Curiosities about the Polish language

LC

May 1, 2019

Abstract

Part I

Sounds

1 The common origin of PL deszcz and PL dżdżu

Except for the clear similarity in meaning, at first look the spelling of PL deszcz has nothing to do with that of PL dżdżu. However, the two words derive from the common form PL deżdż in use in the XV-XVI centuries, and declined as [deżdż/dżdżu/...] in the singular, and as [dżdże/dżdżów/...] in the plural. From this, the spelling PL deszcz arose as to reflect the devoicing of the final cluster *-żdż*, and then it started to take its own endings as in [deszcz/deszczu/...]. On the other hand, the old genitive PL dżdżu survived in expressions like

PL wyglądać jak kania dżdżu. (1)

Moreover, forms derived from the original PL dżdżu include the feminine form PL dżdża which is a technical term from meteorology indicating heavy rain, the adjective PL dżdżysty which is a synonym of PL deszczowy maning EN rainy, and finally the word PL dżdżownica, which in the past meant EN rainwater, and now it denotes a certain kind of worm.

But how did the declination [deżdż/dżdżu/...] arose in the first place? In order to answer this question, one must look more closely at Proto-Slavic, which is the predecessor of Polish language. Proto-Slavic had two very short vowels called *yers*, denoted ь and ъ, and, depending on the position in the word, some of those disappeared and others were "upgraded" to the full vowel PL e (in a process called *vocalisation of yers*). With all the yers in place, in Proto-Slavic the grandfather of PL deżdż was declined like [*dъzdjь/*dъzdja/...]. However,

which of those yers disappeared, and which became PL e? The process follows a very simple alternation:

> Starting from the end of the word, the last yer is lost, the previous yer is maintained, the previous yer is lost, ..., and so on until we reach a full (non-yer) vowel, after which the process repeats.

The yers which are lost are called *weak* and those which are maintained are called *strong*. (The rule above is called *Havlík's law* in honour of the Czech scholar Antonín Havlík (1855–1925), who determined the pattern in 1889.) Applying this rule to our example, we get the following derivation:

PSL *dъzdjь → PSL *dezdj → PL deżdż,
PSL *dъzdja → PSL *dzdja → PL dżdża.

Indeed, in PSL *dъzdjь the first yer from the end ь is weak and thus dropped, and the next one going towards the left is ъ and thus it becomes PL e. On the other hand, in PSL *dъzdja the unique yer ъ is weak and thus is dropped altogether.

2 The unusual change of root in [dech/tchu]

Also this can be explained by the loss of weak yers and the vocalisation of strong ones:

PSL *dъxъ → PSL *dex → PL dech,
PSL *dъxa → PSL *dxa → PL tchu[1],

where, according to Havlík's law, the first yer from the left disappears and the second becomes PL e. However here, the additional tendency of devoicing of the initial consonant cluster "dx" induced a change of spelling of the root to PL tch- in the rest of the declination.

3 An PL i out of nowhere in [gołąb/gołębia]

Not every weak yer disappeared without leaving any trace of its presence. While weak *back* yers ъ just disappeared as in PSL *dъa → PL dwa, weak *front* yers ь often softened (palatalised) the preceding consonant, as in PSL *konь → PL koń, which is visible in the soft consonant PL ń, and consequently in the rest of the declination, as in the genitive PL konia (which ought to be spelled PL końa), dative PL koniowi, and so on.

In the case of PSL *gołǫbь, the Proto-Slavic ancestor of Polish PL gołąb, such softening induced by the disappearance of the final front yer ь is a bit more

[1] We use here the modern ending PL -u for the genitive.

subtle, since Polish does not have a soft PL b. However, softening strikes back in the other cases, giving the genitive PL gołębia, dative PL gołębiowi, and so on.

4 Why the sound PL ą is not spelled PL ǫ (as it should)?

It is striking that while PL ę can be thought as the nasalised version of PL e, PL ą clearly is not the nasalised version of PL a, but rather of PL o. Therefore, it ought to be spelled PL ǫ! So what went wrong?

The history of nasal vowels in Polish is complex and spans several centuries. While no other slavic language has nasal vowels nowadays, Proto-Slavic did have them, and Polish is the only member of the family that retained this feature. Interestingly, in Europe only other two languages have nasal vowels, and they are both derived from Latin (which didn't have nasal vowels): French and Portuguese. (There are many other unexplained parallels between Polish and Portuguese; cf. **??**.) However, while French has *monophthongal* nasal vowels, that is, plain sounds like those found in PL bon or PL vin, in Polish these nasal vowels are *diphthongal*, in the sense that the sound starts with a certain position of the mouth, and ends in another one. For instance, the pronunciation of PL ę is not very far from PL e-on. This makes it quite interesting when Polish people—with a certain pride—pronounce the name of their national hero PL Chopin, whose surname, while being French, gets polonised in what in Polish spelling sounds more like PL Szopę.

(The topic of mapping sounds from one language to another is a fascinating one. For instance, in Polish the French word PL menu is pronounced PL meni. In reality, the real pronunciation of the last vowel is more similar in what in certain spelling conventions is noted PL ü, which is a sound combining characteristics of both PL i and of PL u: The lips are rounded like in PL u, but the rest of the mouth is in a position as in PL i. Other languages adopted other solution. For example, in Italian, this French sound is pronounced by just pronouncing a plain PL u, while English adopts an intermediate solution by using the diphthong (again those!) PL i-u, which starts in PL i and ends in PL u.)

Looking at Polish verbs, and in particular at the first person singular of the present tense, one notices that the ending is either PL -ę (like in PL idę) or PL -am (like in PL mam). Another observation is that nasal vowels occur either at the end of the word, or are followed by a consonant, and they never appear at the beginning of a word. This is striking, and it suggests that nasal sounds originate from the evolution of the nasal consonants PL m (and PL n) when those are followed by a consonant, or are at the end of the word.

And this is indeed the case: The oldest occurrences of PL ę and PL ǫ in Proto-

Slavic are derived from the evolution of the Pre-Indo-European sonorant consonants PL m and PL n (and their soft variants PL ḿ and PL ń), and from the diphthongs PL em, PL im, PL om, PL am, PL um (similarly for PL n), when followed by a consonant. More precisely, if a sonorant PL m or PL n was followed by a consonant, then we obtain the *back* nasal PL ǫ (which is misleadingly written as PL ą nowadays), and if the same happened to its corresponding soft version PL ḿ or PL ń, then we obtain the *front* nasal PL ę:

PIE *tūs-k'mtom → PSL *tysǫtjь → PL tysiąc,
PIE *ńg'hū → PSL *językъ → PL język.

(In the other cases where these sonorants where followed by a vowel, they did not generate nasal vowels.) Similarly, if a combination PL em/im was followed by a consonant, it yields PL ę, and similarly PL om/am/um yields PL ǫ (the same for PL n):

PIE *penk^{u}t → PSL *pętь → PL pięć,
PIE *krongh → PSL *krǫgъ → PL krąg,
PIE *kamptos → PSL *kǫtъ → PL kąt,
PIE *dhumb → PSL *dǫbъ → PL dąb.

So far so good. But this is only the beginning of the story, since the modern sounds PL ę and PL ǫ in contemporary Polish *are not* a direct continuation of the corresponding Proto-Slavic sounds. In fact, in the centuries XII-XIV when Old Polish was spoken, there were no sounds PL ę, PL ǫ at all!

So, what happened exactly? In order to explain how the modern sounds PL ę and PL ǫ arose, it's necessary to explain that Proto-Slavic had in fact *four* nasal vowels, which could be either *short* PL ĕ, ŏ or *long* PL ē, ō . In fact, the so called *vowel length* was so important in Proto-Slavic, that there were different words which could be distinguished by vowel length, and by no other feature. For instance, PSL *mŏka and PSL *mōka were two different words, the first meaning 'torture' (modern Polish PL męka), and the second 'flour' (modern Polish PL mąka). This example suggests that the short vowel ŏ became the modern PL ę, and that the long vowel ō became what is modernly written as PL ą. This is exactly what happened, but in order to understand why PL ą is not spelled as PL ǫ as it should, we need to look a bit more closely at an intermediate evolution stage.

Across the centuries XII-XIV short and long nasal vowels PL ĕ, ŏ, ē, ō underwent a general process of *lowering* of the articulation towards the new nasal vowel PL ą not existing before, while preserving vowel length. (Here by PL ą we mean the nasal version of the vowel PL a, a bit like in French PL vin.) Thus, short nasals PL ĕ, ŏ became PL ă , and long nasals PL ē, ō became PL ā . However, while vowel length is still existing in other Slavic languages, such as Serbo-Croatian, Polish lost this feature during the following centuries XV-XVI. In the process, the short nasal PL ă became the modern PL ę, and the long nasal PL ā became the modern PL ǫ. The transformation PL ā → PL ǫ is particularly interesting, since it shows that the articulation was now *raised*, which is the opposite

to what happened in the previous period, and it can be explained as follows: In order to preserve the same amount of energy necessary to pronounce the long vowel PL ą̄ , which has a low articulation, one needs to raise its articulation towards PL ǫ, for the reason that a higher articulation requires more energy to be produced. However, the XVI century orthography PL ą didn't change accordingly and it lasts to our days, which explains the conundrum.

5 Why *rz* and *ż* sound the same?

The origin of the Polish consonant PL rz is unrelated with PL ż, but, thanks to a sequence of sound changes, the two consonant are nowadays pronounced the same. Originally, PL rz was pronounced like the modern Czech consonant PL ř, e.g., PL řeka (river). As reflected in its spelling, PL rz can be thought of as the palatalised version of PL r obtained by trying to pronounce PL r and PL ż "at the same time". This simultaneous combination of sounds is called *synchronous palatalisation*. However, starting from the XV century the palatalisation of PL rz became more *asynchronous*, which means that PL rz was rendered as a PL r followed by a short (perhaps partially overlapping) PL ż sound. (A similar process in Montenegrin, Croatian, and Bosnian produced the asynchronous version PL rijeka.) Over time, the secondary component PL ż gained prominence, and, already in the XVIII century, it became the only sound to be heard. That's why the PL rz and PL ż sound the same in contemporary Polish, but their spelling remind us of their different origins.

6 *h* vs. *ch*

The two spellings *h* and *ch* were always pronounced the same in the national Polish language. However, in the those areas under the influence of Czech, Ukrainian, and Belorus languages the pronunciation of *h* was *voiced*, as in the Ukrainian words UK голова (PL głowa, EN head) and UK гальмо (PL hamulec, EN brake). In other words, the only difference between *h* and *ch* is that the vowel chords do produce a sound while pronouncing *h*, while they remain silent when pronouncing *ch*. As the spelling suggests, *ch* derives from the sound *k* (as in PL charakter vs. EN character), and similarly its voiced variant *h* derives from *g*, which, not surprising, is the voiced version of *k*. This can be seen in some Old Polish words imported from its neighbours, like SPL gardy (haughty) and SPL gańba (shame), which in modern Polish became PL hardy and PL hańba, respectively. While the voiced *h* was never a widespread feature in Poland, it had sufficient influence on the national language as to affect its spelling, and today we have the two variants *h* and *ch*.

7 On the common origin of PL barwa and PL farba

Both PL barwa and PL farba come from the German PL Farbe, however they were imported in the language at different stages of its phonological development. The earlier import is PL barwa, which was adopted when Polish didn't have the sound PL f. (Incidentally, neither Proto-Indo-European, nor Greek, nor Proto-Slavic had the sound PL f.) In fact, the sound PL f started to appear in Polish only in the XIII century, and before Polish had it in its repertoire, any PL f in foreign loanwords was replaced by a PL p or a PL b. So for instance, the latin words PL firmare and PL ferula yield the contemporary PL bierzmować and PL berło, respectively.

However, gradually the sound PL f appeared in Polish as well. Its origin is primarily the devoicing of the sound PL w at the end of the word, like in PL paw, and after a devoiced consonant, like in PL świat: In fact, nowadays these two words are pronounced PL paf and PL śfiat, respectively. (One can compare this with Ukrainian PL svit, Serbian PL svet, or Czech PL svět, where devoicing didn't occur.)

As the Polish language became more acquainted with the PL f sound, loanwords containing it where subsequently imported more accurately, as it happened later on, when the German PL Farbe was reimported just as PL farba.

8 Why PL ó and PL u are pronounced the same?

The letter PL ó is what in Polish is called "closed u" (PL u zamknięty), and nowadays it sounds exactly like PL u, which is called "open u" (PL u otwarty). However, it was not always like this. In the first half of the XVI century, Polish had in fact the three different vowels PL o, PL ȯ , and PL u, were PL ȯ represented a sound intermediate between PL o and PL u.

The differentiation of these two related but distinct vowels PL o and PL ȯ arose as a consequence of the lost of *vowel length* during the XV century. More precisely, PL o is the descendant of the *short* Proto-Slavic vowel PL ŏ , while PL ȯ is the descendant of the *long* Proto-Slavic vowel PL ō . While in the first case there was no change in vowel length, and thus also the sound of the vowel was preserved, in the second one the long vowel PL ō had to be *shortened* in order to become PL ȯ . This shortening triggered a compensatory process meant to preserve the total effort required to pronounce this vowel, and thus the articulation of PL ȯ was raised more towards PL u, resulting in a new sound intermediate between PL o and PL u.

The coexistence of both PL o and PL ȯ lasted until the XVII century. However, the two sounds were not perceived as sufficiently different, and PL ȯ continued to shift even more towards the sound PL u, till in the XIX century, when the two sounds PL ȯ and PL u where not distinguishable anymore and were thus

identified, as it is in Polish nowadays. Thus, one can see in the modern spelling of PL ó a reminder of its origins from PL ȯ and PL ō .

9 The common origin of PL gość and PL guest

from Proto-Germanic *gastiz (source also of Old Frisian jest, Dutch gast, German Gast, Gothic gasts "guest," originally "stranger"), from PIE root *ghos-ti- "stranger, guest; host" (source also of Latin hostis, in earlier use "a stranger," in classical use "an enemy," hospes "host," from *hosti-potis "host, guest," originally "lord of strangers;" Greek xenos "guest, host, stranger;" Old Church Slavonic gosti "guest, friend," gospodi "lord, master")

10 Why are Polish and Portuguese so similar?

For no reason. However, there are several remarkable similarities which justify posing such a question.

11 Polish spelling v. 2.0

- Evolution of Polish orthography

Spelling reform:

PL cz → PL ċ,
PL rz → PL ṙ,
PL sz → PL ṡ,

PL ci → PL ć,
PL dzi→ PL dź,
PL ci → PL ć,
PL ni → PL ń,
PL si → PL ś,
PL zi → PL ź,

PL ch → PL x.

Let's see through some examples how the new spelling would look like. Instead of comparing the current and the reformed spelling, we will give examples directly for the latter as a proof its naturalness. Let's begin with the word most dear to Polish speakers, PL Ścebṙeṡyn, the infamous home town of a PL xṙąśċ (beetle) who is particularly fond of singing PL w tṙćińe (in the reed). This locality is

probably rivalled only by PL Xŕąśćyżewośyce, equally infamous home town of PL Gŕegoś Bŕęćyśćykiewić.

Part II

Words

12 The dual number

While nowadays nouns, adjectives, and verbs can have either the singular number (= 1; *liczba pojedyncza*) or the plural number (≥ 1; *liczba mnoga*) form, Proto Slavic was richer and it had also an intermediate form: the *dual* number (= 2; *liczba podwójna*, like for espresso). Remnants of the old dual number can still be found nowadays, in archaisms such as

> *Jak nie chceta, to nie musita.*
> If you (two) don't want to, you (two) don't have to.

where the endings "-eta" and "-ita" refer to the 2nd person dual, i.e., "you two".

Similarly, other phenomena in the grammar which nowadays look like irregular patters in fact were once totally regular and come from the dual number. Excellent examples include the plural forms of those things which come typically in pairs, such as *ręka/ręce* (hand/hands; not *ręki*), *oko/oczy* (eye/eyes; not *oka*), and *ucho/uszy* (ear/ears; the plural form *ucha* exists and it means "handles", but it cannot be applied to the anatomical part). Compare for these same examples the alternations in the instrumental plural: *rękami/rękoma*, *oczami/oczyma*, and *uszami/uszyma*.

A final example of occurrence of the dual number is the number *dwieście* "two hundreds" which comes from *dwie* "two" + *ście*, which is the dual form of *sto* "one hundred". The next two hundreds are *trzysta* "three hundreds" and *czterysta* "four hundreds", which both use the regular plural form *sta* instead.

13 Wyjść za męża

Let's consider the following Polish idiomatic expressions:

- *wyjść za mąż*,
- *siąść na koń*,
- *być z kim za pan brat*, and
- *na miły Bóg*.

Nothing strange? Well, they all have something in common: The prepositions *za* and *na* should be followed by the accusative case (*biernik*) and not the nominative (*mianownik*) as above, which means those expressions should read rather like *wyjść za mężа*, *siąść na konia*, *być z kim za pana brata*, and *na miłego Boga*. So what's going on?

In fact, there is no mistake, and the forms *mąż, koń, pan brat, Bóg* are indeed in the correct accusative case. However, they are not in the current form of the accusative, but in accusative form that existed before the XVI century.

In Old Polish, the accusative and the nominative looked the same, like for nouns denoting inanimate objects nowadays (compare *pióro/pióro* with *mąż/mężа*). However, since Polish is a language where the word order is relatively free[2], this caused ambiguity in expressions like

lew atakuje człowiek,

where it is not clear whether the lion attacked the man, or the other way around. For nouns denoting animate objects, as the accusative started to assume the same form as the genitive, we can now disambiguate the two meanings above as either (by maintaining the same word order) *lew atakuje człowieka* (the lion attacked the man) or *lwa atakuje człowiek* (the man attacked the lion).

It is very typical that idiomatic expression preserve fragments of the language as it existed long ago, without keeping up with the changes that the language underwent. For example, similar remnants of archaic forms of declinations no longer in use can be found in the following idiomatic expressions:

- *dobry z kościami*—modern instrumental (narzędnik): *z kośćmi*;
- *przed laty*—modern instrumental: *latami*;
- *dobrymi słowy*—modern instrumental: *słowami*.

14 Mówię po polskiemu; na Zakopanym

In Proto-Indo-European there was no grammatical difference between nouns and adjectives. This means, that from the endings alone it was not possible to tell whether a given word would belong to the first or to the second category. In fact, in the family of Slavic languages adjectives acquired an independent declination only towards the beginning of Early Proto-Slavic. This means that at some point adjectives were declined like nouns. Do we have any trace of this phenomenon in Polish nowadays? Yes, plenty of them:

- *z daleka* "from far"—modern genitive (dopełniacz): **z dalekiego*;
- *z cicha* "softly"—modern genitive: **z cichego*;

[2]We need a word of caution here. From practical experience, it seems that word order is *more* free for native speakers than for learners of the Polish language.

- *bez mała* “almost”—modern genitive: **bez małego*;
- *do syta* “to satiety”—modern genitive: **do sytego*;
- *po polsku* “in Polish”—modern dative (celownik): **po polskiemu*;
- *po cichu* “silently”—modern dative: **po cichemu*;
- *po prostu* “simply”—modern dative: **po prostemu*;
- *po kryjomu* “covertly”—modern locative (miejscownik): **po kryjomym*;
- *w Zakopanem* “in Zakopane”—modern locative: **w Zakopanym*, but *w zakopanym grobie* “in the buried tumb”.

But we can go further, and find such traces even in adjectives themselves (i.e., not in idiomatic expressions). In Old Polish it was possible to find forms such as SPL żyw “alive” (modern *żywy*), SPL szczodr “generous” (modern *szczodry*), SPL miłościw “gracious” (modern *miłościwy*), SPL gniewien “wrathful” (modern *gniewny*), and many similar ones.

In fact, some of these archaic forms still exist today, such as *wesół/wesoły* “merry”, *zdrów/zdrowy* “healthy”, *gotów/gotowy* “ready”, *ciekaw/ciekawy* “interesting”, *pewien/pewny* “certain”, *syt/syty* “sated”, *świadom/świadomy* “conscious”, and *pełen/pełny* “full”, which alternate the archaic form -∅ with the modern one in *-y*; *rad* “glad”, *kontent* “content, satisfied”, and *wart* “worthwhile”, which do not admit modern alternate forms **rady, *kontenty, *warty*, and are thus the only possibility.

However, alternate forms such as *pewien/pewny* “certain” are not fully interchangeable: The use of the archaic version *pewien* is restricted to predicative expressions such as *jestem pewien, że...* “I’m certain that...”, *jestem ciekaw, czy...* “I’m curious whether...”, and *jestem gotów do...* “I’m ready for...”, and cannot be used as a modifier in expressions such as **pewien siebie* “sure of oneself” (correct: *pewny siebie*), **ciekaw film* “interesting film” (correct: *ciekawy film*), **gotów obiad* “ready lunch” (correct: *gotowy obiad*). The only exception to this rule seems to be *pełen/pełny* “full”, where the two forms are completely interchangeable; in particular, unlike in the previous examples, the archaic form *pełen* can be used also as a modifier, like in the expression *pełen autobus* “full bus”.

This raises the question of how adjectives such as SPL żyw “alive” which were originally declined like nouns (żyw, żywa, żywu, etc.) evolved into a morphologically distinct class with their own set of endings, such as in the modern version of the same adjective *żywy, żywego, żywemu*, etc. Actually, we can already see a hint to the answer by looking at the endings *-ego* and *-emu* for the genitive and dative case, respectively. What do we notice? They look the same as in the corresponding forms of the pronouns *jego* and *jemu*, and this is not a coincidence.

In fact, adjectives appearing in simple expressions such as

dobrъ rabъ, *dobra raba*, *dobru rabu*, ... ("good slave")

could be strengthened into the compound forms

dobrъ jь rabъ, *dobra jego raba*, *dobru jemu rabu*, ...

which are obtained by postponing the pronouns *jь, jego, jemu, ...* right after the adjective. (The compound form *dobrъ jь* was used to attach a definite character to the adjective *dobrъ*, which, when appearing alone, had an indefinite meaning[3].) The stable appearance of fixed combinations such as *dobra jego* permanently paired up the two words, and this allowed certain transformations to take place uniformly in the language, giving rise to derivations such as: *dobra jego* (Early Proto Slavic) → *dobrajego* (Late Proto Slavic) → *dobrego* (Old Polish), and similarly for *dobru jemu* → *dobrujemu* → *dobremu*[4].

15 *Onego czasu, wonczas; ki diabeł*

Demonstrative pronouns in modern Polish are *ten, ta, to* "this", *tamten, tamta, tamto* "that", and the somewhat more literary *ów, owa, owo* "that". The original set in Proto Slavic was much richer, featuring the familiar PSL *tъ, ta, to (with meaning of "close and known") and PSL *ovъ, ova ovo (with meaning of "close", but not necessarily "known"), plus three more kinds: PSL *sъ, si, se "close", PSL *jъ, ja, je "known", and PSL *onъ, ona, ono "far". The last three eventually disappeared in the evolution of the language. However, they often left some traces even to our days, more or less hidden in various corners of the language.

In the case of the defunct PSL *sъ, si, se, its presence can still be detected practically in any Polish sentence—provided one knows where to look at! For example, it still lives in common forms such as *dziś* "today" (= *dzień* + *ś* = this day), *ktoś* "somebody" (= *kto* + *ś*), and many others of this kind; and also in some more archaic examples, such as *latoś* "this year" (= *lata* + *ś*), *do siego roku* "Happy New Year", *ni to, ni sio* "neither this, nor that", and *siaki i owaki* "this and that".

Other pronouns, instead of disappearing from the language, transformed into a new use. This is the case of PSL *onъ, ona, ono, which was gradually rebranded from a demonstrative pronoun for someone/something far from the speaker, into the familiar personal pronoun *on, ona, ono* "he, she, it", which in the new use still retains a flavour of distance, indirectness. And, lo and behold!, if we dig in the language sufficiently deeply, we can still find some traces of when this pronoun was a demonstrative article, such as *onego czasu* "at that time" and *wonczas* "(the same)".

[3] This is similar to the distinction between the definite article "the" and the indefinite articles "a, an".

[4] Other cases, genders, and numbers are not always as straightforward as that, but this gives the idea.

In Proto Slavic the interrogative pronoun *kto* "who" had a competitor *ki, ka, kie* "who", whose traces can still be spotted in expressions such as *ki diabeł* "who the hell", *kie licho* "(the same)", *ki czort* "(the same)", and *po kiego diabła/licha/czorta* "what for".

As a last example, there is an hidden gem in expressions like *potomny* "descendant", *potomek* "descendant", and *przytomny* "conscious" In this case, unlike in the previous examples, instead of containing an archaic pronoun, they contain the archaic declination *tom-* of the modern *ten, ta, to*, such as in *togo, tomu* (cf. *kogo, komu* "of whom, to whom").

16 Does PL pięć come from PL pięść?

17 Developing: PL japko, PL dopsze, PL czejść