožerský's grammar is arguable. It is praised by both Dobrovský (1819:VII) and Jungmann (1849:128) and is credited with approaching the concept of verbal aspect by Večerka, Šlosar, et al. (1988:9). They also call it the first Czech grammar in the true sense of the word. It is the only grammar of importance published after Blahoslav's version of the *Gramatika česká* was completed around 1571, and before the controversial *Čechořečnost* (1672) of Václav Rosa. Other works which fall between these two landmarks in Czech language history are not grammars in the full sense of the word, but rather descriptive textbooks with paradigms of declensions and conjugations².

The *Grammaticae Bohemicae...* is a normative or prescriptive grammar consisting of two books: an Etymology and a Syntax. The former includes sections on orthography and pronunciation, declension and conjugation. The Syntax covers agreement, case usage and dialectal variations. The grammar is written in Latin and is based on the Latin grammar of Peter Ramus. It appears at a time of transition for the Czech language: after the so-called Golden Age of Czech (14th

¹ The author is currently involved in a research project which proposes to produce an annotated edition of the Nudožerský grammar. The current article is a report on progress made so far on the project.

² For a more detailed discussion of these grammars and textbooks see Smith (1992:61-70).

to 16th century) and before the onset of the Dark Age of Czech (after the Battle of the White Mountain in 1621).

The first book of the grammar begins with a combined orthography and pronunciation guide. The orthography employed by the grammar is based on the *Bratrský pravopis*, an orthographical treatise in turn based on Jan Hus's tract *De Orthographia bohémica* from about 1410. According to Komárek (1962:159–60) the *Bratrský pravopis* was a manuscript used by the Czech Brethren in writing the *Bible kralická* (1579–1593) and was in common use as the standard orthography until the end of the 18th century, when new orthographical rules were proposed by grammarians of the Czech National Revival, most notably Dobrovský and Šafařík (Bělič, Kamiš, Kučera 1978:698). The orthography used in Nudožerský's grammar uses a combination of diacritical marks and digraphs to represent the sounds of the Czech language. It replaces Hus's so-called diacritical *nabodeničko krátké* (short round point) with the *háček* (small hook), which is still used today in Modern Czech. The orthography also uses the digraphs *šš* (for *š*), and *ch*. The grammar observes the spelling rule that *ý* instead of *j* must be written after the sibilants *c*, *z*, *s*³. Modern Czech *nej-* is rendered alternatively as either *ney-* or *neg-* by Nudožerský, according to the rules of the *pravopis*⁴. Nudožerský's spelling conventions in comparison with Modern Czech orthography include the following: *g* in place of *j*, *j* for *í*, *au* for *ou*, *v* for *u* in word initial position, *w* for *v*, *š* for *s* and *šš* for *š* at the beginning and in the middle of words, with *s* and *š*, respectively, used in word final position. Nudožerský also distinguishes two *l*-s: a hard (*l*) and a soft (*l*)⁵. Nudožerský's spelling has been retained throughout the examples in this article.⁶

This last spelling distinction was purely an orthographical convention in Czech by the time Nudožerský wrote his grammar in 1603. The difference between the hard and soft *l* had been lost in Bohemia in the beginning of the 15th century and this loss spread to Moravia (except in certain dialects) by the end of the 16th century. Trávníček (1935:134–5) notes that the distinction of the two *l*s is artificial and only graphical in the grammars of Drachovský (1660), Šteyer (1668) and even as late as Pelcl (1798), though Doležal's grammar of 1746 correctly states that Slovaks have two *l*s, the Czechs only one. The distinction exists in Slovak to this day and is preserved as well in certain eastern Moravian dialects, most notably in the *lašský* dialect⁷. Because Nudožerský was a Slovak we can safely assume that he would have correctly reconstructed the distinctions between the hard and soft *l* in Czech. His grammar, however, was printed in Prague and the fact that this distinction was completely lost in Czech is clear from

³ See Komárek (1962:160).

⁴ D. Šlosar. Personal communication (1/10/94).

⁵ Nudožerský uses the Latin terms *dur* and *moll* (1603:4)

⁶ Nudožerský's total inventory of graphemes is listed on page 5: *a, b, c, č, d, d', e, ě, f, g, ě, h, i, j, k, l, l, m, n, ň, o, p, q, r, ř, š, šš, t, t', u, w, x, y, z, ž, ch*. Nudožerský also uses *s* and *š*, though only as positional variants.

⁷ See Trávníček's treatise *Moravská nářečí*, 1926:15–18.

the number of typographical errors that we must assume were committed by the typesetter. Mistakes in the hard and soft l often occur juxtaposed in the same sentence, and sometimes even in the same word. Nudožerský first mentions the distinction of the hard and soft l on page 4 of his *Etymologia*. In point number 17 he specifies the two types of semivowel l and ḷ. The first mistakes in this distinction appear shortly afterward in an example on page 7 *aby uſſel* instead of the correct form *aby uſjel*. The utter confusion on the part of the typesetter is more apparent in the examples on page 21 where **chléb chleba* are juxtaposed and on page 52 where **milowal* and *milowal* occur in the same sentence. Most of the confusion can be attributed to the only slight difference between the two characters when written by hand. But this point only accentuates the fact that the typesetter had no feel at all for where these recreated differences originally belonged. There are some other typographical errors present in the text of the grammar, but none are so noticeable or appear with such frequency as the incorrect l/ḷ.

The preservation of the l/ḷ distinction is not the only evidence of the archaic nature of the grammar. Nudožerský also partially preserves the dual number. In the feminine declension he presents the nominative dual forms *rybě, kopě, hodině* (p. 15, 9), remarking that these forms are identical to the dative singular. Again on page 31 Nudožerský presents the instrumental dual in the paradigm of plural adjectives (*dobrýma*). According to Lamprecht, Šlosar, Bauer (1986:132–33) the dual number never spread to all substantives in Czech and disappeared at the end of the 15th century except in certain words which semantically signify a pair (i.e. body parts and the words *two* and *both*). Thus in Nudožerský's day these forms are already archaic, limited to use in biblical texts⁸.

Another indication of the conservative nature of the grammar is found on pages 34–5 where Nudožerský presents a paradigm of personal pronouns in which he includes the archaic first person plural accusative form *ny* beside the modern form *nás*. He does note that this form is archaic and does not present the corresponding second person plural accusative *vy* beside modern *vás*. Lamprecht, Šlosar, Bauer (1986:180) state that the doublets (*ny/nás, vy/vás*) were present in the earliest historical times, but that the modern forms (*nás, vás*) won out in the 16th century. Trávníček (1935:354) agrees with this timetable and it is clear that this form (*ny*) is truly archaic in Nudožerský's time.

The archaic nature of Nudožerský's grammar is not surprising in light of the fact that it was written using the *Bratrský pravopis* as a model and with the help of Adam z Veleslavína, who also worked on the *Bible kralická* (1579–1593). Although written in the 16th century, the *Bible* used an archaic model of Czech from the Golden Age which did not reflect the current state of the spoken language. One element of the grammar which argues against its conservative nature is Nudožerský's mention of the shorter form of the infinitive with a hard –t

⁸ Dušan Šlosar. Personal communication (12/8/93).

(p. 49–50, 25 *milowat*). According to Lamprecht, Šlosar, Bauer (1986:240) the infinitive in *-t* first occurs sporadically in the second half of the 14th century, but state that its acceptance into the literary language as a parallel to the infinitive in *-ti* comes first in this century.

Another interesting element in the grammar concerns the category of animate/inanimate in the masculine. On page 11, Nudožerský states that the distinction between masculine animate and masculine inanimate in the noun is not rare, and he incorporates this distinction into the paradigms of his grammar. On page 13, 5 he states that for masculine nouns in the singular, the nominative and accusative inanimate are the same and that the accusative and genitive animate are the same. He further states that in the plural of inanimate masculine nouns, the nominative, accusative and vocative are the same. Similarly, the nominative and vocative of plural animate masculine nouns are the same. He then presents full separate paradigms of animate and inanimate masculine nouns for the first and second declensions (pp. 21 and 25, respectively). The animate/inanimate distinction is preserved, as well, in the declension of masculine adjectives. On page 30, 2 Nudožerský states that the nominative plural masculine animate is distinguished from the inanimate by the ending *-j* (i.e. *dobrý dobřj*). On page 31 in the paradigms of masculine adjectives this distinction appears where expected: in the accusative singular and the nominative plural and vocative.

None of this is particularly surprising in light of the history of the development of the masculine animate/inanimate distinction. This difference originally arose as a result of the development in masculine *o*-stems and *u*-stems that there was no longer a difference between the accusative and nominative singular forms and therefore these nouns could no longer be distinguished as subject or object. This was mainly a problem with animate nouns in sentences such as *Отъсь бѣжетъ братѣ*⁹, where it was not clear who was beating whom. In regard to the timetable of the change, Trávníček (1935:284–87) asserts that the so-called genitive-accusative in masculine singular animate nouns (i.e. N.Sg. *vlk*, A. and G.Sg. *vlka*) probably has its origins in Protoslavic, though its development occurred mainly during the historic period. He states that it is found frequently in texts from around 1300 along with the older accusative (i.e. N. and A.Sg. *vlk*). He also asserts that the spread of the genitive-accusative to the plural came very late, and only in certain dialects, sometime after the 16th century, though he allows that its origins may have been earlier. Use of the accusative-nominative in the plural of inanimate masculine nouns, according to Trávníček, began early in the 15th century and by 1600 it had reached the current state. According to Lamprecht, Šlosar, Bauer (1986:135–36) the use of the genitive-accusative for animate masculine names of people spread also to the names of animals during the 15th and 16th centuries and by the end of the 16th century it was definitely established in Czech. This usage spread to other cases (furthest in the genitive

⁹ See Lamprecht, Šlosar, Bauer (1986:133–35) for further discussion on the historical development of gender in Czech.

singular of masculine nouns) and to the plural. They further state that in the plural there was first a general dissimilation of the nominative and accusative (N.Pl. *vľci* A.Pl. *vľky* and N.Pl. *potoci*, A.Pl. *potoky*) and later the nominative plural masculine inanimate was distinguished from the animate (N.Pl. an. *vľci*, N.Pl. inan. *potoky*). Lamprecht, Šlosar, Bauer (1986:135–36) date these changes somewhat later than Trávniček, placing them during the 16th and 17th centuries, after the definite change in the singular. Trávniček (1935:285) further asserts that attributive adjectives and pronouns agreed with their attributes in gender, number and the animate/inanimate distinction: *dobrého člověka, toho přítele*, etc. According to either timetable the distinction of animate/inanimate in the masculine was established by the time of Nudožerský's grammar and Nudožerský embraces it fully in the declension of substantives.

It is therefore curious that Nudožerský does not preserve this distinction in what he calls the preterite (the past (I) participle). On page 11 he asserts that although the distinction between masculine animate and inanimate in the noun is not rare, he has never come upon this distinction in the verb in the writings of Bohemians. He states further that the Slovaks¹⁰ and numerous Moravians distinguish in the preterite masculine plural the animate in *-i* and the inanimate in *-y*. He mentions that nominative plural masculine inanimate nouns in *-owé* are often treated as animates (i.e. *štomowé u fchli*). Again on page 52, 10, he states that the plural ending *-li* in the preterite is used by Bohemians with both masculine plural animate and inanimate subjects. For Slovaks the animate/inanimate distinction is preserved in the preterite, except as mentioned above (N.Pl. masculine inanimates in *-owé*).

There is no specific mention in either Trávniček (1935) or Lamprecht, Šlosar, Bauer (1986) of the historical development of the animate/inanimate distinction in the I-participle, but its absence in Nudožerský's grammar might be attributed to the loss of the hard/soft *I/I* in Bohemian Czech mentioned earlier in this article. By the beginning of the 17th century when this grammar was written there was no longer any phonetic distinction in Bohemian Czech between *-li* and *-ly*. This difference was merely a spelling convention. If these participial forms coalesced in orthography, phonetically nothing changed. In the declension of nouns, on the other hand, the animate/inanimate distinction had (and still has) real phonological and morphological consequences. This idea is further supported by Nudožerský's assertion that the distinction is preserved in Slovak and in some Moravian dialects, which also preserve the phonological differences between *I* and *l* and *i* and *y*. In Slovak and those Moravian dialects which preserve phonological *I/I* and *i/y* the inanimate *-ly* form would be phonologically distinct from the animate in *-li*. In this particular instance Nudožerský's grammar may be descriptive rather than prescriptive, that is, it may be describing the state of the spoken language at that time.

¹⁰ Nudožerský uses the term *Slavi* to refer to the Slovaks, *Bohemi* to Bohemian Czechs and *Moravi* to the Moravians. (p. 11, 52)

Another interesting aspect of Nudožerský's grammar is its treatment of colloquialisms which were certainly present in the Czech of his time. For the most part the grammar is quite conservative in its treatment of colloquialisms. Nudožerský allows virtually none of the colloquial elements which were a consequence of sound changes which took place from the end of the 14th century to the end of the 16th (and in some cases into the early 17th). Some of these (i.e. the loss of the *l/l* distinction) have been discussed already. Others, specifically 1) *é* to *í*, 2) *ý* to *ej*, 3) *ú* to *ou* in word initial position, and 4) prothetic *v* before *o*, will be discussed here by comparing their treatment in Nudožerský's grammar to that in Václav Rosa's *Čechořečnost* (1672). Nudožerský's treatment can be summed up quite succinctly. The only one of these phonological sound changes that he deals with at all is the first, *é* to *í*, and this only in a very narrow, morphological sense. On page 30, 3 in regard to the declension of adjectives in the masculine, Nudožerský states: ... *é* in the final, or in the penultimate [syllable] mutates to *ý*, thus *dobry wjno, dobrýho otce syn* for *dobré, dobrého*. This is the only mention of the phenomenon. Nudožerský does not incorporate it into his paradigms. As for the other sound changes, Nudožerský makes no mention of them. This is another reflection of the conservative nature of Nudožerský's grammar.

Rosa, on the other hand, fully incorporates the first two of the sound changes into his paradigms and he specifically mentions the third in the text of the grammar. No evidence of the fourth sound change has been found by this author. Evidence of the first two sound changes (1) *é* to *í*, 2) *ý* to *ej*, is found in the paradigm of the adjective *krásný* on pages 106–7. Here we find doublets with change 1): *krásné/krásný* (N. and A. Sg. nt., G. and D. Sg. f., N.Pl. f., A.Pl. m. and f.), *krásného/krásného* (G.Sg. m. and nt.), *krásnému/krásnému* (D.Sg. m. and nt.), *krásném/krásným* (L.Sg. m. and nt.) and change 2): *krásný/krásneg* (N.Sg. m. and A.Sg. m.inan.), *krásnému/krásnegmu* (I.Sg. m. and nt.), *krásných/krásnegch* (G. and L. Pl. all genders), *krásným/krásnegm* (D.Pl. all genders), *krásnými/krásnegmi* (I.Pl. all genders).

As for the third change (3. word initial *ú* to *ou*), Rosa makes a note that *ou* should not appear at the beginning of words (i.e. **auřad* should be *úřad*) and this author did not find any evidence to the contrary in his text. No mention is made of the fourth sound change and no evidence of it was found in the text of the grammar.

In addition to these phonological sound changes, Rosa, in contrast to Nudožerský, incorporates several morphological changes into his grammar. An interesting point in regard to the first sound change (1. *é* to *í*) is that the new form with *í* spreads morphologically in the plural declension of adjectives. Thus we find in Rosa's grammar the following doublets in the nominative and accusative neuter plural of *krásný*: *krásná/krásný* (N. and A. Pl. nt.) (1672:107). The second element in this doublet (*krásný*) constitutes a colloquial or sub-standard form in modern Czech. Nudožerský (1603:31) preserves three distinct forms in the

nominative plural: m. an. **dobřj**, m. inan. and f. **dobré**, nt. **dobrá** and makes no mention of the alternate forms presented by Rosa. Another morphological change incorporated by Rosa, but not by Nudožerský is the spread of the feminine instrumental dual noun endings **-ami**, **-ama** to the masculine instrumental plural. Thus in Rosa we find the following triplets: **stromy/stromami/stromama**, **národy/národami/národama** (p. 76), and **měšycy/měšyccemi/měšyccema**, **krály/králemi/králema** (p. 85).

From this brief comparison it is clear that Nudožerský's grammar presents a vastly more conservative model of the Czech language in the 17th century than does Rosa's. Rosa's grammar is written almost three-quarters of a century after Nudožerský's and some of the sound changes that were still active or at least still very new in the language in Nudožerský's time may have been more fully incorporated by the time Rosa wrote his grammar. But the main reason for the great differences in the language presented in each of these grammars is the fact that one, Nudožerský's *Grammaticae bohemicae...* is a prescriptive grammar, whereas Rosa's *Čechořečnost* is a descriptive grammar.

REFERENCES

- BĚLIČ, J. – KAMIŠ, A. – KUČERA, K.: Malý staročeský slovník. Praha 1978.
 KOMÁREK, M.: Historická mluvnice česká: I. Iláskosloví. Praha 1962.
 LAMPRECHT, A. – ŠLOSAR, D. – BAUER, J.: Historická mluvnice češtiny. Praha 1986.
 NUDOŽERSKÝ, V.B.: Grammaticae bohemicae ad leges naturalis methodi conformatae et notis numerisque illustratae ac distinctae; libri duo. Praha 1603.
 ROSA, V. J.: Čechořečnost seu grammatica linguae bohemicae. Praha 1672.
 SMITH, N.: History of Czech Verb Classification from the 16th Century up to Dobrovský. SPFFBU, A40, 1992, s. 60–70.
 TRÁVNÍČEK, Fr.: Historická mluvnice československá. Praha 1935.
 TRÁVNÍČEK, Fr.: Moravská nářečí. Praha 1926.
 VEČERKA, R. – ŠLOSAR, D. a kol.: Vývoj odborných zájmů o češtinu. Brno 1988. Vysokoškolská skripta.

Research for this article was supported in part by a grant from the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), with funds provided by the National Endowment for the Humanities, the United States Information Agency, and the US Department of State, which administers the Russian, Eurasian, and East European Research Program (Title VIII).

