# Materials for an Etymological Dictionary of North-Lechitic Dialects

## Introduction

This work encapsulates comparative data from a short monograph on North-Lechitic accentology (Bogatyrev 1995) focusing primarily on partly extinct dialects of Pomerania: Slovincian and Kashubian.

The most detailed description of a Pomeranian dialect (Lorentz 1903, 1908, 1912) documents several closely related Slovincian idioms that were spoken at the time by a few hundred people and are currently presumed extinct. Lorentz’ transcription represents sounds of a dying language with amazing precision but is very difficult to reproduce, a factor that played no small part in the slow pace of adoption of Slovincian (and, to a lesser extent, Kashubian) data in Slavic linguistics. In the meantime, some of its archaic features, such as mobile stress, piqued curiosity of several scholars producing, on occasion, radical hypotheses that were difficult to verify given the dearth of available material (see for example Garde 1973). With this in mind, I attempted to produce a systematic overview of available material rendered in simplified transcription. As one would expect, Pomeranian stress turned out to be coordinated with the existing reconstruction of the Proto-Slavic accent, although not as closely as the earlier data from South and East Slavic manuscripts investigated by Vladimir Dybo, Andrey Zaliznyak, and their students. Combined with another archaic feature, the distinction between the so-called “narrow” and “non-narrow” vowels, the former reflecting old West Slavic lengths, Pomeranian and, in particular, Slovincian, proved to be a useful resource confirming and, in some cases, clarifying existing accentological reconstructions. However, it occurred to me that, while somewhat helpful in accentological research, the book’s material might be more effective if it were recast as a mini-etymological dictionary, a companion to the existing, much larger collections of comparative data, such as Derksen 2008. A narrow focus on a particular group of dialects may help identify accentological and phonemic peculiarities that are less prominent in a broader etymological study.

Last but not least, this publication provided me with an opportunity to correct several errors and omissions. In addition to typos in a few etymological entries, they include missing bibliographic items, most unfortunately, a reference to Križanić's grammatical treatise (Križanić 1859), as well as incomplete and occasionally erroneous rules that explain correspondences between Lorentz’ transcription and the simplified spelling. I take this opportunity to apologize to the readers and publishers of the original text for unintentional confusion that this may have caused.

On a more pleasant note, I would like to acknowledge generous assistance from Philipp Krylov and Dr. Sergey Krylov who helped convert the original manuscript from a custom source to a modern word processor format, Dr. Tijmen Pronk who reviewed South Slavic material and corrected errors in Slovene forms, and Professor Alexander Lubotsky for support and guidance. I am indebted to my colleagues whose help was instrumental in the publication of the original book, most importantly, to Dr. David Birnbaum, Sergey Bolotov, Dr. Rimma Bulatova, Dr. Vladimir Dybo, Dr. Vyacheslav Ivanov, Dr. Werner Lehfeldt , Dr. Sergey Nikolaev, Dr. Reinhold Olesch, Dr. Hans Rothe, Dr. Adam Suprun, and Dr. Andrey Zaliznyak.
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