

ЗБОРНИК  
МАТИЦЕ СРПСКЕ  
ЗА ФИЛОЛОГИЈУ И ЛИНГВИСТИКУ  
LXII/2

МАТИЦА СРПСКА  
ОДЕЉЕЊЕ ЗА КЊИЖЕВНОСТ И ЈЕЗИК  
**ЗБОРНИК**  
МАТИЦЕ СРПСКЕ ЗА ФИЛОЛОГИЈУ И ЛИНГВИСТИКУ  
MATICA SERBICA  
CLASSIS LITTERARUM  
ARCHIVUM PHILOLOGICUM ET LINGUISTICUM

Покренут 1957. године  
До XXVI књиге (1983) излазио под називом *Зборник за филологију и лингвистику*

Главни уредници:  
Др Миљивој Павловић (1957–1960), др Рудолф Коларић (1961–1962),  
академик Павле Ивић (1963–2000), академик Александар Младеновић (2001–2009),  
академик Јасмина Грковић-Мејџор (2010–)

LXII/2

Уредништво:  
Др МИЛИВОЈ АЛАНОВИЋ, Др НАДА АРСЕНИЈЕВИЋ, Др ЖАРКО БОШЊАКОВИЋ,  
Др ЈАСМИНА ГРКОВИЋ-МЕЈЏОР, Др ДРАГА ЗЕЦ, Др ГЕРХАРД НЕВЕКЛОВСКИ, Др МОТОКИ НОМАЧИ,  
Др СЛОБОДАН ПАВЛОВИЋ, Др ДРАГОЉУБ ПЕТРОВИЋ, Др МАТО ПИЖУРИЦА, Др МИЛОРАД РАДОВАНОВИЋ,  
Др ВЛАДИСЛАВА РУЖИЋ, Др СВЕТЛАНА М. ТОЛСТОЈ, Др ЗУЗАНА ТОПОЛИЊСКА, Др БЈОРН ХАНСЕН

Collegium redactorum:  
Dr MILIVOJ ALANOVIĆ, Dr NADA ARSENIJEVIĆ, Dr ŽARKO BOŠNJAKOVIĆ, Dr JASMINA GRKOVIĆ-MAJOR,  
Dr BJÖRN HANSEN, Dr GERHARD NEWEKLOWSKY, Dr MOTOKI NOMACHI, Dr SLOBODAN PAVLOVIĆ,  
Dr DRAGOLJUB PETROVIĆ, Dr MATO PIŽURICA, Dr MILORAD RADOVANOVIĆ, Dr VLADISLAVA RUŽIĆ,  
Dr SVETLANA M. TOLSTOJ, Dr ZUZANNA TOPOLIŃSKA, Dr DRAGA ZEC

Главни и одговорни уредник:  
Академик ЈАСМИНА ГРКОВИЋ-МЕЈЏОР

ISSN-0352-5724 | UDK 80/81(082)

# ЗБОРНИК

МАТИЦЕ СРПСКЕ  
ЗА ФИЛОЛОГИЈУ И ЛИНГВИСТИКУ

LXII/2

НОВИ САД  
2019

Aljoša Milenković

## TWO ETYMOLOGICAL REEXAMINATIONS (\*šćępjàti and \*velikъ/\*velьkъ in Lekhitic)\*

Polabian /*stepǎ*/ 'split', Kashubian *szczepiac*, and Polish (*roz*)*szczepiać* derive from the iterative verb \*šćępjàti (accent paradigm [b]), not \*šćępjati, as traditionally maintained, whilst Polish *wielki* 'big' and Polabian /*viltǝ*/ go back to Proto-Slavic \*velьk-. The suffix \*-ik-/\*-ьk-, extracted from quantitative pronouns and adverbs, has been added to the simple adjective \*velь. It is proposed that Kashubian *wialdзи* and *wiòldзи* 'big', whose root-vocalism is irregular, have been influenced by their antonyms *mali* and *mòli*.

*Key words:* etymology, word formation, Proto-Slavic, Lekhitic, Polabian, Kashubian, Polish.

Полап. /*stepǎ*/ 'цепати (дрва)', каш. *szczepiac* и пољ. (*roz*)*szczepiać* изводе се из \*šćępjàti (акценатска парадигма [b]), не из \*šćępjati, како се традиционално претпоставља, док пољ. *wielki* и полап. /*viltǝ*/ 'велики' потичу од псл. \*velьk-. Алтернација између \*i и \*ь у медијалном слогу указује да је неизведени придев \*velь проширен наставком \*-ik-/\*-ьk-, преузетим од заменица и прилога са значењем количине. Каш. облици *wialdзи* и *wiòldзи* 'велики', са иначе неправилним вокализмом корена, развили су се под утицајем антонима *mali*/*mòli*.

*Кључне речи:* етимологија, творба речи, прасловенски, лехитски, полапски, кашупски, пољски.

**0. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.** This article challenges the existing etymologies of Plb. /*stepǎ*/ 'split' (section 1) and Kash. *wieldзи*/*wialdзи*/*wiòldзи* 'big, great' (section 2), alongside with their Lekhitic cognates. The previous scholarship is to be put under scrutiny and the phonology and formation of our words carefully re-examined. The findings of post-1957 Slavic accentology play a prominent role in this etymological contribution.

### 1. THE ORIGIN OF PLB. /*STEPǎ*/ 'SPLIT'

1.1. What appears to be the *communis opinio* on the background of Plb. /*stepǎ*/ 'łupie, rozszczepia (drzewo)' (SEJDP 759), 'he splits' (PED 137), 'spalten, zerspalten' (TLDP 1087) – all three dictionaries derive the form from PSl. \*šćępjajetъ – is cast into doubt in this section. After revealing the drawbacks of the prevalent view, a new, more tenable explanation shall be put forth.

1.2. The Polabian word is attested as *Stepia* (H), *Stēpia* (B<sub>1</sub>) and *tepia* (HWfb). The diacritic in B<sub>1</sub> marks the stress on the penult, so the vowel of the ultimate syllable is inevitably reduced: /*stepǎ*/ (SEJDP 759), i.e. /*stepǎ*/ (PED 137; TLDP 1087).

---

\* This paper has greatly benefited from the comments made by Professor Orsat Ligorio. I am also indebted to three anonymous reviewers, who pointed out several inconsistencies in the first submitted version. All eventual remaining drawbacks are entirely my responsibility.

As for the ppp.nom.sg.n /*stepǫǎ*/, the attestations include: *Stepiǫna* (H), *Stepyǫna* (B<sub>1</sub>; B<sub>2</sub>; C), *Stepjona* (H574; H880); TLDP 1087.<sup>1</sup>

I failed to find any Kashubian related forms in RAMULT 1893, or in SEK. However, Sychta has recorded *šćěpac*, prs.3sg *šćěpǎ* (SGK V: 234), i.e. *szczepiac*, *szczěpiō* in the standard notation. The Slovincian counterpart (-*šćěpjǎc*, prs.1sg -*šćěpjǎ*, 2sg -*šćěpjōš* (SW 1149)), just like the Polish one, happens to be unattested as a simple verb.

No clues about the original Lekhitic quantity of *\*e* (< PSl. *\*e*, *\*ě*) can be deduced from standard Polish (as opposed to Kashubian); compare Pl. inf *świecić* ‘shine’, prs.3sg *świeci* vs. Kash. *swiecēc*, *swięci* < PSl. *\*světiti*, *\*světi*, and analogously, Pl. (roz)*szczepiać*, prs.3sg (roz)*szczepia* vs. Kash. *szczepiac*, *szczěpiō*.

1.3. Were the traditional view to be upheld, Plb. prs.3sg /*stepǎ*/ ‘split (wood)’ would be deemed a descendant of PSl. *\*šćepjajetъ* (SEJDP 759), i.e. *\*šćepjajetъ* (TLDP 1087), or *\*šćep’aje* (PED 137). Our current knowledge on Polabian phonological development – nothing more than that – forces us to dismiss the proposed *\*šćepjajetъ* as the preform of Plb. /*stepǎ*/ . One can hardly disprove that PSl. *\*e* is reflected in Polabian as /i/ before palatal syllables (SCHLEICHER 1871: 49; LORENTZ 1902: 11; LEHR-SPLAWIŃSKI 1929: 31f.; SUPRUN 1987: 19; POLAŃSKI 2010: 61), hence PSl. *\*šćepjaje* (> *\*šćepja*) would in fact be expected to yield Plb. *\*/stipǎ/*,<sup>2</sup> which renders the solution advanced in SEJDP, PED and TLDP inadequate. Neither does PSl. *\*šćepjanoje* fit right with Plb. /*stepǫǎ*/.

Upon closer inspection, the Kashubian correspondences decline the likelihood of the old solution even more. A parent form with the root-vowel *\*e* is irreconcilable with Kash. *szczěpiō* and Slc. -*šćěpjōš*, since Kash. *é* (Slc. *ě*) could have arisen from PSl. *\*e* only by compensatory lengthening. Unfortunately, such a scenario cannot be employed to account for Kash. *szczěpiō* (and Slc. -*šćěpjōš*), as the said lengthening was operative in the syllables with a voiced stop or resonant in the coda.

But what could be true of Plb. /*e*/ and Kash. *é* (Slc. *ě*) is that they go back to PSl. *\*ě*. The lengthened grade of the root would be a clear-cut indication of an iterative verb, formed by adding the suffix *\*-a-*, which is preceded by *\*-j-* if the underlying perfective verb belongs to the *i*-type (LORENTZ 1903: 347f.; SP I: 47; PRONK 2012: 222).

Both of the above features are discernible in the discussed forms. The supposed lengthened vowel of the root (*\*ě*) is reflected in /*stepǎ*/ and *szczěpiō* (-*šćěpjōš*),<sup>3</sup> although the testimony of Pl. *rozszczepia* is not unequivocal (cf. 1.2). More transparent is that they all display an intervening *\*j* between the root and the suffix *\*-a-*. While SEJDP, PED and TLDP failed to detect the former, they could not afford to overlook the latter detail.

<sup>1</sup> H = C. Henning’s *Vocabularium Venedicum*; B<sub>1</sub>, B<sub>2</sub>, C = copies of H (SEJDP XI; PED 30); H574 = *Wendisches Wörterbuch Deutsch und Wendisch ex Lexico Frencelii Manuscripto auctum*; H880 = *Gründliche Nachricht von dem Wendischen Pago, Dravān genannt*; HWfb = *Wendisches Wörterbuch* (TLDP XXXVif.).

<sup>2</sup> As turns out to be the case with e.g. PSl. *\*zemjā* ‘ground’ > Plb. /*zimǎ*/, PSl. *\*medjā* ‘border’ > Plb. /*mižǎ*/ etc.

<sup>3</sup> The length of the latter two is due to the long rising accent that the initial syllable of these present forms had born, cf. below.

Therefore, I conclude that \*šćěpjàti, prs.2sg \*šćěpjašb, an iterative verb, should be reconstructed here.

This being so, \*šćěpjàti must have been the aspectual pair of the perfective *i*-verb \*šćěpiti,<sup>4</sup> cf. *rozszczepić* (pf) vs. *rozszczeplić* (impf) ‘split’ in Polish or Slovincian *šćiepjic* (pf) vs. *šćiepjac* (impf) ‘einpfpopen’ (SW 1149).

A vast number of Slavic iterative verbs with lengthened grade of the root belong to the accent paradigm [b]<sup>5</sup> (PRONK 2012: 222).<sup>6</sup>

A short root-vowel (like in *szczepiac*, -šćiepjac < \*šćěpjàti) is usually found in [b] infinitives in Kashubian, including Slovincian.<sup>7</sup>

The long neoacute of the root-syllable assumed for \*šćěpjašb is the source of the length that the *é* in Kash. *szczépiô* and the *ě* in Slc. -šćěpjôš stem from. It also explains the reduced vowel of the desinential syllable in Plb. prs.3sg /stepǎ/: the neoacute had yielded length in early Polabian, with this length causing a vowel reduction in the succeeding syllable (KORTLANDT 1989: 163 = 2011: 193), as in Plb. nom.sg.m /b’olě/ ‘white’ < PSŁ. dial. \*bělŷ, Plb. /jotrǎ/ ‘liver’ < PSŁ. nom.pl \*jětra (cf. Čak. jětra ‘id.’; KALSBECK 1998: 458).<sup>8</sup>

PSŁ. dial. \*šćěpja regularly yields Plb. /stepǎ/ anyway: (1) PSŁ. \*šč is reflected as Plb. /st/, arguably through the intermediate stage \*št,<sup>9</sup> cf. PSŁ. \*ščmelb > Plb. /stamil/ ‘bumblebee’, PSŁ. \*ščenę > Plb. /stina/ ‘puppy, little dog’, \*pšćelica > Plb. /pastělaicǎ/ ‘oven opening’ (SCHLEICHER 1871:140; LORENTZ 1902: 17; LEHR-SPLAWIŃSKI 1929: 99; PED s.v.v.), (2) PSŁ. \*ě > Plb. /e/ (cf. PSŁ. \*světjǎ > Plb. /svečǎ/ ‘candle’), with the exception of \*ě being immediately followed by a hard anterior consonant, where it was prone to the Lekhitic *przegłos* (LEHR-SPLAWIŃSKI 1929: 35; SUPRUN 1987: 19; POLAŃSKI 2010: 55).

It might be objected that PSŁ. \*ě would not expectedly be realized as such after palatal(ized) consonants, implying that setting up PSŁ. \*šćěpjàti raises the question as to how it escaped the dissimilation \*ě > \*ā (which would have given rise to \*šćāpjàti). The simplest answer to such an objection would be that \*šćěpjàti was created when the change \*ě > \*ā had already ceased to operate, as the verb is in all possibility an early Lekhitic *Neubildung*.

<sup>4</sup> The perfective verb is reflected in Pl. *szczepić* and Slc. *šćiepjic*. In addition to these two forms, PSŁ. \*šćěpiti yields Rus. *ščepit’* ‘pfropfen’ (REW III: 448f., s.v. *ščepá*), Ukr. *ščepýty* and Cz. *štěpiti*.

<sup>5</sup> As noticeable in e.g. Nštok. prs.1sg *rādām* ‘give birth’, *pláčām* ‘pay’, *lúpām* ‘pound, knock’. The present tense of this type owes its root-stress to Stang’s Law (pace e.g. KAPOVIĆ 2015: 106ff., who has recently rejected Stang’s Law, arguing that the cases where the neoacute is found on the root syllable of AP [b] substantives, adjectives and verbs have never been subject to a progressive shift).

<sup>6</sup> AP [a] simplex iteratives in Slavic are analogical. Their root ‘acuteness’ is explained as taken over from the corresponding prefixed forms (PRONK 2012: 223f.; pace VILLANUEVA SVENSSON 2011: 27f., who regards Nštok. *umirati* ‘die’ and Rus. *vorócat’* ‘turn’ as displaying the expected acute reflexes of PIE lengthened grade in non-final syllables, and JASANOFF 2017: 87ff., especially 87f.<sup>35</sup>, where he maintains that *umirati*, *sipati*, *prějcati* ‘are the old forms’).

<sup>7</sup> Compare: Kash. *wiāzac*, *młocēc*, *mācēc*, *chwalēc*, *mieszac*; from PSŁ. \*vęzàti ‘tie’, \*moltiti ‘thrash’, \*mōtiti ‘stir’, \*xvaliti ‘praise’, *měšati* ‘mix’, respectively; Slovincian -vjāzǎc, *mlitǎcēc*, *mācēc*, *xvālēc*, *mjięšǎc*.

<sup>8</sup> Admittedly, even if not a descendant of \*šćěpja, Plb. /stepǎ/ would have acquired a reduced vowel of the final syllable, owing to the fact that this pattern had been generalized in the present tense (KORTLANDT 1989: 167f.).

<sup>9</sup> In an alternative scenario (LORENTZ 1902: 17), *mazurzenie* was anterior to the loss of the fricative component: \*šč > \*sc (i.e. *sts*) > *st*.

1.4. Contrary to the view that the Lekhitic items listed in 1.2 trace back to PSŁ. \*šćepjati, prs.2sg \*šćepjaješb, which is at variance with the /e/ in Plb. /stepǎl/, /steponǎl/ and the root-length that the Kashubian present forms (3sg szczépiô, Slc. 2sg -šćěpjôš) point to, the solution sketched in this section resolves the traditional problems, inasmuch as the iterative verb \*šćěpjati, prs.2sg \*šćěpjašb (expectedly AP [b]) regularly yields Plb. /stepǎl/, Kash. szczepiac, szczépiô, Slc. -šćiępjac, -šćěpjôš, and Pl. (roz)szczepiać, (roz)szczepia. Accordingly, Plb. /steponǎl/ goes back to PSŁ. \*šćěpjanoje (> \*šćěpjane by contraction), not \*šćepjanoje.

## 2. PSŁ. \*VELIKŲ/\*VELKŲ IN LEKHITIC

2.1. In West Slavic etymological dictionaries, the treatment of what has usually been reconstructed as PSŁ. \*velikŲ<sup>10</sup> ‘big, great’ involves a variety of *ad hoc* developments. The following lines aim at reducing the need to evoke such tentative solutions in explaining phonemic properties of the Slavic (especially Lekhitic) words in question.

It takes only a glimpse into the data to notice a considerable degree of variation among the Lekhitic forms that (have traditionally been considered to) derive from this etymon, as one encounters Pl. *wielki* (dial. *wielgi*), OPl. *wieliki*, *wielki*, *wielgi* (BRÜCKNER 1985: 616f.; BORYŚ 2008: 693f.), Plb. /viltě/ (SEJDP 983ff.; PED 171; TLDP 1439ff.), Kash. *wieldzi*, *wialdzi*, *wiôldzi* (SGK VI: 131 – *velgi*, *valgi*, *valgi*),<sup>11</sup> including Slc. *vjělhi* ‘gross’ (SW 1289).

That said, three hurdles stand in the way of reaching a straightforward explanation of their prehistory: (a) the coexistence of the variants with \*i and \*b in the medial syllable, (b) the unexpected g of the Kashubian and some Polish descendants and (c) the root-vocalism of Kash. *wiôldzi* and *wialdzi*.

2.2. The problem (a) does not solely pertain to Lekhitic, but also to Proto-Slavic etymology. Pl. *wielki*, Plb. /viltě/, and Kash. *wieldzi* (Slc. *vjělhi*)<sup>12</sup> all point to PSŁ. \*velikŲ (def. \*velikŲjb > \*velikŲj). However, there have been attempts (not quite successful, though) to treat these forms as reflecting PSŁ. \*velikŲ (cf. BORYŚ 2008: 693).<sup>13</sup> An original solution is offered by Olesch (TLDP 1434): he ascribes the lack of \*i in the medial syllable of Plb. /viltě/ to \*velikŲjb > \*velkŲjb, but the age of this development remains uncertain. Nevertheless, this runs counter to the ‘soft’ reflex of \*e in Polabian, unless one assumed that the palatalization had been retained by \*l (\*velkŲjb), which is far from compelling. Either way, Olesch’s explanation is quite *ad hoc*.

Both \*velikŲ<sup>14</sup> and \*velkŲ are reconstructed by Derksen (2008: 515), who has a point claiming that (in addition to Pl. *wielki*) Cz. *velký* and Slk. *velký* must continue the latter variant. Still, he does not associate Plb. /viltě/ with them.

<sup>10</sup> Skok assumes that Lith. *velika* (sic) ‘Ostern’ derives from the same source as PSŁ. \*velikŲ (ERHSJ III: 573). This does not hold true, as Lith. *velýka* ‘Ostern’ was borrowed from Russian (FRAENKEL II: 1219).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. the Kashubian place names *V’elgi Kack* ‘Wielki Kack [...]’ and *V’elgã V’es* ‘Wielka Wies [...]’ (SGK VI: 132); also Slc. *vjělgosc* ‘die Grösse’ (SW 1289).

<sup>12</sup> The only exception being the irregular stem-final \*g.

<sup>13</sup> Machek (1968: 682) likewise believes that Cz. *velký* has arisen from *veliký* by vowel reduction.

<sup>14</sup> On the basis of e.g. Rus. *velikij*, f. *velikaja*, Derksen (2008: 515) reconstructs the medial acute (\*velikŲ). Nštok. *vělik* (def. *vělikŲ*) deviates from the reconstructed accent.

The vacillation between *\*i* and *\*b* found in *\*velik-* vs. *\*velbk-* is strongly reminiscent of the alternation characteristic of the Slavic pronouns (and adverbs) denoting quantity, cf. *\*tolik-* ‘that big’ (Nštok. *tòlik*) vs. *\*tolbk-* (Slk. *tol’ky*). The simple adjective *\*velb* (reflected in e.g. OCz. *velí*; DERKSEN 2008: 515) might have been enlarged with *\*-ik/\*-bk*, extracted from such pronouns as *\*tolikb/\*tolbkb*, as a distinctive marker with quantitative meaning (*\*velb* > *\*velikb* after *\*tolikb*, and *\*velbk* after *\*tolbk*). The striking resemblance between OCS *velikb* and *tolikb* (and likewise Pl. *wielki* and *telki*) has already been noticed by Vaillant (1958: 487), as an anonymous reviewer kindly informs me.

2.3. An apparent Lekhitic innovation, the *g* of Pl. dial. *wielgi*, Kash. *dž* in *wieldži* and Slc. *h* in *vjělhi* (the latter two originating from this *\*g*), are still a major problem in Slavic historical linguistics. As they cannot be elucidated through known Common Slavic or Lekhitic sound laws and I just fail to see any reasonable motivation for any kind of analogical extension of this *\*g*, I shall refrain from discussing the matter on this occasion.

2.4. Not recognized as a problem and thus thoroughly neglected, the root-vocalism of Kash. *wialdži*, *wiöldži* is conspicuously secondary, since *alô* can by no means reflect the *\*e* of the supposed etymon *\*velbk*. Yet, where it has been adopted from need not be difficult to grasp, bearing in mind that the antonym *\*malb* ‘small’ is reflected as both *malí* and *môli* (i.e. *malí* and *mâli* in SGK III: 42). I would venture to propose that Kash. *wialdži* and *wiöldži* have taken their root-vocalism from *malí* and *môli*, respectively.

It would not be odd for antonyms to exert influence on each other, as they are frequently collocated. These collocations could have been reshaped as follows: *malí i wieldži* to *malí i wialdži*, and *môli i wieldži* to *môli i wiöldži*. Essentially the same occurrence can be identified in the Kosovo-Resava dialect of Serbian (*kosovsko-resavski*), where the adjective *děsni* ‘right’ (Vučitrn, ELEZOVIĆ 1932: 132; North Metohija, BUKUMIRIĆ 2012: 126) has taken over its present-day accent from *lěvi* ‘left’ (BUKUMIRIĆ 2012: 299).<sup>15</sup> Standard Nštok. *děsnī* and Čak. *desnī* (JURIŠIĆ 1973: 43) bear the historically expected accent.<sup>16</sup>

2.5. To conclude, OPl. *wieliki* continues PSll. *\*velikb*, while OPl./Pl. *wielki* and Plb. */viltě/* are the regular outcomes of PSll. *\*velbk*. The original Proto-Slavic adjective *\*velb* has supposedly been remodelled on quantitative pronouns (cf. already VAILLANT 1958: 487), such as *\*tolikb/\*tolbk*, *\*kolikb/\*kolbk* ‘how big’, *\*jelikb/\*jelbk* (a relative pronoun), *\*selikb/\*selbk* ‘this big’ etc. The unexpected *\*g* of OPl./Pl. dial. *wielgi*, Kash. *wieldži* (*wialdži*, *wiöldži*) and Slc. *vjělhi* is a remaining issue. Lastly, the aberrant root-vocalism of Kash. *wialdži* and *wiöldži* has been imported from the antonym *malí/môli*.

**3. OVERALL CONCLUSION.** Plb. */stepǎ/*, Kash. *szczepiac*, *szczépiô*, Slc. *-ščěpjāc*, *-ščěpjōš*, Pl. *(roz)szczepiać*, *(roz)szczepia* are transposed to PSll. dial. *\*ščěpjāti*, *\*ščěpjašb* (contrary to TLDP 1087; SEJDP 759; PED 137). The only Lekhitic reflex

<sup>15</sup> I have also recorded the adverb *děsno* ‘right, rightwards’ (after *lěvo* ‘left, leftwards’) in Maskare (Central Serbia, the same dialect), unlike standard Nštok. *děsno*.

<sup>16</sup> Derksen (2008: 100f.), following Zaliznjak (1985: 138), reconstructs AP [c] for this adjective.



of PSl. \**velikъ* is OPl. *wieliki*. All other Lekhitic forms – irrespective of whether they impose further difficulties or not – trace back to PSl. \**velьkъ*. Kash. *wialdźi* and *wiôldzi*, have taken the root-vowel of *mali* and *môli*.

The Polabian inherited lexical stock still imposes challenges to etymologists. The conviction that there is not much to contribute to the etymology of this scarcely recorded language – it has nonetheless already got three comprehensive dictionaries, all of which provide the etymologies of their entries – might be called into question. A substantial progress in the field of Slavic etymology could be accomplished by embracing recent results of (Balto-)Slavic accentology, though this area is not devoid of controversy.

#### ABBREVIATIONS

1, 2, 3	tres verbi personae	Kash.	Kashubian
AP	accent paradigm	Lith.	Lithuanian
def	definite	Nštok.	Neoštokavian
f	feminine	OCS	Old Church Slavonic
impf	imperfective	OCz.	Old Czech
inf	infinitive	OPl.	Old Polish
m	masculine	Pl.	Polish
nom	nominative	Plb.	Polabian
n	neuter	Rus.	Russian
pf	perfective	Slc.	Slovincian
pl	plural	PIE	Proto-Indo-European
prs	present	PSl.	Proto-Slavic
ppp	past passive participle	Ukr.	Ukrainian
sg	singular	*x	unattested x
Cz.	Czech	$x > y$	x regularly yields y
Čak.	Čakavian	$x < y$	y regularly descended from x

#### REFERENCES

- BORYŚ, Wiesław. *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2008<sup>2</sup>.  
 BRÜCKNER, Aleksander. *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna, 1985<sup>2</sup>.  
 BUKUMIRIĆ, Mileta. *Rečnik govora severne Metohije*. Beograd: Institut za srpski jezik, 2012.  
 DERKSEN, Rick. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2008.  
 ELEZOVIĆ, Gligorije. Rečnik kosovsko-metohiskog dijalekta, I. *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* IV (1932): 1–477.  
 ERHSJ: SKOK, Petar. *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, I–IV. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1971–1974.  
 FRAENKEL, Ernst. *Litauisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I–II. Heidelberg – Göttingen: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag – Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962–1965.  
 JASANOFF, Jay H. *The Prehistory of the Balto-Slavic Accent*. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2017.  
 JURIŠIĆ, Blaž. *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade uspoređen s nekim čakavskim i zapadnoštokavskim govorima. II dio: Rječnik*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1973.  
 KALSBECK, Janneke. The Čakavian Dialect of Orbanici near Zminj in Istria. *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 25. Amsterdam – Atlanta: Rodopi, 1998.  
 KAPOVIĆ, Mate. *Razvoj hrvatske akcentuacije. Fonetika*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2015.

- KORTLANDT, Frederik H. H. Der Polabische Wortakzent. *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 49/1 (1989): 163–170.
- KORTLANDT, Frederik H. H. *Selected Writings on Slavic and General Linguistics*. Amsterdam – New York: Rodopi, 2011.
- LEHR-SPLAWIŃSKI, Tadeusz. *Gramatyka połabska*. Lwów: K. S. Jakubowski, 1929.
- LORENTZ, Friedrich. Das gegenseitige Verhältniss der sogenannten lechischen Sprachen. *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 24 (1902): 1–73.
- LORENTZ, Friedrich. *Slovinzische Grammatik*. St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1903.
- MACHEK, Václav. *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*. Praha: Academia, 1968<sup>2</sup>.
- PED: Kazimierz Polański, James Allen Sehnert. *Polabian-English Dictionary*. The Hague: Mouton, 1967.
- POLAŃSKI, Kazimierz. *Gramatyka języka połabskiego*. Katowice: Biblioteka Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2010. <<https://www.sbc.org.pl/dlibra/show-content/publication/edition/18899?id=18899>> 30.12.2018.
- PRONK, Tijmen. Proto-Indo-European Long Vowels and Balto-Slavic Accentuation. *Baltistica* XLVII/2 (2012): 205–247.
- RAMULT, Stefan. *Słownik języka pomorskiego, czyli kaszubskiego*. W Krakowie: Nakładem Akademii Umiejętności, 1893.
- REW: VASMER, Max. *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I–III. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1953–1958.
- SCHLEICHER, August. *Laut- und Formenlehre der Polabischen Sprache*. St.-Petersburg: Commissionäre der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1871.
- SEJDP: Tadeusz Lehr-Splawiński, Kazimierz Polański. *Słownik etymologiczny języka Drzewian połabskich*, I–VI. Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków: Zakład Narodowy Imienia Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1962–1994.
- SEK: Wiesław Boryś, Hanna Popowska-Taborska. *Słownik etymologiczny kaszubszczyzny*, I–VI. Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy, 1994–2006.
- SGK: Bernard Sychta. *Słownik gwar kaszubskich na tle kultury ludowej*, I–VII. Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków: Zakład Narodowy Imienia Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1967–1976.
- SP: Franciszek Sławski (red.). *Słownik prasłowiański*, I–. Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy Imienia Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1974–.
- STANG, Christian. *Slavonic Accentuation*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1957.
- SUPRUN, Adam E. *Połabskij jazyk*. Minsk: Izdatel'stvo universitetskoe, 1987.
- SW: Friedrich Lorentz. *Slovintzisches Wörterbuch*, I–II. St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1908–1912.
- TLPD: Reinhold Olesch. *Thesaurus linguae Dravaenopolabicae*, I–IV. Köln – Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 1983–1987.
- VAILLANT, André. *Gramaire comparée des langues slaves. Tome II, Morphologie*. Lyon: IAC, 1958.
- VILLANUEVA SVENSSON, Miguel. Indo-European Long Vowels in Balto-Slavic. *Baltistica* XLVII/2 (2011): 5–38.
- ZALIZNJAK, Andrej A. *Ot praslavjanskoj akcentuacii k russkoj*. Moskva: Nauka, 1985.

Аљоша Миленковић

ДВА ЕТИМОЛОШКА ПРЕИСПИТИВАЊА  
(\*šćępjati и \*velikъ/\*velьkъ у лехитским језицима)

Резиме

Полапско /stepǎ/ ‘цепати (дрва)’, заједно са кашупским *szczepiac* (3. л. јд. през. *szczępiō*), словињским *-ščępjās* (1. л. јд. през. *-ščępjā*, 2. л. јд. *-ščępjōš*) и пољским (roz)*szczepiać* (3. л. јд. през. (roz)*szczepia*), обично се изводи из псл. \*šćępjati (2. л. јд. през. \*šćępjaješъ). Међутим, ова реконструкција не одговара вокализму корена у полапском: \*šćępjaje(ть) (> \*šćępja) даје по-

лапско \*/stipǎ/, а не пружа ни објашњење за дужину на коју упућује коренски вокал у кашупским презентским облицима. Решење које превазилази ова два недостатка јесте извођење датих форми из итеративног глагола \*ščěpǝti, 2. л. јд. през. \*ščěpǝšъ. Коренски неоакут у презенту објашњава вокалску редукцију у финалном слогу у полапском и дужину на коју кашупско *é* и словињско *ě* упућују, док \**ě* уместо \**e* објашњава полапско /*e/* у /*stěpǎ/*.

За разлику од старопољског *wieliki*, пољско *wielki* и полапско /*vilič/* не могу регуларно одражавати прасловенско \**velikъ*. Зато се напоредо реконструишу прасловенске основе \**velik-* и \**velbk-*, иако је било покушаја етимолога да се две варијанте сведу на облик \**velikъ*. Алтернатија \**i* : \**ь* подсећа на заменице и прилоге са значењем количине (\**tolik-* у новоштокавском *толик* : \**tolbk-* у словачком *tolky*), те делује да је изворни придев \**velъ* проширен овим наставком, који потиче из заменичког система. Интригантно *g* у старопољском и пољском дијалекатском *wielgi*, на које се свде и *dź* у кашупском *wieldzi* и *h* у словињском *vjělhji* тешко се може објаснити познатим лехитским гласовним законима. За неочекивани вокализам корена кашупског *wialdži/wiôldži* предлаже се да је преузет од антонимног придева *malī/môli*.

Универзитет у Београду  
Филолошки факултет  
Катедра за српски језик са јужнословенским језицима  
(студент основних студија)  
Студентски трг 3, 11000 Београд, Србија  
[aljosa97milenkovic@gmail.com](mailto:aljosa97milenkovic@gmail.com)

(Примљено: 1. априла 2019;  
прихваћено: 6. новембра 2019)