

there is a colophon of the book "*Jesus the Son*" by Nersēs Šnorhali, published in Venice 1643, Molino says:

*'Glory (to the Most High)...that you gave an ability to my humble and tortured person – an interpreter Yovhannēs Ankiwrec'i, by Europeans called Jovanni Molino (Č'iwani Mōlinō), to complete my labour of editing, [...] Again I entreat you [...] to remember a poor soul Yovhannēs Ankiwrec'i and his parents Mourad sarkavag<sup>19</sup> and P'ašamelik' and the young sons Mik'ayēl and Gabriēl.'*

The two other colophons are reprinted in Oskanyan's, Korkotyan's and Savalyan's book<sup>20</sup>. From the "*Salmosaran*", published in Venice 1642, where Molino presented himself again as:

*'the humble translator Yohannēs, called Č'iuanni Mōlinō.'*

and from "*Pataragatetr*" (*Ordo Divinae Missae armenorum*), Roma 1642. Here he uses another description of himself:

*'Me, Yohannēs Mulina, the Armenian translator have seen and read this book in Armenian and Latin'.*

'Nothing moves without translation', as someone has said. Giovanni Molino, alias Yovhannes from Ankara (Ankivrac'i/Ankurac'i) was one of the foreign intellectuals who "moved" turcology forward, writing a fundamental dictionary, reflecting the state of Turkish in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The material from Molino's Dictionary has always interested turcologists. But this question belongs to another article.

Perhaps it would be possible to find more information about his live and work. But even from the information that is accessible to us today it is possible to piece together the picture of a highly motivated and studious family man and the good son, who left behind an interesting and useful cultural legacy, belonging to two different civilisations.

I am deeply indebted to Dr Maria Pia Pedani-Fabris for her invaluable assistance and Dr Artsvi Bakhchinyan for information from Armenian sources.

<sup>19</sup> *sarkavag* – a clerical degree in the hierarchy of Armenian Church.

<sup>20</sup> Levonian..., *op.cit.*, pp. 25a, 25b

EDWARD TRYJARSKI

## ON THE IMPORTANCE OF SLAVIC ELEMENTS IN ARMENO-KIPCHAK TEXTS

It is striking enough that the Slavic elements existing in Armeno-Kipchak have so far not aroused among the Slavic scholars the interest they deserve. As far as the Slavic loanwords in this language are concerned most attention to them was given by K. H. Menges who in his review of the three parts of the *Dictionnaire arméno-kiptchak d'après trois manuscrits des collections viennoises* [Tryjarski 1968-1972] supplemented and corrected etymologies of a number of Slavic words [Menges 1972]. On another side, A. N. Garkavec did his best to analyse the influence of Slavic languages on morphology and on syntax of Armeno-Kipchak [Garkavec 1974, 1975, 1979, 1988]. Now we come back to the problem not only because a few decades have already elapsed from the publication of those studies and new texts have appeared but mainly in order to emphasize the diversity and extensiveness of the material awaiting elaboration and its Polish connotations. It is clear that some of the Slavic and foreign words existing in Armeno-Kipchak should favour a better knowledge of the Oriental elements in Polish. We will come back to this question.

It is true that there are some reasons which could restrict the interest of the Slavic scholars of the material in question. One of them is that they already have at their disposal more detailed and more precisely registered Polish and Ukrainian texts from the same epoch along with monographic studies [cf. the literature indicated by Lehr-Spławiński, Kuraszkievicz, Kurzowa]. This motive is comprehensible but the conclusion appears to be conceived *a priori*. More motivated is the

reservation saying that we are far from having a complete picture of the problem since not all existing Armeno-Kipchak texts have been edited so far. Some other doubts may arouse concerning various mixed systems of transliteration and transcription used by the editors.

It seems to be advisable that the analysis of the material in question might in some cases comprise not only the Old Polish and the Old Ukrainian levels but also the pre-Russian linguistic community.

The main point is a real difficulty in a more precise attribution of a considerable number of Slavic words which may belong to the Old Polish, the Old Ukrainian, and even to the Old Russian stock. At the same time it is often difficult, and in some cases even impossible, to know whether we have to do with a spoken dialect or a developed literary language. It is worth reminding here that the Armeno-Kipchak as a whole performed several functions: on the one hand, it served as a speech of everyday communication, and, on the other, as a written language of administrative character used in juridical acts, in religious, historical and moralistic or didactic texts.

Be as it may, after a separation of a group of words, and a small number of phrases or expressions showing clearly Old Ukrainian or Old Polish features, there remains a considerable bulk of lexemes which can not be definitely qualified as a result of the obliteration of their distinctive features and the existence of numerous variants, due to their phonetic values and partially also to some peculiarities of the Armenian orthography.

These unfavourable circumstances, observed on several occasions, were rightly characterised by K. H. Menges:

“(…) Durch die Entstehung resp. Schaffung von *κοινή*-Formen der erwähnten Art wird es in vielen Fällen vollkommen unmöglich, zu entscheiden, ob ein Wort aus dem Polnischen oder dem Ukrajinschen her stammt; diese Formen haben entweder klar und deutlich Charakteristika beider Sprachen zugleich, oder aber gar keine spezifischen, was am meisten verbreitet zu sein scheint, und können deshalb so gut als Kontaminationen angesehen oder bezeichnet werden” [Menges 1972: 305].

In other words, it is often difficult to establish are there Polish words pronounced after the Ukrainian manner, or Ukrainian words

borrowed from Polish or pronounced after the Polish manner. This is the result of a long historical process, of mutual relations existing between Ukrainian and Polish speakers. According to K. H. Menges:

“Diese eigenartige Nivellierung einiger Charakteristika des Polnischen resp. Ukrajinschen, durch welche diese Sprachen dem Gemein-Slavischen nähergebracht werden, erleichtert ohne Zweifel den Gebrauch der beiden Sprachen durch eine dritte, nichtslavische Nationalität, da sie damit Formen schafft, die weder polnisch noch ukrajinsch sind und dadurch in einem Gebiet, in welchem diese beide Sprachen gesprochen werden, von einer größeren Zahl von Menschen leichter verstanden werden” [Menges l.c.].

It may be added that Armeno-Kipchak in its written form, the only accessible to us (exceptionally we dispose of a short specimen of a conversation between two cultivated persons), is a language of literate and rather instructed Armenians in which the Slavic dialects of inhabitants of Kamenec and Lvov are reflected [cf. especially colloquial fragments contained in the court records published by Grunin, 1967]. According to A. N. Garkavec, the Armeno-Kipchak possessed a literary written variant strongly bound with the everyday speech. This language had three styles: official to produce documents, ecclesiastical and the artistic one [Garkavec 1979:13].

The linguistic material at our disposal must be estimated, even in the present state of research, as voluminous. To document the present paper we took only two groups of texts dating back to the 16th century: *Dokumenty na poloveckom jazyke XVI v.* [Grunin 1967] and *Dictionnaire arméno-kiptchak d'après trois manuscrits des collections viennoises* [Tryjarski 1968-1972]. In the first book we find more than 300 Slavic words, in the second about 1600. It is natural that in the present paper attention can be given to some problems only, while all remaining material must await a future specialistic study.

In the present paper we have applied a simplified, clearer transcription of Armeno-Kipchak, factually of Slavic words. We gave up namely the distinction between *t*<sup>c</sup> and *t*, *p*<sup>c</sup> and *p*, *k*<sup>c</sup> and *k*, *ě* and *e*, *č* and *č̣*, we write *c* (instead of *č*), *dz* (instead of *dž*), *dž* (instead of *dẓ̌*). For further research, however, original versions are recommended. It

should be remembered that the final -y, sometimes also the middle -y-, has in Armenian alphabet not a phonetic but a purely graphic value.

It is interesting to observe that a considerable part of Slavic words in Armeno-Kipchak shows phonetical features characteristic of Eastern Slavic languages. Thus, putting aside the problem of the accent, which remains unsolvable for us, and its place, which we can only guess basing on later evidence, we would like to point out the following points.

We often are able to observe the pleophony, i.e. the combinations of -oro-, -olo- and -ere- between consonants in the forms to which in other Slavic languages (for instance in Polish or in Serbo-Croatian) correspond other word combinations, for instance: *bolonka*, *boronit et-*, *koloda*, *korosta*, *nahorodit et-*, *molotit et-*, *obhorodit et-*, *perelivat et-*, *štorona/strona*. The last example shows that the full vocalism is not the absolute rule in our texts.

The loss of nasal vocals is generally observed as in: *bolačka*, *často*, *drenčicsja bol-*, *drong*, *jadra*, *kruhljy*, *menžni*, *petlica*, *podvjaška*, *rubok*, *sprent*, *stehno*, *stengvja*, *ščka*, *ščenšče*, *vdženčni*, *von-tka*, *vontroba*, *vorobyi*, *vorozka*, *žoludok*.

The simplification of the consonant combinations *tl* and *dl* does not furnish convincing examples. On the one hand we find *je-lina/jalina*, and, on the other, *iodlovij* or *šidlo/šidlo*.

The use of *č* and *ž* instead of Polish *c* and *dz* can be evidenced by a rather small number of cases: *peč*, *saža*, *sažawka*.

The combination of -or-, -ol- and -er- versus Polish -ar-, -er-, -il-, -el-, -lu- can also be observed: *čornuška*, *horlica* (cf. Pol. *synogarlica*), *korčma*, *verx*.

The passage of ancient *yers* into movable *o* and *e* is difficult to be observed since the appropriate words appear as a rule in the Nominative Case.

Among the Slavic loan-words in Armeno-Kipchak we find a number of items which are characteristic of the Eastern group of the Slavic languages, to cite: *čerepxa*, *lebed*, *naružnij*, *osenica*, *skazania*, *stakīn*, *utka* and others [For the above specification observations presented by W. Kuraszkiewicz have been used, 1954:78-82].

A considerable number of the loanwords in question show at the same time phonetical traits characteristic of the Ukrainian language and appearing in one of its dialectal forms. So we can observe the evi-

dence of the hard pronunciation of consonants before *e* and before the old *i*: *kremen*, *serp*, *tixoy* (probably pronounced *tixoy*). The extensiveness of this Ukrainian dispalatalization seems to be not too great in the texts we have selected. The same can be observed in relation to these well-known Ukrainian ikavisms: *smit et-*, *snidat*, *tisto*.

Deprived of larger contexts we are unable to observe some other phonetic traits of those Slavic elements. We will point out, however, two phenomena which concern the onset. One is a prothetic *i-* in words like *irdzja/irdzi*, *iskazat*, *isprava*, *istrona*, *isvatiy*. A similar solution is observed in: *sītirta*, *sītirčīt*.

A few cases of the metathesis (or inversion) will be observed: *gzek* (from *zgek*), *įendorożec* (from *įednorożec*), *zmīrk* (from *zmīrk*), *zohda* (from *zhoda*).

More valuable observations can be made concerning the rich vocabulary. It has partially the Eastern Slavic character and its dialectal and rare words should be noticed, for instance: *draypak* (for *drapak* ?), *hīrtanka/hatanka*, *košel*, *xrušč*, *mayarič/maxarič*, *maxaričnik*, *mīzda*, *prisačėnik/prisežnik*, *sponka*, *šlik*, *šparong*, *strižen/strežen*, *vološanka*, *žeruxa* and others.

Difficult to be solved is the problem of a real origin of those words which are considered to be the Polish loan-words in Ukrainian. The question is of such words which are by W. Kuraszkiewicz treated as Polish loanwords in Ukrainian, for instance: *barva*, *obicat*, *obicatca* etc. Should they be treated as such also in the use of polyglotic Armenians living in the Slavic entourage?

After the elimination (what is not always possible) of eastern elements we receive a pure Old Polish linguistic material of the 16<sup>th</sup> and the 17<sup>th</sup> centuries. Though subdued to eastern influence and disformed by the Armenian graphic system, it has clearly conserved its ancient features: *Bohorodica*, *čiščjēc*, *dobrodžjėystvo*, *džjedžic/dzedžic*, *gorčica*, *gvjazdozorca*, *huf*, *hetman*, *kleynot/klenot*, *mandrik*, *manna*, *mdli*, *menžobuyca*, *miłošnica*, *oleyok*, *opona/opana*, *ovečka*, *mira*, *mješkanje*, *mlinica*, *možnij*, *načinje*, *nadvornij*, *namjestnik*, *njeplodnij*, *njevod*, *padol*, *panščizna*, *piščalka*, *pjestunka*, *pobožnij/bobožnij*, *poddani/poddanij*, *podvička*, *pohodnja*, *pomazani*, *poručnik*, *pospulstvo*, *pružna xvala*, *ričer*, *rodzay*, *rosa*, *roskoš*, *stado*, *spižarnja*, *stavinozga*, *stud-*

*nja, ščep, tenča, tkač, topor, trava, troyca, ubogiy, vješček, všetečnic-tvo, zapaska, zapon, zdroy, zvičjenstvo, zmaza, žniva, život.*

The Slavic lexical elements in Armeno-Kipchak can be classified into semantic categories. Such an analysis is instructive since it shows a deep and extensive penetration of the Slavic elements in that language embracing nearly all domains of the human experience. The following semantic sections will be noticed:

#### 1) Nature. Universe

*bliskanje, dolina, hlina, hrad, iskra, jaskina, ježoro, kamen, xolod, liškanje, mhla, natura, para, pečera, požar, rika, rozpadlina, ruvnina, sažavka, skala, teplica, uhol, vapna, všpa, zatoka, zdroy, žrudlo.*

#### 2) Beasts, birds, insects, reptiles, amphibians

*bočan, buyvol, červec/čirvec/čirvec, hniđa, horlička, iž, jalovica, jas-tremb, jaščurka, jendorožec, jelen, jelenica, kavka, kobila, kopito/ kopito, koza, kret, krokodil, kruhlik, xrušč, lasica/lašica, lastuvka, lebed, mol, njeđzviadek, osa, osenica, papuga, pelikan, poklunka, puhač, rařog, saranča/sarančxa, sčurok, sEMPL/siEMP, serna, skop, skopec, sova, soyka, stado, txor, vjelorič, vorobiy, zayjec, zubr, žaba, žurav.*

#### 3) Plants

*cīnamon, cīpris/cipris/sīpris, izop, iarina, iavor, ielina/ialina, klos, kmen, kokol, kopr, konopa, lelja/lelia, len/liEN, makuvka, mīan-tka/mīatka, modrevo, polin, pomagrana, sosna, temīan, tutun, trava, verbina, vešba, žolud.*

#### 4) Rustic life: crops, implements, utensils etc.

*bidlo, cebrik, čaša/čaška, diža, draypak, hospoda, humna, izba, iarmo, kad, komora, korčma, kubok, kufa, kuxna/kuxnija, xliv, lemešč, lixtar, liškar/riskar, lopata, motika, niva, obora, orač, orat et-, parkan, plon, plot/plotca, pluh, posdel, postoronok, sala, salači, salam, selo, snor, stol, vjedra/vedra, zbože, žolob.*

#### 5) Urban life, buildings

*bazar, bugumistr/burmistr, butka, cehla/zehla, dax, ganok, gmax, iar-mark, kebit, košk, mješkan, palac, pentra, ratuš, spixlir/špixlir, ulica, ulička, vježa.*

#### 6) Man and his body

*bjodro, bilmo, bliznay, čerep, holen, jadra, kulak, macica, nirk, nozdra/nozra, pluca/pluća, prirodzenje, slina, vontroba, vzrok, zolč, žila, žoludok.*

#### 7) Diseases, infirmities, medicines

*balsam, bjegunka, horbatij, lišay, lisi/lišiy/lisoy, pleškanje, plešovati/ plešovatiy, prišč, trendovati.*

#### 8) Food and drink

*horox, kaša, krupa, oley, oliva, oprasnik/sprasnik, polivka, potrava, trunok.*

#### 9) Occupations, functionaries, human qualities

*aptikar, barvir, bayak, čoban, čarnokšonžnik, doktor, furman, gamrat, gančar, gospodar, gebernator, gvjazdozorca, haftar, hetman/yetman, kancler/kancčer, ključnik/ključnik, koval, kravec, kšonže, kuxar, xanica, lotir/lotor, malar, maršalko, milošnica, milošnik, mocar, monarxa, mular, njevolnik, njevolnica, okularči, orač, orator, pani stara, pastux, pekar, pekarka, pisar, podstarosta/posstarosti, prisežnik/prisačenik, pristav, ptašnik, rayca, ribolov, šafar, švačka, tesla, tkač, urjädnik, vorožka, voyvoda, voznica, voznij, vrutnij, zapasnik, žebak.*

#### 10) Army, weapons, commanders

*armata, helm, hetman/yetman, huf, xirbač, kopiynik, oboz, obozni, pancar, plazovat, pobudka, pocikacija, počet, poxva, prilbica, proce, ricer, ricerstvo, rota/ruta, rotmistr, rohatina, taran, tarča, topor, tovariš, tvirdza, zasacka, zbroya, žolner/žolnir.*

#### 11) Amusement, music, danse

*cīmbal, cītra, igriška, kolomijka.*

#### 12) Religion, church

*heretik, kaplica/kapnica, kropitlo, kruxt, mjetropolit, obrezanje, obrezovat, opatrnost, pokorni, pokuta, pokutovat et-, sinod, teoloyik, troyca/truyca, zakon, zakonnik.*

#### 13) Death, funeral customs

*grob, oplakovanje, pohreb, trunna, žaloba, žalobnij.*

## 14) Learning, science

*gramatika, istoria, istorik, nauka, neuk, opisanje, poeta/puveta, škol/skol, virš, viklad, vikladač, vikladat.*

## 15) Measures, weights, money

*ban, cantnar/catnar, funt, kamen, kila, korec, lot, mil, pinez, sikl/šikl*

At last we would like to stress the importance of those Armeno-Kipchak words, both of Slavic and foreign origin which simultaneously appear as loan-words in Polish, Ukrainian, Russian, also in Hungarian and Roumanian, but the origin and ways of penetration of which are not always certain. Since in last time we observe in Poland a new wave of interest of this group of words [S. Stachowski 1995, S. Kałużyński's report in 1998], the necessity of including them into the study of Oriental loan-words in Slavic languages, especially in Polish, is evident. Taking into consideration the important role played just by the Polish Armenians in the exchange of cultural goods between the Orient and Poland one cannot but be amazed that just this group of words has not been exploited so far. The question is of about 50 words which starting from A. Czartoryski and A. Muchliński on are known as Oriental loanwords in Polish language. We list main of them below:

*aya, altembas/altenbas/altınbas, bašibuzuk, bazar, bišor, boklah, bozdohan, buya, čerevik, čoban, čubuk, kamxa, karvan, kebit/kjebit, korap/kerap, košk, kuteš, xapčux, xaptirxa, xarač, xarbus, xardaš, xirbač, xuvun/xovun, moydan, muštuluk, oylan, padšah, papudž, payik, sala/salay/salla, salači, salaš, sandal, saranča/sarančxa, saray, sunduk, tabor, taystra, temian, tlumač, torba, tuman, tutun, ušax.*

## Bibliography

- Daškevič, J. R., 1979, "Armjano-kypčakskij jazyk. Bibliografija literatury 1802-1977", *RO* 40,2, 79-86.
- Grunin, T. I., 1967, *Dokumenty na poloveckom jazyke XVI v. (sudebnye akty Kamenec-Podol'skoj armjanskoj obščiny)*. Transkripcija, perevod, predislovie, vvedenie, grammatičeskij komentarij i glossarij T. I. Grunina. Pod redakciej E. V. Severtjana. Stafja J. R. Daškeviča, Moskva.

- Hensiorski, A. I., 1961, "Pirdennoruski i polški leksyčni wzajemno-zviazky w XIII st.", in: *Doslidzenia i materialy z ukrajinskoji movy*, Kijov 1961, 15-25.
- Hrabec, S., 1949, *Elementy kresowe w języku niektórych pisarzy polskich XVI i XVII w.*, Toruń.
- Kuraszkiewicz, W., 1954, "Języki wschodnio-słowiańskie", in: *Przegląd i charakterystyka języków słowiańskich*, Warszawa, 77-121.
- Kurzowa, Z., 1985, *Polszczyzna Lwowa i kresów południowo-wschodnich do 1939 roku*. Second enlarged edition, Warszawa-Kraków.
- Lehr-Splawiński, T., 1954, "Prasłowiańska wspólnota językowa", in: *Przegląd i charakterystyka języków słowiańskich*, Warszawa, 11-42.
- Lesiów, M., 1962, "O polsko-ukraińskich związkach językowych w średniowieczu", *JP* XLII, 1, 70-71.
- Stachowski, S., 1995, "Osmanisch-türkische und tatarische Lehnwörter im Polnischen und ihre Bedeutung für die türkische Wortgeschichte", in: *Laut- und Wortgeschichte der Türkischen Sprachen. Beiträge des Internationalen Symposiums*, Berlin, 7. bis 10. Juli 1992. Herausgeg. von B. Kellner und M. Stachowski, Wiesbaden, 55-171.
- Tryjarski, E., 1968-1972, *Dictionnaire arméno-kiptchak d'après trois manuscrits des collections viennoises*, t. I, fasc. 1-4 (A-Z), Warszawa.
- Urbańczyk, S., 1963, "Charakterystyka staropolskich zapożyczeń wyrazowych z języka ukraińskiego", in: *Studia linguistica in honorem Thaddei Lehr-Splawińskiego*, PWN, 437-444.