

Smith, Nancy Susan

**The treatment of participles in Nudožerský's Grammaticae bohemicae..., Blahoslav's Grammatika česká and Rosa's Čechořečnost**

*Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. A, Řada jazykovědná.* 1995, vol. 44, iss. A43, pp. [81]-91

ISBN 80-210-1192-0

ISSN 0231-7567

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/101010>

Access Date: 19. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

NANCY S. SMITH

## THE TREATMENT OF PARTICIPLES IN NUDOŽERSKÝ'S *GRAMMATICAE BOHEMICAЕ ...*, BLAHOŠLAV'S *GRAMMATIKA ČESKÁ* AND ROSA'S *ČECHOŘEČNOST*

### 1.0 Treatment of participles in the *Grammaticae bohemicae...*(1603)

An interesting anomaly of Nudožerský's grammar of 1603 is its treatment of participles. He presents two distinct types: *participialia* and *participia*, each with two subtypes by tense. The two kinds of *participialia*, primary and secondary, correspond, respectively, to Modern Czech present and past transgressives or *přechodníky*. Havránek and Jedlička recognise two formal tenses: present (*přechodník přítomný*) and past (*přechodník minulý*)(1981:260). The present is semantically divided into present and future tenses with the present formed from imperfective verbs and the future from perfectives. As mentioned above, there are also two types of *participia* in the *Grammaticae bohemicae...*: the first formed from the present tense and the second from the past. The first *participium* corresponds to the Modern Czech verbal adjective or *přídavné jméno slovesné* (Havránek/Jedlička 1981:266). The second *participium* corresponds to the Modern Czech past passive participle or *příčestí trpné* (Havránek/Jedlička 1981:265). The *participialia* are included in the verb paradigms in Nudožerský's grammar, whereas the *participia* are not. This is probably a consequence of the fact that the *participialia*, defined by Nudožerský on page 49a, paragraph 24 as *modus infinitivus*, are considered to be infinitive verb forms and can act as the main verb in a (subordinate) clause, whereas the *participia* can only occur in combination with a finite verb. In this the *participialia* are real participles, whereas the *participia* are closer in character to adjectives. This article will concern itself mainly with the former, that is, the *participialia* since their presentation in the grammar brings up several problems and anomalies.

### 1.1 The primary *participialis* or transgressive as defined by Nudožerský

Nudožerský's primary *participialis* is the present transgressive and thus has only present and (semantically) future forms with the singular masculine in *-ě* or *-a*, feminine/neuter in *-c* or *-cy*, with a short penultimate and/or ultimate syllable, and plural forms for all genders in *-jce* and *-auce*, though these are often truncated to *-jc* and *-auc* respectively, through apocope. The form is built in that these endings are added to a stem from the third person plural present tense, i.e. *činj* stem: *čin-* transgressives: m. *čině*, f. and nt. *činjc* and *činěcy*, pl. *činjce* (*činjc*). In a note to paragraph 26 (p. 54a) Nudožerský writes that others call these forms participles (*participia*) and admits that they do have some of the same characteristics but notes that the primary transgressive does not have forms in the oblique cases as his *participia* do (...*sed cum ad explendam participiorum differentiam casus obliquos non habeant...*). He prefers to call these transgressives *participialia verba*, notes that they are equivalent to the Latin *gerundia* and *supina*, and repeats the endings as given above, the masculine singular in *-ě* or *-a*, the feminine/neuter ending in *-c* or *-cy*, and specifically states that both the final *-y* and the penultimate syllable are short (...*femininum et neutrum in -cy, -y brevi, penultima etiam correpta...*). On page 54b Nudožerský gives several examples for the feminine singular (*řkaucy, gřucy, gřúc*), and the neuter singular (*gřúc, gřúc, wřřemohaucý, neřúc*). For the most part the above examples are in direct conflict with what Nudožerský prescribes, that is, short vowels in the penultimate and ultimate syllables. Historically the feminine/neuter form has a long vowel in the penultimate (in full forms) or the ultimate syllable (in truncated forms). Finally he notes that the neuter is sometimes found with a masculine ending (*Interdum tamen neutrum in masculina terminatione reperitur*) and gives several examples (*ráno wcházage... wřřáwage, stwořenj... rozněcuge ře*).

#### 1.1.1 History of the primary transgressive form

What Nudožerský is presenting here as his primary transgressive is what Dobrovský later calls the *Transgressiv* (1819:132) and what Havránek and Jedlička (1981:260) call the *přechodník přítomný*, a form which is almost altogether lost in Modern Czech, found only in specialized texts and certain set adverbial phrases such as *nehledě k tomu, podle toho soudě*, etc. Historically this form originates from the so-called *nt*-participle. According to Lamprecht, Šlosar, Bauer (1986:177-8), this participle originally had a consonantal declension and the only forms which were preserved in Czech were the masculine and neuter nominative and accusative singular. There were two types: *nesa* (< \**nesōn*), *nesúci* and *trpě, trpieci*. The symbol \* indicates a reconstructed form from a proto-language, in this case ProtoSlavic. The *nt*-participles of verbs of

all classes belonged to one or the other of these types. The plural forms *nesúce* and *trpiece* arose from *\*nesot-j-e* and *\*trpět-j-e*, respectively. The original distribution of forms starts to break down quite early. From the 15th century on the neuter and newly-formed feminine start to coincide. Feminine forms without the final *-i* and even plural forms without final *-e* appear already in the first half of the fourteenth century (i.e. *trpiec*). Although these forms quickly begin to dominate in the feminine, especially in colloquial style literature, in the plural the original form is, for the most part, preserved. From the 17th century on these differences in gender and number are less distinct. They are starting to be confused even earlier. In Blahoslav's *Grammatica česká* from 1571 (Čejka, Šlosar, Nechutová:1991, p. 128a) he complains that Czechs and Moravians make mistakes in these participles. In colloquial literature they are distinguished only in the minority of cases. This is a result of these fact that limited syntactic use brought participles and adjectives closer together and blurred the already slight differences in their forms.

### 1.1.2 Status of the present transgressive in Modern Czech

As mentioned above, usage of these participles or transgressives is rare even in Modern Standard Czech and as far as remnants of these participles exist in eastern Moravian dialects they have an adverbial character and, in keeping with that, there exists always only one form, arrested in development (i.e. *chod'a, kleča*). In central Moravian they have other forms as well. The situation in Modern Standard Czech is the same as in the high style literary language of the 16th century as it was codified by Dobrovský, that is, there are three forms: masc., fem./neuter, and plural, but they are only used in extremely high style, archaic writing, in specialized texts and in set phrases, as mentioned above. Havránek and Jedlička (1981:260) present two models: *nesa, nesouc, nesouce; prose, prosíc, prosíce*. From these models it is clear that the developments of the fourteenth century mentioned above, the loss of final *-i* in the feminine/and the preservation of final *-e* in the plural, were brought into the modern language through codification by Dobrovský. It is also clear that in the feminine neuter the penultimate (in full forms) or ultimate syllable (in truncated forms) was and is always long. Nudožerský's forms with short vowels represent possible variants which were not preserved in the modern language.

### 1.2 Nudožerský's secondary *participialis* or past transgressive

On page 49b, paragraph 27, Nudožerský defines his secondary transgressive, which in the singular past tense ends in *-w* in the masculine, in *-wffi* in the feminine and neuter and in *-wffe* in all genders in the plural: *učiniw, učiniwffi, učiniwffe*. The masculine is formed from the preterite (*učinił*), the final *-ł* changes to *-w* (or exceptionally *-d*, where the other genders

would end in *-dffi*, i.e. *wyffed*, *wyffedffi*). In contrast to the presentation of the primary transgressive, the presentation of the secondary transgressive is in agreement with these statements both in the paradigms and elsewhere in the grammar. The one apparent exception to this regularity is the absence of secondary transgressive forms for the verbs *nésti* and *příněsti*. The reason for this may be that the stems from these verbs do not fit the prescribed pattern for the secondary transgressive. The theoretical forms *nefw*, *nefwffi*, *nefwffe* (with stem *nef-* from the preterite *neř*) are perhaps too cumbersome for Nudožerský, though Blahoslav does mention them. See below (2.0).

### 1.3 The first *participium* or verbal adjective

On page 50a, paragraph 28, Nudožerský's presents a second form, also derived from the third person plural present tense of the verb, but with only one ending in the nominative singular: *-cý*, i.e. *chowagjcý*, *budaucý*. In the original text this ending is short (*-cy*). The form should be long. The custom at the time of this grammar to mark quantity in printed texts, but not consistently in handwritten texts is probably responsible for this inconsistency. This form is the first of the two *participia*. The ending in the first *participium* should be *-cý /cí/* for all genders and numbers (a soft adjective ending) in the nominative because this form is historically an adjective derived from the *nt*-participle. The primary *participialis* does not have forms in the oblique cases, as noted above, due to its participial nature. The first *participium* or verbal adjective, on the other hand, has an ending with a long *-ý /í/* in all genders and numbers and is declined in all cases due to its adjectival nature.

### 1.4 The second *participium* or past passive participle

Nudožerský presents the second *participium* in paragraph 29 on page 50a. It is formed from the preterite indicative mood masculine form (*chowal*). The *-l* ending changes to *-n* and vowels in the stem change from *a* to *á*, *i* to *ě*: *chowal* *chowán*, *učinil* *učiněn*, *chwálil* *chwálen*. Some verbs have *-t* instead of *n*: *gat*, *uřat*, *bit*, *zabit*. In paragraph 30 Nudožerský states that in regard to this *participium*, verbs are either active (*activum*) or neuter (*neutrum*). In paragraphs 31, 32 and 33 he explains that from active verbs (i.e. *no řým no řfen*) the participle can be formed and from neuter verbs (i.e. *chodřm*) it cannot. The term active here indicates transitive verbs, the term neuter, intransitive. The treatment of the past passive participle is unremarkable, that is, it brings with it no surprises. It is somewhat strange that Nudožerský lumps this participle with the verbal adjective, but this may be due to their dependence on a finite verb as mentioned above (1.0). What is sort of surprising is that Nudožerský does not consider the preterite (i.e. *chowal*) form among the *participia* although it also requires an auxiliary finite verb (except in the third person).

### 1.5 Mistakes in the primary transgressive

As mentioned above (1.1.1) the difference between adjectives and participles is being lost even before Nudožerský's time. This indistinctness leads to confusion in the *Grammaticae bohemicae*... In his paradigms of the primary transgressive Nudožerský presents a variety of forms conflicting with those prescribed in the text of the grammar, itself.

#### 1.5.1 The feminine/neuter singular of the primary transgressive

The majority of the paradigms, in regard to the primary transgressive, follow the pattern of *wolati* as presented on page 56b:

Participialis I.

Praesens

Sing. M. *wolage*

F. et N. *wolagjc vel wolagjcy*

Pl. Om. *wolagjce vel wolagjc*

or *né fti* as presented on page 62a:

Participialis I.

Praesens

Sin<g>. M. *ne fa*

F. et N. *ne fúć et ne fúćy*

P. Omn. *ne fauc et ne fauce*

The masculine form is regular and correct according to Nudožerský's definition in all of the paradigms. In the feminine/neuter and plural forms, however, there is a great deal of inconsistency. In six paradigms [those of *wolati* (p.56b), *dáti* (p. 57b), *né fti* (p. 62a), *přiné fti* (p. 63a), *uffjti* (p. 66a), *býti* (p. 67a) and *chowán býti* (p.68b)] Nudožerský presents forms with long vowels where a short vowel is prescribed, either in the ultimate or penultimate syllable or both: *wolagjc wolagjcy*, *dagicý*, *ne fúć ne fúćy*, *přine fúć přine fúćy*, *uffjgicý*, *gfúć gfúćy*, and *chowána gfúćy/ chowáno gfúć*. The forms with a short penultimate and a long ultimate syllable (*dagicý*, *uffjgicý*) have no historical support and also no support in the grammar outside of these paradigms. They are most probably simply errors in quantity, which, as mentioned above, are not uncommon in the grammar. There are approximately 148 errors in quantity, of which 42 concern *-i-/j*, not counting those in the paradigms in question here. The truncated forms with a long vowel in the ultimate syllable (*wolagjc*, *ne fúć*, *přine fúć*, *gfúć*, *chowáno gfúć*) are historically correct, but go against Nudožerský's own rules. And the other forms with a long vowel in both the

ultimate and penultimate syllables (*wolagjcy, nefúcy, přinefúcy, chowána g fúcy*) also break Nudožerský's rules, though he may be confusing them with the first *participium*, or verbal adjective (1.3) above. The primary transgressives, or *participialia verba* as Nudožerský calls them (1603:54b), have the ending *-cy* (or the truncated form *-c*) in the feminine and neuter singular. The verbal adjective (*participium*) has the single ending *-cý* for all genders and both numbers and there is no truncated form. From this we can say certainly that according to Nudožerský true participles (*participialia*) should have forms with a short *-y*.

### 1.5.2 Participles with feminine/neuter forms in *ú*

Out of the eleven participial paradigms in the grammar, exactly half (5.5) have the expected and prescribed ending *-cy* in the feminine/neuter singular. The other half (5.5) have the ending *-cý*. In one paradigm (*chowána/chowáno býti* (p. 68b)) the endings are even split between neuter and feminine (*chowána g fúcy* versus *chowáno g fúcy*), two forms which should be the same. It is possible that Nudožerský was confusing the forms with long *-ý* with the verbal adjective. There is only one example of a participle with a short *-u* and short *-y* in the grammar. This occurs on page 54b in the notes to paragraph 26: *počala g fucy stará*. It is interesting to note that the Bible Kralická has consistently a short *-u* both where Nudožerský has *-ú* and where he has *-au* in these forms. These forms are contemporary doublets. The appearance of both of these forms in the grammar may be due to the fact that Nudožerský was a Slovak and may have included elements of the Slovak variant of Czech used in his time.

#### 1.5.2.1 The value of *ou* versus *ú*

There is one more interesting point to make about the participial paradigms. In each of the paradigms of the pattern *ne fa, ne fúc* et *ne fúcy, ne fauc* et *ne fauce*, the feminine/neuter forms have an ending with long *-ú-* and the plural forms have an ending with the diphthong *-au-*. But according to Nudožerský *-ú* is always pronounced as *-au* (page 2a, paragraph 18), at least by Bohemians, and it is clear that the Czech he is codifying is Bohemian Czech. In contrast to this, Nudožerský states, in both cases Moravians and Slovaks have a vowel with long character (*ú*). If it is truly the case that *ú* = *au*, then two of the forms mentioned above, the shortened forms in the feminine and plural (*ne fúc* and *ne fauc*), should be homophonous. As mentioned above, historically the shorter form became dominant in the feminine but in the plural the original form was preserved. This development may have come about as a result of this homophony. In regard to examples of participial forms presented in the grammar outside the paradigms, Nudožerský seems to use these two spellings almost interchangeably. On page 54b in notes to paragraph 26 he presents the following examples: feminine *Řkaucy*, and *Připogená g fúc k tobě du fje má*;

neuter *Zahrřito gříc, Neříc jako meč břitký poručenj twé, and Wřřfemohaucy twé řlowo*. Again on page 81b, paragraph 3 he presents the following example of the participle: *čřaucy přřřmo*. According to the model presented in the participial paradigms we should expect the spellings *řřkřicy, wřřřfemohřicy* and *čřřřicy*. These forms were clearly homophonous for Nudožerský and the spelling distinction seems to be lost to a certain extent.

### 1.6 Conclusion about Nudožerský's primary transgressive

Nudožerský's apparent confusion of the participial and adjectival forms comes as no surprise. As mentioned above, from the 17th century on gender and number differences in the participles were not as distinct as they once had been. And some of the unexpected forms may also be attributed simply to mistakes in orthography. In light of what we have seen here, the most logical conclusion to Nudožerský's presentation of the primary transgressive is to say that this was a system in disarray, where distinctions between forms were already very vague.

## 2.0 Participles in Blahoslav's *Grammatica česká*

The *Grammatica česká* of Jan Blahoslav is less a grammar than a guide to the translation of biblical texts from Latin to Czech. Blahoslav's work incorporates the *Grammatica česká* of Beneš Optát, Václav Philomates and Petr Gzell (1543) in its entirety and comments section by section on the earlier work. Blahoslav's work existed only in manuscript form at the time of his death (1571) and the complete text was first published in 1991 by Čejka, Šlosar and Nechutová.

### 2.1 Treatment of the *přechodníky*

The formal treatment of present participles in Blahoslav's grammar (with the original text written by Philomates) does not differ much from that of Nudožerský's. He has the same endings in the present: masculine (*-a, -ě*) and feminine (*-uci, -ěci*), but does not consider the neuter form. Because he is writing the grammar from the point of view of Latin, he initially lumps the present participle (Nudožerský's primary *participialis*) with the preterite participle (Nudožerský's secondary *participialis*) under the heading *Participium presentis temporis*, participle of the present tense. The forms, however, match those given by Nudožerský: m. sg. *vřřřav*, f. sg. *vřřřavřři*. Again he does not consider the neuter form. On page 127b – 128a Blahoslav comments on Philomates' treatment of the tenses, pointing out that in this particular area the Czech language is richer than Latin. Here he also laments the fact that many Czechs and Moravians make mistakes in the participial forms and states his



preference for past participle forms shortened through apocope (i.e. *vztah* versus *vztahv*).

## 2.2 Adjectivization of the participles

On page 130a,b Philomates points out that sometimes participles become *nomina* or substantives. These forms are equivalent to Nudožerský's first *participium*: the verbal adjective. He is not entirely clear on when this occurs, but he presents the adjectival forms with a long vowel ending and notes that there is one form for all genders, which is correct. Thus *učiněn sem jako měd zvučící* or *zvonec znějící* are adjectives whereas the participial forms would be *měd zvuče* and *zvonec zněje*. Blahoslav tries to improve on Philomates' explanation and succeeds in more clearly defining compound verbs and participles. The Latin compound forms such as *natus est*, *locutus est* he correctly translates with the preterite forms *narodil se*, *mluvil* and states that the forms without an auxiliary verb are the true participles: *locutus*, which should be translated appropriately with participial forms in Czech: *mluviv*. But Blahoslav also gets mired in the distinction between participles and adjectives. He suggests that a good explanation of the problem in Latin is given in Donatus' grammar *Ars minor De participio*. He also points out that the small difference in Czech, this accent that indicates the quantity of the final vowel, is important. Adjectives have a long vowel ending and participles a short vowel.

## 2.3 Substitutions in gender and tense

On page 251b – 253b Blahoslav discusses the occurrence of the feminine form in place of the masculine where the masculine form is ambiguous, for example, where the participle has the same form as the present indicative: i.e. *milující* (f. sg. present participle) for *miluje* (m. sg. present indicative and present participle). Here he also discusses the shortening in length of the vowel in the feminine form to distinguish it from the truncated plural form (i.e. f. sg. *milujíc* for f. sg. *milujíc* versus pl. *milujíc(e)*). Blahoslav also suggests that this ambiguity can be avoided in several other ways, such as using a phrase rather than the participle alone (i.e. for *pláče pravím* he suggests the phrase *pravím s pláčem*). Further on (p. 254a) he mentions the use of the present participle for the preterite. This usage he condones for the most part due to the fact that although the use of the preterite in certain phrases is closer to the Greek original, it's usage is unusual (*inusitate*) and he prefers the present participle because of it's *euphonia gratia* or gracious sound.

### 3.0 Participles in Rosa's *ČeCHOŘEČNOST seu grammatica linguae bohemicae, Praha 1672*

#### 3.1 *Modus transgressivus*

Rosa's grammar in comparison to Blahoslav's has quite a complete treatment of participles, which he considers *Modus transgressivus* and divides into past, present and future tenses. The *modus transgressivus* is covered on pages 134 – 136 of Rosa's *ČeCHOŘEČNOST*.

##### 3.1.1 *Modus transgressivus: the present tense participle*

In the present tense, which corresponds to Nudožerský's primary *participialis* and is formed in the same way from the third person plural indicative present, Rosa has distinct endings for each of the three genders in the singular and a pair of possible endings for all genders in the plural: (i.e. masc. *trhage*, *weda* fem. *trhagecy/trhagjcy*, *wedaucy/weducy* neut. *trhagic*, *wedauc/weduc* pl. all genders *trhagjce/trhagjc*, *wedauc/wedauc*). This differs from Nudožerský, whose feminine and neuter forms are the same. On page 134 Rosa states that the final *-e* in both the feminine and plural endings can be dropped, which in some cases results in a blending of the forms. The same is true in Nudožerský's grammar. Rosa's separate neuter form, however, always ends in either *-ic* or *-uc* with a short final syllable. Concerning the tense of the transgressive mood, Rosa states on page 138 that the present transgressive signifies a simultaneous action, that is, simultaneous with the action of the main verb. Thus it has only relative tense. This is a distinction that Nudožerský does not make, but one that is true of the *přechodník přítomný* in Modern Standard Czech.

##### 3.1.2 *Modus transgressivus: the preterite tense*

Rosa's preterite tense of the *Modus transgressivus* corresponds exactly to Nudožerský's secondary *participialis*. It is formed in the same way from the preterite indicative and has the same endings in all genders and both numbers. The conjugation is regular throughout the paradigms with the exception of the verb *giti* which has the indicative preterite *šfeš* and the transgressive preterite forms m. *šfed*, f. and nt. *šfedšfi* and pl. *šfedšfe*. In a note on page 152 Rosa mentions that the form *šfew* is also regularly used for the masculine *šfed*.

#### 3.2 Rosa's *Participia* or derived adjectives

What Rosa considers as *Participia* are the same as Nudožerský's first *participium*, that is, they are adjectives derived from participles and Rosa states, again on page 134, that they should be declined as adjectives. On page 135 he

also claims that his *participia* have a long  $-y$  in the last and a short  $-i$  in the penultimate syllable, although he allows that mistakes in the latter are frequent and forgivable. He states on page 165 that his *participia* are formed from the present transgressive neuter adding only a long  $-y$ . This makes quite a bit of sense both synchronically and diachronically. Nudožerský's derives his first *participium*, as mentioned above, from the third person plural present tense of the verb and it has only one ending in the nominative:  $-cý$ . Nudožerský makes no direct statement about the length of the vowel in the penultimate syllable in this form and it does not appear in the paradigms of the verb. In examples outside of the paradigms in Nudožerský's grammar a short  $u$  occurs only once and a penultimate short  $i$  (instead of  $j$ ) never appears in this form.

### 3.3 Rosa's *Participialia* or deverbalised nouns

On page 175 Rosa also discusses a form called *Participialia*, which, in Modern Czech, correspond to deverbalised nouns, i.e. *čtenj*, *šliffenj* (!). They are derived from the passive participle,  $-y$  changes to  $-j$ , thus from *čtený*, *šliffený* come *čtenj*, *šliffenj*, etc.

## 4.0 Conclusion

Rosa's treatment of the participles, while somewhat confusing in its usage of familiar terminology for unfamiliar phenomena and not altogether correct for his time (There is no historical support at this time (1672) for three distinct genders in this participle. See above section 1.1.1), it is still much more thorough than that of either Blahoslav or Nudožerský. It is also much better organised than the other two. In the case of Blahoslav's grammar this can be mostly attributed to the fact that he was perfecting a guide to the correct translation of biblical texts rather than writing a grammar in the true sense of the word. In the case of Nudožerský, his grammar, though prescriptive, is quite thoroughly morphological and does not pay much attention to semantics. In addition his grammar has many contradictions in what it prescribes and what it describes. Many of these contradictions may be attributed to mistakes in the marking of quantity, a consequence of the time in which the grammar was written. It should also be noted that Rosa had the advantage of almost seventy years of further linguistic study and of having Nudožerský's grammar at hand with which to work.

## REFERENCES

- BĚLIČ, J.: *Nástin české dialektologie*. Praha, SPN 1972.  
 BLAHOŠLAV, J.: *Gramatika česká*. ed. Čejka, M., Šlosar, D. and Nechutová, J. Brno, Masarykova universita 1991.  
 DOBROVSKÝ, J.: *Lehrgebäude der Böhmisches Sprache*. Prag. Gottlieb Haase 1819.

THE TREATMENT OF PARTICIPLES IN NUDOŽERSKÝ'S *GRAMMATICAE BOHEMICAE* ..., BLAHOŠLAV'S *GRAMMATIKA ČESKÁ* AND ROSA'S *ČECHOŘEČNOST*

- DVOŘÁK, E.: Vývoj přechodníkových konstrukcí ve starší češtině. Praha, Universita Karlova, 1970.
- DVOŘÁK, E.: Přechodníkové konstrukce v nové češtině. Praha, Universita Karlova, 1972.
- HAVRÁNEK, B. – JEDLIČKA, A.: Česká mluvnice. Praha, SPN 1981.
- KOMÁREK, M.: Historická mluvnice česká: I. Hláskosloví. Praha, SPN 1962.
- LAMPRECHT, A. – ŠLOSAR, D. – BAUER, J.: Historická mluvnice češtiny. Praha, SPN 1986.
- MISTRÍK, J.: Moderná slovenčina. Bratislava, Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo 1988.
- NOVÁKOVÁ, J.: Edičně textologická pravidla pro vydávání latinských spisů J.A. Komenského. Unpublished manuscript.
- NUDOŽERSKÝ, V.B.: *Grammaticae bohemicae ad leges naturalis methodi conformatae et notis numerisque illustratae ac distinctae; libri duo*. Praha 1603. (I used a copy at the *Ústřední knihovna Filosofické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity* in Brno.)
- ROSA, V. J.: *Čechořečnost seu grammatica linguae bohemicae*. Praha 1672. (I used a copy at the *Ústřední knihovna Filosofické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity* in Brno.)
- SMITH, N.: Preliminary Remarks on the *Grammaticae bohemicae...*(1603) of Vavřinec Benedikt Nudožerský. SPFFBU, A 42, 1994, s. 61–67.
- TRÁVNÍČEK, F.: Historická mluvnice československá. Praha, Melantrich 1935.
- VÁŽNÝ, V.: Historická mluvnice česká: II. Tvarosloví I. část Skloňování. Praha, SPN 1964.
- VEČERKA, R. – ŠLOSAR, D. a kolektiv: 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).

