

ARCHAISMS AND INNOVATIONS IN POLABIAN PHONOLOGY: SOME COMPARATIVE REMARKS**

The article analyses some significant phonological isoglosses in the Polabian language, from the point of view of comparative Slavic linguistics. The primary goal is to shed new light on traditional problems, but the article is also aimed at determining the exact position of Polabian within the Lekhitic subgroup of West Slavic (which consists of Polabian, Kashubian and Polish). The issues discussed here are: the **ę-przegłos*, the outcome of **čr-*, vowel length resolution, and the liquid metathesis in Lekhitic.

Key words: West Slavic, Lekhitic, Polabian, *przegłos lechicki*, the liquid metathesis, linguistic geography, isoglosses.

1. INTRODUCTORY NOTES

1.1. Polabian, an extinct West Slavic language, attested in merely a few written monuments from the late seventeenth and the early eighteenth centuries, has always attracted the most prominent names of Slavic and Indo-European linguistics. The interest in this language culminated in the second half of the twentieth century, when it got a comprehensive etymological dictionary (SEJDP), the four-volume *Thesaurus linguae Dravaenopolabicae* (TLDP)¹ and the bilingual *Polabian-English Dictionary* (PED). Needless to say, Polabian phonology and inflexion have been extensively examined, both synchronically and diachronically (cf. Lehr-Spławiński, 1929; Suprun, 1987; Polański, 2010). The language contact with Low German, which has left its most noticeable traces in Polabian syntax and lexicon, has not been neglected either (e.g. Lehr,

* aljosa97milenkovic@gmail.com

** The paper represents an altered version of the presentation *Osobnosti polapske fonologije: tipološka analiza* held at *Stulikon* in Zagreb (May 12th 2018).

1 The forth volume being indices.

1917; Polański, 1962). The amount of what has been written on Polabian indeed markedly exceeds the amount of what has been written in Polabian.

1.2. Still, the role of Polabian in the reconstruction of Proto-Slavic has not always been widely understood and appreciated. It has commonly been ignored and not incorporated into wider theories, which was the initial incentive for the present study. I intend to show that, in spite of being fragmentarily documented, Polabian does provide researchers with a lot of useful information for historical survey of the Slavic languages.

In addition, the article is aimed at clarifying some remaining problems of Polabian historical phonology. I shall also analyze the position of Polabian within the Lekhitic subgroup of West Slavic, on the basis of certain phonological isoglosses that have not drawn a lot of attention from the scholars so far.

1.3. The phonological features of Polabian which are to be dealt with include: (1) the results of the Lekhitic **ę-przegłos*; (2) the fate of the Proto-Slavic dialectal anlaut cluster **čr-*; (3) vowel length resolution and the development of the Polabian vowel system in comparison to the ones of Kashubian and Polish; and (4) the liquid metathesis in the interconsonantal sequences **el* and **ol*.

It might be objected that not all of the above isoglosses have been neglected, notably the liquid metathesis. Where this is the case, I only seek to elucidate some aspects of the problem.

1.4. As a starting point, Lekhitic is believed to be a group of closely related idioms which shared several common innovations, albeit not completely consistently. It comprises Polabian, Kashubian and Polish. The westernmost Kashubian dialect, Slovincian, abundantly recorded, had gone extinct by the half of the twentieth century. So-called West Pomeranian (Pl. *gwary zachodnopomorskie*) is attested in place names (Rzetelska-Feleszko, Duma, 1991). Our knowledge on Polabian is mostly based on the dialect of the region of Drawehn. The vernacular was recorded in the seventeenth and the early eighteenth centuries, at the very end of its existence.

1.5. Before proceeding to discuss the problems, a few notes on the sources and transcription should be put forward.

Polabian examples are taken from the upper-mentioned dictionaries (PED, SEJDP and TLDP). Whenever they do not exhibit the same phonemic interpretation of the attested forms, I shall adhere to the solutions presented in PED. The phonemic transcriptions are to be separated from the actual

recordings by being enclosed, as in /zenǎ/ ‘woman, wife’ - the transcription, versus Séna - an example taken from an original Polabian monument (in this case, Pfeffinger’s *Vocabulaire Vandale*; Rost, 1907). This solution has originally been applied in Kortlandt, 1989 (= 2011: 193-197).

The main sources for Slovincian, an extinct North Kashubian dialect, are Friedrich Lorentz’s *Slowintzische Grammatik* (Lorentz, 1903) and *Slowintzisches Wörterbuch* (SW) and his notational system shall be applied in the article. Stankiewicz’s notation (1993), which is rather simplified but fails to capture the essential features of Slovincian phonology, such as diphthongization of the stressed vowels and vowel timbre changes, shall not be utilized here.²

As regards the other Kashubian dialects, including what is nowadays considered to be the Kashubian standard, several writing systems have been used in the past (cf. Ramułt, 1893; Lorentz, 1925; Sychta, 1967-1976 etc.). I will quote the examples from Kashubian using Macéj Banjdur’s system, presented and first applied in his translation of Exupéry’s *Le Petit Prince* (2018). Even if taken from other sources, they will be transliterated to Banjdur’s system.

2. ISSOGLOSES

2.0. As already announced, several issues in the history of Polabian phonology shall be tackled in the following.

2.1. **The **ę*-przegłos in Lekhitic.** It is a known fact that Proto-Slavic soft vowels (**e*, **ě*, **e*, including **br* and **bl*) have been hardened before non-palatalized anterior consonants in Lekhitic, the preceding consonant having got palatalized as the only trace of a previously soft vowel (**e* > **o*, cf. **běro* > Pl. *biore*; **ě* > **a* and so on). However, the results of this process do not occur consistently throughout the Lekhitic area.

2.1.1. First of all, **e* > **o* has never operated in Polabian (Schleicher 1871: 47 ff., Lorentz 1902, Lehr-Spławiński, 1929: 31 ff., Suprun, 1987: 19); cf. Plb. /*brezǎ*/ ‘birch’, /*cerǎ*/ ‘yesterday’, /*metlǎ*/ ‘broom’, /*sestrǎ*/ ‘sister’, /*zenǎ*/ ‘woman, wife’, /*led*/ ‘ice’, /*sedlǔ*/ ‘saddle’, /*vestlǔ*/ ‘oar’, /*zelǒd*/ ‘acorn’, /*sredǎ*/ ‘middle, Wednesday’, /*med*/ ‘honey’ /*vicer*/ ‘evening’, /

² I also refer to the discussion in Stankiewicz, 1993: 292. His objections to the phonetism of Lorentz’s notation should not be disregarded.

sestě/ ‘sixth’³ < PSl. **běrza*, **vbčera*, **metyla*,⁴ **sestrà*, **ženà*, **lědb*, **sedlò*, **veslò*, **žělqdb* **serdà*, **mědb*, **věčerb*, **šesty*,⁵ respectively.

Ostensible counterexamples from Polish are in fact analogical: cf. datsg/locsg *żonie* ‘wife’ (not the expected **żenie*) after nomsg *żona*. The same would hold for Slc. *mjětłā* ‘broom’ (after datsg/locsg; but also the regular outcome *mjětłā*) < PSl. **metyla* (C), also *vjieslò/vjētōslò* ‘paddle’ < PSl. **veslò*, praes 1sg *niēsą* ‘carry’ << PSl. **nēsō* (praes 1sg *nīēsą*, which is phonemically regular, has been remodeled after praes 2sg *nīēsš*); Lorentz, 1903: 66. Still, some Slovincian forms cannot be accounted for by an analogy within the paradigm, like the adverb *fčeraú* ‘yesterday’ < PSl. **vbčera*. (Lorentz, 1903: 67)

2.1.2. The **ě-przegłos* appears to have been more widely spread in Lekhitic. In Polabian, it exhibits no exceptions, cf. Plb. /*votěr/* ‘wind, air’, /*b’olě/* ‘white’, /*gnozďel’* ‘nest’, /*moro/* ‘measure’, /*lotül’* ‘year, summer’, /*los/* ‘wood, woods’, /*gjozdäl’* ‘star’, /*st’onäl’* ‘wall’, /*sonül’* ‘hay’, /*kjot/* ‘flower’, /*zil’ozül’* ‘iron’, /*col/* ‘whole’, /*tül’onaj/* ‘knee’, /*d’olül’* ‘work, effort’ < PSl. **větrb*, **běly*, **gnězdò*, **měra*, **lěto*, **lěšb*, **gvězdà*, **stěnà*, **sěno*, **květb*, **želězo*, **kolěni*, **cěl’b*, **dělo*, respectively. Once again, analogical leveling could have disturbed the original patterns (see Długosz-Kurczabowa, Dubisz, 2006: 86 ff. for Polish).

2.1.3. Accordingly, PSl. **ę* should be expected to have been reflected as **’ō* under the same circumstances. While there has been no doubt about the previous developments, the problem of the **ę-przegłos* has misled several scholars, which has resulted with some inaccurate conclusions. One of those misconceptions is that modern Polish and Kashubian data are relevant to the problem. For instance, Klemensiewicz (1976: 18) adduces Pl. *piąty* ‘fifth’, Kash. *pjōti* ‘id.’ < PSl. **pěty* in order to illustrate *ę* > *ō* / _ [+cons, +ant].

3 As for Plb. /*sestě/*, it was interpreted as /*sistě/* in Polański, 2010: 121. The attestations (*Sête*, *sêsse* and *Seste*) indicate that the notation /*sestě/* (SEJDP: 705, PED: 130, TLDP: 980) would rather be the correct one.

4 Lehr-Splawinski’s derivation from PSl. **metla* (1929: 97) can no longer be maintained, in view of the South Slavic descendents, like NŠtok. *mětla*, with the sequence *tl*. It is a clear indicator of **ь* in the underlying PSl. form.

5 S. p. C in Derksen, 2008 (486): **šěstb*. If so, this is another irregular reflex of a s. p. C adjective in Polabian (see below, fn. 10).

As a matter of fact, Polish and Pomeranian merger of the nasals and their later division based on quantity have obscured their earliest Lekhitic timbre.⁶ Consequently, *a* in Pl. *piąty* and *ō* in Kash. *pjōti* do not represent the result of the **ę-przegłos*, as they are here due to the length in which the long neoacute is reflected.

On the contrary, no fusion of the nasal vowels in this position has taken place in Polabian, which makes it the only language of the group which betrays their earliest timbre (cf. Lehr-Splawiński, 1929: 38-39). Therefore, Plb. */pat/* ‘five’ and */pōtē/* ‘fifth’ actually reflect the timbre of PSI. **pēt̃b*, **pēt̃ȳ* (> **pōty*), respectively. The **ę-przegłos* can be observed in the following examples: */jōzēk/* ‘tongue’ < PSI. **jezyk̃b*, */vōzāt/* ‘bind, tie’ < PSI. **vezāti*, */jōtrā/* ‘liver’ < PSI. **jētra*,⁷ */sjōtē/* ‘holy, saint’ << PSI. **svēt̃ȳ*,⁸ */plōsāt/* ‘dance’ < PSI. **plēsāti*, */pōtē/* ‘fifth’ < PSI. **pēt̃ȳ*, */divōtē/* ‘ninth’ < PSI. **devēt̃ȳ* and so on.

2.1.4. In conclusion, besides the fact that some scarce information on the problem could be deduced from the earliest Old Polish monuments (like the *Bulla Gnieźnińska*; Długosz-Kurczabowa, Dubisz, 2006: 84), what is known on the **ę-przegłos*, a distinctive innovation of the Lekhitic subgroup of West Slavic, is solely based on the data from Polabian.

2.2. **čr-* in Polabian. Polabian is the only Lekhitic language with preserved initial cluster **čr*. Unlike Pl. and Kash. (including Slc.), the cluster had been kept intact, until it yielded */cr/* as a result of *mazurzenie*.

2.2.1. In Polabian, one finds */crevū/* ‘intestine’, nompl */crevāl/*, */criv/* ‘shoe’, */crivnēk/* ‘shoemaker’ < PSI. **čer̃vo*, **červā*, **čerṽb*, **čerṽbnik̃b*, respectively. As for the other West Slavic languages, cf.: PSI. **čerdā* (B) ‘herd’⁹ > Pl. *trzoda*, Kash. (*s*)*trzōda*, Slc. *str̃ōudā*, Cz. (*s*)*třída*, Slk. *črieda*, US *črjōda*; PSI. **čer̃vo* ‘intestine’ > Pl. *trzewo*, Slc. *třieṽø*, Cz. (*s*)*třevo*,

6 As correctly pointed out in Długosz-Kurczabowa, Dubisz 2006: 84.

7 According to Derksen (2008: 158), Plb. */jōtrā/* continues the nompl form of the s. p. B neuter noun **ętrō*. This is additionally corroborated by Sln. *jētra*, gen *-tar* ‘die Leber’ (Pleteršnik) and Čak. *jētra* ‘liver’ (Kalsbeek, 1998: 458).

8 I consider it to be an irregular outcome of PSI. **svēt̃ȳ* since the stress was not retracted from a long final syllable (Kortlandt, 2011: 195). Therefore, the reduced vowel */ē/* of the ultimate syllable must have been taken over from s. p. B adjectives (like */b’olē/*).

9 Elsewhere I have argued (2018: 8-9) that the s. p. C of this noun is attested in Pl. *trzoda* (Opl. *czrzoda*), the Slc. variant with a short vowel of the stem, (*str̃oda* in Stankiewicz’s notation; 1993: 295) and Čak. *črēdā*, acc sg *črēdu* (Novi). Pl. dial. *strzoda* and OCz. *treda* (ESSJa IV: 60-63, s.v. **čerda*) should be added to this list.

Slk. *črevo*, US *črjewo*, LS *crówo*; PSI. *čerslō ‘groin’ > Pl. *trzosła*,¹⁰ Cz. (*s*)*tříslo*, Slk. *čriesla*, US *črjóslo*, LS *crósto*; PSI. *čerъъ ‘tile’ > Pl. (*s*)*trzep*,¹¹ Cz. (*s*)*třep*, Slk. *črep*, US *črjop*, LS *cróp*; PSI. *čerъъха ‘ramson’ > Pl. *trzemcha*, Cz. *střemcha*, OCz. *třemcha*, Slk. *čremcha*; PSI. *čerъъ ‘stem’¹² > Pl. *trzon*, Kash. *trzón*, Slc. *střóuŋk* (< PSI. *čerъъкъ), OCz. *střen*, Slk. *čren*, US *črona*, LS *cróno*.

2.2.2. PSI. *č reflects an earlier *k succeeded by *e, *ě₁ (< PIE *eh₁), *i₁ (< PIE *ei/*iH), *b or *ę. It is therefore conspicuous that the Proto-Slavic dialectal anlaut cluster *čr must have resulted from a more recent development. There is no doubt that it was the liquid metathesis of *čerC- that gave rise to *čr- in West and South Slavic. The sequence has undergone the pleophony in East Slavic, thus becoming *čereC-. This has later been partially concealed in Russian by the inflow of Church Slavonic loanwords, South Slavic in origin, e.g. Rus. standard *črevo* ‘intestine’, which, as opposed to dialectal *čévevo* ‘id.’ (ESSJa IV: 82), does not exhibit the expected East Slavic reflex.

2.2.3. It may be argued that the further West Slavic development of the cluster may have been dependent on the outcome of *ř. If it yielded the trill fricative *ř,¹³ the preceding *č would change, which is an attractive solution from a phonetic standpoint.

The available West Slavic data, in spite of their scarcity, suggest that *ř > *ṛ̌ is exactly what prompted the decomposition of *č in this cluster. The change *čr > *tř/*stř has appeared in Czech, Polish and Kashubian (with Slovincian), all of which display *ṛ̌ > *ř, which is assumed to have taken place in the thirteenth century in each of these languages. While Czech has preserved the phonetic value [ṛ̌], *ṛ̌ yielded fricatives in Polish ([ʒ] / [ʃ]). According to Banjdur (2018), Kash. *rz* is pronounced as [ṛ̌], i.e. “drěžōcé [...] jak v czescjim *tři* /tṛ̌i/, *řeka* /ṛ̌eka/”. However, in some Kashubian dialects, more precisely “na vestrzédněch a pôlnjověch Kaszěbach”, [ṛ̌] yielded [z] (Banjdur loc.cit.). The problem has also been taken up by Jocz (ms.). His empirical survey of the North Kashubian vernacular of Jastarnia

10 Also dial. *trzósła*, with the expected *ó*.

11 Old Polish and dialectal attestations (ESSJa IV: 72).

12 S. p. C, according to Slc. *črĕn* and Rus. *čéren* (Milenković, 2018: 16).

13 IPA ʀ. This sound has traditionally been noted as ṛ̌ in Slavic linguistics, in accordance with Czech orthography. It has been usually referred to as *r frykatywne* in Polish dialectology (Jocz, ms.).

has shown that the phonetic value [r̥] has been preserved to a greater extent than previously assumed, even in younger generations.

2.2.4. The cluster has not got dissimilated in Polabian, although one finds Plb. /*crevü*/ for PSl. **čerŋvo* ‘intestine’. In Polabian, like in some dialects of Polish, PSl. **č*, **ž*, **š* were reflected as *c*, *z*, *s*, respectively, which is usually referred to as *mazurzenie* (*Polabian mazurzenie*, Polański, 1993: 799), though /*š*/ and /*č*/ have been reintroduced via Low German loanwords (Polański, 2010: 90). This explains the final outcome /*cr*/.

In Lower Sorbian, the opposition between **č* and **c* has been abolished (Shevelov, 1965: 590-591, Schaarschmidt, 1997: 115-116). Unlike Polabian and the Polish dialects with *mazurzenie*, the merger has not affected the pairs *ž* : *z* and *š* : *s* (Schaarschmidt, loc. cit.). LS *cr-* in *cröp*, *cröwo*, *cröno* etc. and Plb /*cr-*/ in /*crevü*/, /*criv*/ and /*crivněk*/ do not represent the dissimilation of **čr-* into *cr-*, as in Štokavian and Macedonian, where PSl. **č* has been regularly reflected as such, having turned into *c* only in the initial cluster **čr* (cf. Shevelov, 1965: 590, Carlton, 1991: 330); e.g. Plb. /*coso*/ vs. NŠtok. *čăša*, Mac. *čaša*; all from PSl. **čăša* ‘glass’; NŠtok. *čăs*, Mac. *čas* vs. LS *cas* < PSl. **čăsъ* ‘moment’.

2.2.5. However, Polabian does not provide one with a considerable amount of salient examples, since, in addition to /*crevü*/, only two of them are found, at least to my knowledge: /*criv*/ ‘shoe’ and /*crivněk*/ ‘shoemaker’ (SEJDP: 84-85; PED: 47). Moreover, not only is the latter word evidently derived from the former, but it has also been suggested (ESSJa IV: 84) that the two go back to the same etymon (PSl. **červ-*) as PSl. **čerŋvo*. This implies that one is left with a single root exemplifying the history of the initial cluster **čr* in Polabian. Still, I believe it to suffice for drawing a conclusion, inasmuch as no counterexamples have been made available.

2.2.6. To sum up, the Polabian trill *r* has not triggered any further changes of the preceding affricate **č*. The cited examples demonstrate that the Polabian course of the development of **čr-* diverges from the remaining Lekhitic languages, and coincides with the Sorbian and Slovak state of affairs. The resemblance between West and South Slavic is striking here. Central innovative areas (South Slavic - Štokavian and Macedonian, with *čr* > *cr*; West Slavic - Czech, Polish and Kashubian, with **čr* > **čř* > **tř*/**stř*) are divided from two archaic peripheries: Western (South Slavic

- Slovene, Kajkavian and Čakavian;¹⁴ West Slavic - Polabian and Sorbian) and Eastern (South Slavic - Bulgarian; West Slavic - Slovak).

2.3. **Vowel length resolution in Lekhitic.**¹⁵ An interesting observation has been made by Lorentz (1927: 26), who stated that Ø quantitative development of the vowel phonemes (*iloczynowy rozwój samogłosek*) is a feature in which Kashubian and Polish diverge from Polabian. It implies that no such process as vowel length resolution has taken place in Polabian.

2.3.1. This claim opens what has been one of the most stumbling problems of Polabian studies - the prosodic properties of Drawehn vernacular. The question whether the opposition between long and short vowels was phonemically relevant in Late Polabian (like in present-day Czech, for example) or not (like in Polish) has been the subject of an exhaustive polemic.

Some scholars, including Trubetzkoy (1929), plead for the former. According to Trubetzkoy's approach, accent placement was dependent on syllable weight, since the stress was predictably attracted by the syllable containing the penultimate mora of a word. A word would therefore be oxytonic if its ultimate syllable was long, or paroxytonic, in case of its short last syllable vocalism. However, his view has been criticized on several occasions, most recently in Polański, 2010. Polański adopted and slightly modified Lehr-Splawiński's hypothesis that the stress was either ultimate or penultimate, depending on whether the last syllable nucleus was full or reduced. I completely agree that it was the opposition between full and reduced vowels, not between long and short, that the stress placement in Late Polabian was determined by.

2.3.2. The question now arises of how the Late Polabian opposition between full and reduced vowels reflects the earliest Lekhitic prosodic system with quantitative distinctions. There have been quite a lot of attempts to stipulate the correlation between Proto-Slavic and Late Polabian prosody, already in Lehr-Splawiński, 1929. The same author

14 This is just a rough sketch, taken from manuals of Serbo-Croatian dialectology. It is, of course, not surprising that this isogloss does not perfectly correspond with the borders between dialects, e.g. *cr'ę:vo*, *c'r:n* in the Kajkavian idiom of Đurđevac (Marešić, 1999: 196).

15 By vowel length resolution, I refer to the transphonologization of vocalic quantity, which can be accomplished in various ways.

devoted a comprehensive article to this topic (Lehr-Splawiński, 1963). The historical development of Polabian accentuation has later, partially or in general, been tackled by Mickelsen (1986), Kortlandt (1989 = 2011: 193-197), Ambrosiani (1996), Bethin (1998: 180-183) and Carlton (1998, 1999). Mickelsen's thesis that the PSl. circumflex and acute were prone to a progressive shift in Polabian (PSl. **pŕvo* > Plb. /*pai^ũvú*/; PSl. **bàba* > Plb. /*bobó*/) has turned out to be far from compelling. His rather complicated relative chronology has been dismissed by Kortlandt. Even Ambrosiani (1996: 350) and Bethin (1998: 159-160) argue against the necessity of postulating progressive accent shifts in Polabian and find Kortlandt's hypothesis more satisfactory.

Assuming that the vowels carrying the acute and circumflex accent were reflected short, while the long neoacute regularly yielded length in Polabian, just like in Polish and Pomeranian, Kortlandt (1989: 166 = 2011: 195) hypothesizes that it was the vowel length that caused the vowel reduction in succeeding syllables. This is generally accepted by Ambrosiani (1996: 350 ff.); unfortunately, the author's failure to discriminate between the inherited length (like PSl. **běly* > Plb. /*b'olě*/, as well as Kash. *bjóli*) and the newly introduced, Polabian length (PSl. **ženà* > Plb. /*zenǎ*/, but Pl. *žona*, Slc. *ž^{en}ǎ*), which arose in open syllables from the short rising accent, both inherited (PSl. **vòla* > Plb. /*vilǎ*/) and the one that originates from the retraction of the stress from a short ultimate syllable (/ *zenǎ*/); Kortlandt, 1989: 166 ff. = 2011: 195 ff., has led him to the hardly defensible conclusion that Polabian has preserved pretonic length in s. p. C substantives (PSl. **rǫkà* > Plb. /*rǫkǎ*/), unlike any other West Slavic language (Ambrosiani, 1996: 353). However, the length found in /*rǫkǎ*/ is a Polabian innovation and the same in origin as that of /*zenǎ*/.

2.3.3. After the operation of the vowel reduction, the distribution of long vowels became predictable and phonologically irrelevant. In Kashubian and Polish, the same has been accomplished by the rise of the new timbre distinctions, as assumed for Proto-Slavic. The early Lekhitic opposition between long and short vowels has been remodeled in Kashubian as follows: **a* : **ā* > *a* : *ô*, like in **b'ǎbǎ* > Kash. *baba* vs. **b'ǎty* > Kash. *bjóli*. The outcomes are less consistently visible in standard Polish, as they are restricted to the nasals (**Vⁿ* > Pl. *ę*, **Vⁿ* > Pl. *ą*) and *o* : *ó* [u] < **o* : **ō*.

2.3.4. Lorentz's claim cited in the introductory paragraph of this section cannot be maintained as such. Polabian does not differ from Polish

and Pomeranian in that no vowel length resolution has occurred in it, but in the way in which the process has been carried out.

2.4. The liquid metathesis: PSI. **CelC* and **ColC* in Polabian, Kashubian and Polish. The main courses of the development of **CelC* and **ColC* in Lekhitic have already been established. In this section, the relevance of certain data traditionally considered to illustrate **el* > **ol* shall be cast into doubt.¹⁶ The entire material is available in Lehr-Splawiński, 1929: 67 (Polabian) and Lorentz, 1903: 80 (Slovincian). The non-Slovincian Kashubian correspondences are taken from Sychta's dictionary.

2.4.1. As to PSI. **el*, two opposite tendencies have determined its reflex in Lekhitic. It either merged with the one of PSI. **ol* (> *lo/lo*) or it gave rise to *le*. Dejna (1973: 88) argues that the southern border of the fusion is the line Magdeburg-Berlin-Bgdogszcz-Gdansk, i.e. that the innovation occurred in Polabian and a part of Kashubian dialects, most consistently in Slovincian.

2.4.1.1. In Polabian, both **el* and **ol* have the same outcome /lâ/, with no exceptions surfacing; e.g. Plb. gensg /mlâkâ/ 'milk' < PSI. **melkâ* = Plb. /glâvâ/ 'head' < PSI. **golvâ* etc. Yet, Plb. inf /vlâcět/ 'drag', praes 3sg /vlâcě/¹⁷ is not an example of PSI. **el* > Plb. /lâ/, as Lehr-Splawiński believed (1929: 67), for the fact that it descended from PSI. **volčiti* (SEJDP: 1011-1012; PED: 174; TLDP: 1482).

2.4.1.2. The **lo* reflex prevails in Slovincian (Lorentz 1903: 80), cf. Slc. *mlȳoc*, *mlȳuko*, *plȳovä*, *plȳoc* < PSI. **mělti* 'grind, mill', **melkò* 'milk', **pělvy* 'glume', **pelti* 'jäten', 'weed'. One encounters the simultaneous existence of the two reflexes in the same word in Slc. *mlȳuč/mlěič* 'Fischmilch' < PSI. **mélčb*.¹⁸ Slc. *vlięc* < PSI. **velkti* 'drag' exhibits the **le* reflex.

2.4.2. The Polish and Kashubian correspondences of the cited forms are usually not affected by the merger of **el* and **ol*, cf. Kash. *plevë*, *vlęc*, *mlékò*, *mlęcz*, but *młoc*, *płoc*; Pl. *plewy*, *mleko*, *mlecz*, *wlec*, *mleć*, *pleć*. However, **el* > **ol* seems to have operated after **č*, **ž*, **š*. Dejna claims:

16 By **el* and **ol*, I am referring to **CelC* and **ColC* hereafter.

17 Vaillant (1950: 157) correctly points out that Plb. /vlâcět/ could reflect both PSI. **vólči* and **velčè*. Since the form constitutes the same paradigm with the infinitive /vlâcět/ < **volčiti* (PED: 174), which must continue PSI. **volčiti*, this is completely irrelevant.

18 The length found in West Slavic (besides Slovincian, cf. Cz. *mlěč/mlíč*, Slk. *mliēc*; ESSJa XVIII: 76-77) can be taken as a proof of the s. p. B of the noun.

“Pozostałe dialekty lechickie oraz dialekty serbołużyckie wymienili międzyspółgłoskowe *el w ol* po *č, ž, š*” (1973: 66) and adduces (loc. cit.) several examples: (1) PSl. *čĕlnъ > Pl. *człon* ‘member’, PSl. *čelnъkъ > Kash. *członk* (Slc. *člounk*); (2) PSl. *žĕlbъ > Pl. *źlób* ‘manger’;¹⁹ Kash. *źlób*, Slc. *žloub*;²⁰ (3) PSl. *šĕlmъ > OPl. *szłom* ‘helmet’; (4) Pl. *człowiek* ‘man’, which would then be derived from *čelvĕkъ, which is arguable.

2.4.2.1. The etymon *čelvĕkъ is at variance with Cz. *člověk*, Slk. *človek*, NŠtok. *čòv(j)ek*, Sln. *človek*, Mac. *čovек*, Bulg. *čovѐк*. All of these forms, alongside with Pl. *człowiek* and Kash. *człowjek*, can be traced back to PSl. *čьlovĕkъ. ESSJa (IV: 48-50), Vasmer (III: 312-313), Brückner (1985: 79), Borys (2008: 99), and Derksen (2008: 80) all reconstruct *čelovĕkъ. Brückner proposes that the initial etymon *čelovĕkъ underwent an early remodeling to *čolvĕkъ, already in Proto-Slavic. On the contrary, in order to account for the aberrant form *čьlovĕkъ, Derksen subscribes to Kortlandt’s theory, according to which *e > *ь “after a palatalized consonant in a pretonic syllable” (2008: 80-81).²¹ Kortlandt (1984-1985: 367) argues that PSl. *e “was raised in a palatal environment”, and presents several more instances of the supposed development: OCS imp 2sg *рѣci, рѣci, тѣci* (praes 1sg *pekŏ, rekŏ, tekŏ*), where PSl. *pecĭ > *рѣci etc.; OCS *вѣчера* vs. *вѣчерь*; PSl. *večera > *вѣчєrà; Slk. *šiel* ‘went’ < PSl. *šĕdlъ (by the retraction from a final jer; Kortlandt, 2011: 18 ff.) < *šьdlъ (from the e-grade of *xodĭti), and so on. This could likewise be the case with *čelovĕkъ > *čьlovĕkъ, which satisfies all conditions for the said narrowing of *e to appear, as observed by Derksen.

2.4.1.2. This cannot hold for Plb. /clāvĕk/, which, unlike the rest of the West Slavic forms, cannot be derived from PSl. *čьlovĕkъ. It would presumably be reflected as Plb. */clĭivĕk/. PSl. *o > Plb /ā/ only after /v/, provided that the sequence was followed by a hard syllable, cf. Plb. /zaiŋvātāk/ ‘heart’ < PSl. *životъkъ, but it does not explain /ā/ of /clāvĕk/. Polański and Sehnert therefore reconstruct *čelvĕkъ (PED: 47) as an underlying form.

2.4.3. The said fusion after *č, *ž, *š is also found outside Lekhitic and Sorbian - in Czech-Slovak and South Slavic. According to Vaillant

19 Pl. *žleb* is seen as a borrowing from Slovak dialects by Borys (2008: 754).

20 It must have belonged to the mobile paradigm in Proto-Slavic, taking NŠtok. *žlĕb/žlĭjeb*, Sln. *žlĕb*, and Rus. *žólob* into account.

21 Similarly, Vasmer (loc. cit.): “Ursl. *čelovĕkъ, daraus gekürztes *čьlovĕkъ”.

(1950: 157-158), this process was posterior to the metathesis. The progressive assimilation is believed to have been conditioned phonetically, as it would entail the depalatalization of *č, *ž, *š. Just the opposite, ESSJa (IV: 44-45, s.v. *čelnъ) accepts Meillet's view that *e yielded *o in front of a hard resonant in Proto-Slavic; similarly - SP (II: 125-126, s.v. čelnъ). The *o*-reflexes appear in NŠtok. *člân, člānak/člānak*, Cz. *žlab* and *žlaza* 'gland'; besides *žleb, žleza* (Vaillant, loc. cit.). Not only does Machek (1968: 729) reconstruct both PSI. *želbъ and *žolbъ, but he also goes even further, stating that the two forms were semantically specified and that *želbъ originally denoted 'údolí, raztoka', while *žolbъ came to mean 'koryto'.

Taking this into account, the merger of *el and *ol after *č, *ž, *š is not a Sorbian-Lekhitic, but Proto-Slavic dialectal innovation. Still, it does appear most consistently in Sorbian and Lekhitic.

2.4.4. Except from the phonemically regular merger of *ol and *el after *č, *ž, *š, we are purportedly dealing with *el > *ol in Pl. praes 1sg *włokę* 'drag'. This cannot be right in view of the fact that Pl. *włokę* is apparently innovative, whilst the original *wleke* (PSI. *vêlkǫ) is attested dialectally, as well as in Old Polish (Boryś, 2008: 703).²² Slovincian has *vlięc*, praes 1sg *vlięka*, as already presented. Pl. *włoczyć*, praes 1sg *włócze*, 3sg *włoczy*, Kash. *włóczęc*, praes 3sg *włóczy* (Sychta, VI: 90) and Slc. *vliōčīc*, praes 2sg *vlóučīš* (SW: 1319) are, without any doubt, derived from PSI. *volčiti, an *i*-verb with the root in *o*-grade, as is additionally witnessed by NŠtok. *(iz)vlačīti*, praes 1sg *(iz)vlačīm* 'drag out'. The preservation of pretonic length in the Polish infinitive²³ and the NŠtok. accent prove its affiliation with the stress pattern B. The stem-vocalism of *włoczyć/vłóczęc* might have been the source of the secondary *włokę/vlokã*.

22 Similarly, Kashubian has *vłęc*, praes 1 sg *vlokã*, i.e. *vłęc, vloką* (Sychta, VI: 90).

23 The pretonic length is not really expected to occur in Kashubian s. p. B infinitives. Slovincian inf. *vliōčīc* points to a short root-vowel here.

3. CONCLUSION

3.1. A peripheral Lekhitic and the westernmost Slavic idiom, the Polabian vernacular of Drawehn expectedly exhibits remarkable phonological archaisms, such as the complete absence of the *e-przegłos* and the preservation of *dz*. Quite the contrary was the Polabian treatment of *šć (> *št), as the innovation is entirely unknown to the other Lekhitic languages. The dissimilation *čř > stř/tř, phonetically triggered by *ř > *ř̃, has never reached Polabian, unlike the merger of PSI. *CeIC and *CoIC. The view that no vowel length resolution tendencies have appeared during the phonological development of Polabian has been dismissed by adopting Kortlandt's hypothesis that the opposition between full and reduced vowels, which existed in Late Polabian, reflects the quantitative oppositions of an earlier stage. It is of utmost importance for traditional Slavic historical linguistics to embrace the outstanding achievements of modern Balto-Slavic accentuation, i.e. the approach stemming from Stang's groundbreaking monograph (Stang, 1957). The present article tried to make a modest contribution in this respect.

3.2. The table below concisely depicts some noteworthy phonological isoglosses in Lekhitic.

	Polabian	Slovincian	Kashubian	Polish
šć > *št ^a	1	0	0	0
*čř > [*čř̃] > stř/tř ^b	0	1	1	1
dz > z ^c	0	1	0	0
*CorC > CarC ^d	1	1/2	1/2	2
*CeIC = *CoIC ^e	1	1/0	0/1	0
<i>e-przegłos</i> ^f	0	1/0	1	1
vowel length resolution ^g	1	1	1	1

0 = archaism; 1 = innovation; 0/1 = archaic feature prevails; 1/0 = innovative feature prevails; 2 = innovated in a different way; 1/2 = two innovative features occur.

^a For *šč* > **št*, see Schleicher, 1872: 140; Lorentz, 1902: 17; Lehr-Splawiński, 1929: 99; cf. Plb. /*s'auko*/, Kash. *szczeka*, Pl. *szczuka* < PS1. **ščuka* 'pike'.

^b See 2.2.

^c Cf. Plb. /*mižā*/, Slc. *mjezā*, Kash. *mjedza*, Pl. *miedza* < PS1. **medjā* 'border'; Kash./Pl. *nodze* < PS1. datsg/locsg **nōdzě* 'leg'; Slc. *drūzā*, Pl. *drodze* < PS1. datsg/locsg **dōrdzě* 'way, road'. Slc. praes 1sg *siežq* (<< PS1. **sēdq* 'sit') has taken over its *ž* from the other praes forms (Lorentz, 1903: 135), like 2sg *siežiš*, where *ž* represents the reflex of **d* before a front vowel. The issue has been addressed in: Schleicher, 1872: 140-141; Lehr-Splawiński, 1929: 89 ff.; Lorentz, 1902: 17; Lorentz, 1903: 134-136.

^d See, among others, Lorentz, 1903: 74-76 (Slovincian); Lehr-Splawiński, 1929: 64; Polański, 2010: 60 ff. (Polabian). PS1. **CorC* > Lekh. dial. **CarC*, whence Plb. /*or*/, with the only exception of Plb. /*brōdā*/ and /*brōdāvaičā*/, which point to **ro* (Lehr-Splawiński, 1929: 65; Knoll, 2011: 38). In Slovincian, both **ar* and **ro* appear, sometimes in the same etyma: PS1. **mōrzb* > Slc. *mārz*/*mrōuz* 'frost' (Lorentz, loc. cit.).

^e Not counting the cases with a preceding **č*, **ž*, or **š*. See 2.4.

^f See 2.1.

^g See 2.3.

SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

* unattested form

> regularly yields

< regularly descended from

<< irregularly descended from

1, 2, 3 verbi personae

adj adjectivum

acc accusativus

def definite adjective form

f femininum

gen genitivus

imp imperativum

int instrumentalis

loc locativus

masc masculinum

nom nominativus
pl pluralis
praes praesens
praet praeteritum
sg singularis

Bulg. Bulgarian
Cz. Czech
Čak. Čakavian
dial. dialectal
Kash. Kashubian
Kajk. Kajkavian
Lekh. Lekhitic
LS Lower Sorbian
Mac. Macedonian
NŠtok. Neo-Štokavian
OCz. Old Czech
OCS Old Church Slavonic
Rus. Russian
PIE Proto-Indo-European
Pl. Polish
Plb. Polabian
PSl. Proto-Slavic
Slc. Slovincian
Sln. Slovene
PSl. Proto-Slavic
US Upper Sorbian

REFERENCES

- Ambrosiani, P. (1996). K voprosu o polabskix otaženijax praslavjanskix prosodičeskix otnošenij. In *Rusistika. Slavistika. Indoevropéistika. Sbornik k 60-letiju Andreja Anatoľeviča Zaliznjaka* (pp. 346-355). Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Indrik.

- Banjdur, M. (2018). Vimòva vedle International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA). In Antoine de Saint-Exupéry: *Mòli princ. Z francěscjéwo jãžeka knigã* przekłòd Macěj Banjdur. Złocieniec: Vědòvjizna Skra.
- Bethin, Ch. (1998). *Slavic Prosody. Language Change and Phonological Theory*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Boryś, W. (2008²). *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo literackie.
- Carlton, T. (1991). *Introduction to the Phonological History of the Slavic languages*. Columbus: Slavica Publishers.
- Carlton, T. (1998). Polabian Stress. Part 1: The Noun. *Slavia Occidentalis* 55, 7-26.
- Carlton, T. (1999). Polabian Stress. Part 2: The Verb and Adjective. *Slavia Occidentalis* 56, 43-58.
- Dejna, K. (1973). *Dialekty polskie*. Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk: Zakład narodowy imienia ossolińskich.
- Derksen, R. (2008). *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- Długosz-Kurczabowa, K.; S. Dubisz (2006). *Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu warszawskiego.
- ESSJa = *Etimologičeskij slovar' slovjanskix jazykov* (pod redakcją O. N. Trubačeva), 1-. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Nauka. 1974-.
- Gussman, E. (2007). *The Phonology of Polish*. Oxford: University Press.
- Ivić, P. (1957-1958). Značaj lingvističke geografije za uporedno i istorisko proučavanje južnoslovenskih jezika i njihovih odnosa prema ostalim slovenskim jezicima. *Južnoslovenski filolog XXI, knj. 1-4*, 179-206.
- Jocz, L. (ms.). *Kilka uwag o wymowie *ri we współczesnej gwarze Jastarni*. <academia.edu>
- Kalsbeek, J. (1998). The Čakavian Dialect of Orbanići near Žminj in Istria. *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 25. Amsterdam – Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Klemensiewicz, Z. (1976). *Historia języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe.
- Knoll, V. (2011). Výskit a význam skupiny TarT v kašubském literárním jayzce. In K. Kedron, M. Příhoda (eds.), *Historické promeny a současný stav* (pp. 37-48). Červený Kostelec – Praha.
- Knoll, V. (2012). *Kašubština v jazykovém kontaktu*. Praha: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity karlovy.
- Kortlandt, F. H. H. (1984-1985). On Reduced Vowels in Slavic. *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku XXVII-XXVIII*, 367-368.
- Kortlandt, F. H. H. (1989). Der Polabische Wortakzent. *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 49/1, 163-170.

- Kortlandt, F. H. H. (2011). *Selected Writings on Slavic and General Linguistics*. Amsterdam – New York: Rodopi.
- Lehr, T. (1917). Zapożyczenia dolnoniemieckie w języku połabskim. *Materiały i Prace Komisji Językowej Akademii Umiejętności*, 7, 271-318.
- Lehr-Spławiński, T. (1929). *Gramatyka połabska*. Lwów: K. S. Jakubowski.
- Lehr-Spławiński, T. (1963). Z rozważań o powstaniu akcentuacji połabskiej. *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej* 4, 73-102.
- Lorentz, F. (1902). Das gegenseitige Verhältniss der sogenannten lechischen Sprachen. *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 24, 1-73.
- Lorentz, F. (1903). *Slovintzische Grammatik*. St. Peterburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Lorentz, F. (1908–1912). *Slovintzisches Wörterbuch, I-II*. St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Lorentz, F. (1925). *Geschichte der pomoranischen (kaschubischen) Sprache*. Berlin – Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.
- Lorentz, F. (1927). *Gramatyka pomorska. Zeszyt I*. Poznań: G. Gebethner.
- Machek, V. (1968²). *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*. Praha: Academia.
- Marešić, J. (1999). Đurđevečki rječnik. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 11, 187-254.
- Mickelsen, L.R. (1986). Polabian Accentology. *Wiener slavistischer Almanach* 17, 365-381.
- Milenković, A. (2018). SCr. *krd(o)* ‘herd’. *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku* LXI/2, 7-20.
- PED = Polański, K.; J. A. Sehnert (1967). *Polabian-English Dictionary*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Pleteršnik, M. (1894–1895). *Slovensko-nemški slovar, I-II*. V Ljubljani: Založilo in na svetlo dalo Knezoškofijstvo. <bos.zrc-sazu.si/pletersnik.html>
- Polański, K. (1962). *Morfologia zapożyczeń niemieckich w języku połabskim*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Polański, K. (1993). Polabian language. In Bernard Comrie, Gerville G. Corbett (eds.). *The Slavonic Languages* (pp. 795–824). London – New York: Routledge.
- Polański, K. (2010). *Gramatyka języka połabskiego*. Katowice: Biblioteka Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Ramułt, S. (1893). *Słownik języka pomorskiego, czyli kaszubskiego*, W Krakowie: Nakładem Akademii umiejętności.
- Rost, P. (1907). *Die Sprachreste der Dravāno-Polaben in Hannöverschen*. Leipzig: J. P. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung.

- Rzetelska-Feleszko, E.; J. Duma. (1991). *Dawne słowiańskie nazwy miejscowe Pomorza Szczecińskiego*. Warszawa: Sławistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy-Omnitech Pres.
- Schaarschmidt, G. (1997). *Historical Phonology of the Upper and Lower Sorbian Languages*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Schleicher, A. (1871). *Laut- und Formlehre der polabischen Sprache*. St.-Petersburg: Commissionäre der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- SEJDP = Lehr-Spławiński, T.; K. Polański (1962–1994). *Słownik etymologiczny języka Drzewian połabskich, I–VI*. Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków: Zakład narodowy imienia Ossolińskich-Wydawnictwo Polskiej akademii nauk.
- Shevelov, G. (1964). *A Prehistory of Slavic. The Historical Phonology of Common Slavic*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- SW = Lorentz, 1908–1912.
- SP = *Słownik prasłowiański* (pod red. Franciszeka Sławskiego), 1-. Wrocław etc. 1974-.
- Stang, Ch. (1957). *Slavonic Accentuation*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Stankiewicz, E. (1993). *The Accentual Patterns of the Slavic Languages*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Suprun, A. E. (1987). *Polabskij jazyk*. Minsk: izdatel'stvo universitetskoe.
- Sychta, B. (1967-1976). *Słownik gwar kaszubskich na tle kultury ludowej, I-VII*. Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków: Zakład narodowy imienia Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo Polskiej akademii nauk.
- TLDP = Olesch, R. (1983-1987). *Thesaurus linguae Dravaenopolabicae, I-IV*. Köln-Wien: Böhlau Verlag.
- Trubetzkoy, N. S. (1929). *Polabische Studien*. Wien: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky.
- Vaillant, A. (1950). *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. Tome I, Phonétique*. Lyon: IAC.
- Vasmer, M. (1953-1958). *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Аљоша С. Миленковић

АРХАИЗМИ И ИНОВАЦИЈЕ У ПОЛАПСКОЈ ФОНОЛОГИЈИ: НЕКОЛИКЕ КОМПАРАТИВНО-ИСТОРИЈСКЕ НАПОМЕНЕ

Сажетак

Чланак представља покушај преиспитивања положаја изумрлог полапског језика у оквиру лехитске подгрупе западнословенских језика (којој, осим полапског, припадају још и пољски и кашупски). Фонолошке црте којима је посвећена нарочита пажња јесу: преглас псл. назала **ɛ*, одраз позно-прасловенске иницијалне консонантске групе **čr*, префонологизација квантитативних опозиција у полапском (у поређењу са сличним процесима у кашупском и пољском) и метатеза ликвида у интерконсонантским секвенцама **el* и **ol*.

Испоставља се да је полапски лехитски језик који пружа најважније и најпоузданије податке о отврдњавању псл. меког назалног вокала испред тврдих антериорних консонаната (*d, t, z, s, r, l, n*). Фрагментарне податке о овом процесу дају нам и најстарији старопољски споменици, док савремени пољски и кашупски, због стапања назала, те каснијег поновног увођења двају назалних вокала као вида префонологизације квантитативних опозиција, не пружају никакве информације о најранијој лехитској боји носних самогласника.

Како полапски није знао за фрикативизацију меког **r*, иницијална група **čr*- је у њему, за разлику од кашупског и пољског (али и чешког), очувана. Управо **r* > *ř* сматра се окидачем дисимилације **čř* > *stř/tř* у пољ., каш. и чеш., што је атрактивно решење са фонетске тачке гледишта. Уочава се занимљив паралелизам у распрострањању ове изоглосе у западнословенском и јужнословенском (у коме је она, колико нам је познато, детаљније изучена). Централна иновативна област (јсл. – штокавски и македонски, где **čr* > *чр*; зсл. – кашупски, пољски и чешки) одваја се од двеју архаичних периферија (западне: јсл. – словеначки, кајкавски и чакавски, зсл. – полапски, горњолужички и доњолужички и источне: јсл. – бугарски, зсл. – словачки).

Када је реч о прозодијском развоју полапског, основно је питање овде како је лехитски систем, у основи квантитативни, одражен у полапској опозицији вокала по редукованости. Супротно мишљењу неких пионира лехитских студија (нпр. Фридриха Лоренца), полапски се не разликује од кашупског и пољског по томе што у њему није било префонологизације квантитетских опозиција. Ова је тенденција била присутна и у полапском, само је остварена на друкчији начин. Док су у пољском и кашупском пређашње опозиције по квантитету преобликоване у опозиције по вокалској боји (какав се процес претпоставља и за прасловенски језик), у полапском је, према

мишљењу Кортланда, дошло до редукције вокала којима је претходио дуг слог. На тај начин је дистрибуција дужине постала предвидива, а ово обељежје фонолошки ирелевантно.

Метатеза ликвида свакако спада међу најисцрпније испитане изоглосе у словенској лингвистици, укључујући и зсл. језике, па и саму лехитску подгрупу. Ипак, нека традиционална решења завређују поновни осврт и преиспитивање, па се указује на ирелевантност и секундарност неких примера за које су аутори сматрали да илуструју стапање рефлексâ псл. секвенци *Ce/C и *Co/C.

Према свему изнетом, намећу се закључци да се у полапском, осим сачуваних архаичних црта, очекиваних за рубно подручје (полапски је најзападнији засведочени словенски идиом!), срећу и значајне структурне иновације, и то такве какве су непознате остатку лехитске заједнице (нпр. *šć > *št). Неке га особености, углавном архаичне, повезују са пољским (нпр. наставак инструментала једине о-основа), мада, разуме се – будући архаизмима – не имплицирају ништа одређеније; неке опет са поморским дијалекатским континуумом (неизвршена метатеза у групи *CorC > *CarC; стапање рефлексâ псл. *Ce/C и *Co/C, које је, додуше не доследно, забележено у кашупском и сл.). Коначни закључци о сложеним односима унутар лехитске групе западнословенских језика не могу се донети без узимања у обзир свих релевантних језичких црта, па и преиспитивања налаза традиционалне славистике, која је умногоме допринела нашем познавању мањих лехитских језика. Уз то, у историјску словенску лингвистику неопходно је инкорпорирати импресивне резултате савремене, постстанговске (балто)словенске акцентуације. Овај чланак представља само мали корак у том погледу.

Кључне речи: западнословенски, лехитски, полапски, лехитски преглас (*przegłos lechicki*), метатеза ликвида, лингвистичка географија, изоглосе.