

Polish Loanwords in Armenian

(Selected Issues)



Polish Loanwords in Armenian

(Selected Issues)

Grair Magakian

Polish Loanwords in Armenian
(Selected Issues)

REFEREES

Andrzej Pisowicz

Lusine Fljyan

Patronage



Orbit

ARMENIAN EUROPEAN MAGAZINE "DAYS"
SINCE 1999 IN PRAGUE



**European
City of Science
Katowice 2024**

Table of Contents

9	Introduction
11	Historical Short Outline
15	Some linguistic features
17	The Armenian colonies and some commercial features
21	The Armenian bridge between Poland and the Levant
23	The Polish Armenian dialect
26	The research problem and some methodological details
29	The Analysis Proper
29	The most commonly used abbreviations
30	The structure of the analysis
33	Legal loanwords
82	Musical art
87	Clothes, fabrics, garments
108	Farming, agriculture
121	Household items
141	Accommodation, elements of architecture, buildings, and decorations
154	People
186	Eating, drinking
201	Animal world, nature
209	Traditions, religion
217	State and attributes of statehood
236	Uncategorized
259	Instead of Conclusions
269	References

297 ____ **Index of Personal Names**

311 ____ Streszczenie

315 ____ Summary

Introduction

The monograph *Polish Loanwords in Armenian (Selected Issues)* has been researched and written over many years, in particular due to the difficulty of identifying the words of Polish origin in the Armenian language (especially in the Arital dialect – the dialect of, among others, Polish Armenians and in modern Armenian). Of course, the process of loanword formation was the result of Armenian emigration to Poland over the centuries (starting at least from the 14th century), and a number of natural changes (or rather development) in both languages. I have to add, however, that the complexity of Armenian language also is in the fact that it occurs in two dialects – Eastern Armenian and Western Armenian.

Time and space influenced the perception of loanwords for Armenians from Poland and Armenian speakers in general. It also often happened that loanwords from Polish went to other languages, then to the above-mentioned dialect of Armenians or modern Armenian. It was also the other way around – from other languages the word found its way to Polish, and then penetrated into Armenian. Therefore, it was necessary to finally identify borrowings from Polish language in Armenian, to study their etymology, etc. It was important, however, to carry out the above analyses in (let me state) symbiosis with research on the mutual links between the (often quite different) Polish and Armenian cultures and nations. In this dimension (with particular emphasis on the etymology and “roads”/“ways” of linguistic borrowings) it was also worth taking into account both the role of Armenians in the economic and civilizational development of Poland from the perspective of the period examined in the book, as well as the role of the Republic of Poland and the Polish language in the development of Armenians themselves in Poland.

A particular problem was the Armenian alphabet, which was created as far back as 405 A.D. There is practically no possibility of complete – full-fledged, transcription of some sounds of the Armenian language in Polish or English. Although the rules of transcription adopted by me are not perfect (or final), they allow for a relatively “friendly” sounds of Armenian words into Polish and into

English. In other words, this system allows as far as possible (a clear) representation of various sounds of the Armenian language, including sounds occurring in the dialect of Polish Armenians.

With this perspective in mind, I focused on loanwords in legal terminology, musical art, clothing, textiles, agriculture, household items, architecture, food, animals, traditions, religion, attributes of statehood, etc. In total, over 220 words were analyzed (also etymologically clarified), with an explanation of their origin in terms of etymology, meanings in Armenian and Polish, and comments regarding the source of their borrowing by Armenians (Polish and not only). In the above planes, were examined the words in the following scopes: 45 legal terms, 7 – related to the art of music, 17 clothes, fabrics, garments, 13 agricultural terms or concepts, 21 names of household items, 13 related to housing, architecture, buildings, and decorations, 29 related to people, 18 related to nutrition, 10 concerning the world of animals and nature, 7 concerning the traditions, religion, 17 related to the attributes of statehood, 25 mixed, which could not be categorized.

Until the publication of the monograph, comprehensive analyses in the above areas were lacking, which often resulted in erroneous conclusions drawn in existing studies, which simply do not allow for accurate determination of the source of loanwords. The current book tries to eliminate these errors, or rather shortcomings, and, among others, explains the proper genesis and etymology of Polish borrowings in the Armenian language.

I would like to add that the monograph can be a source intended both for philologists – Polish philologists, Armenologists, Turkologists, etc., as well as for a wide range of people interested in linguistics. It is worth noting, however, that most of the above-mentioned vocabulary still requires further analysis and research, especially the cognitive ones – for example, the evolution of differences and similarities in the mentality of Armenians and Poles from the Middle Ages to even the present day, the influence of globalization on the perception of loanwords meanings or common words, etc.

Historical Short Outline

Although the issue of Armenians' residence in Poland is not the focus of this study, it is worth briefly describing where they came from and what role they played in the economic and civilizational development of Poland. The literature on the subject, especially from the interwar period of 1920–1939 (but not only), abounds in scientific and popular-scientific research about the Armenians and their place in Poland.

The first known reports about Armenians in Poland date back probably to 1183. Some sources talk about a wooden church in Lviv built exactly in 1183 (Morgan 1919, 292; Mańkowski 1959, 35). Tadeusz Mańkowski points out that Father Krzysztof Faruchowicz¹ (cf. also Rydzkowska-Kozak 2013, 23) emphasizes that in 1183 a wooden Armenian church existed in Lviv, which functioned for 180 years, that is, until the construction of a stone church was completed in 1363 (Mańkowski 1934, 77–78; Zachariasiewicz 1842, 78–79). This fact and this date raise doubts in some researchers, especially since Lviv as a city did not exist in 1183 (cf. Stopka 2010b, 115–131). It is known that Lviv was founded by Galicia-Volynian prince Danil Romanovich in about 1250 or 1256 and named Lviv (Rey 1988, 1107; Subtelny 2009, 62) after his son, Lev. Mańkowski emphasizes, in particular, the position of A. Petruszewicz, who claims that the most probable date was 1283 (cf. Петрушевич 1853, 3–17; Mańkowski 1934, 78; Mańkowski 1932, 1–11). Interestingly, T. Mańkowski disagrees with this point of view, suggesting that the settlement where Armenians could have built their church before the founding of Lviv might exist – it may even refer to the ancient Slavic Zvinograd settlement located in the present Lviv area (Papée 1894, 11–12). The scholar bases his point, among others, on the eventual fact that, in the yard of the Armenian church, formerly the courtyard of the Archbishop's Palace, a stone with an inscription from 1264 was found in a well near St. Christopher's column (Mańkowski 1934, 78). But the problem is that, unfortunately, the loca-

¹ In 1756 he made a thorough inventory of the Armenian church in Lviv.

tion of that stone is not now known. It appears to have gone missing (if it ever existed at all).

In this case, another testimony to its existence is of exceptional value. The problem of the “lost stone” as a fact is shown by Isaac V. Srapean which is probably the only accurate content of Father Krzysztof Faruchowicz’s protocol. He notes that, in the past, at the pillar of Saint Christopher there was a curative water source² that had collapsed and the stones were used for building the bell tower, where, on the corner stone, one could read that the Armenians built it during the kingship of Casimir (Kazimierz) in 1264 (Սրապեան 1903, 301–302). On the year in question, 1264, and the so-called lost stone, it is also worth citing Edward Tryjarski and Yaaroslav Dashkevych. They emphasize that when speaking about the date and the stone, Minas Bzhshkean gives the date in literal Armenian notation (according to the Armenian calendar) as ՉԺԳ [tʃʰʒg]³ (= 1264) (Բժշկեանց 1830, 99). And here comes the possibility of misreading the manuscript: because the inscription is damaged (as Bzhshkean himself mentions), he could have made a mistake and read ՉԺԳ [tʃʰʒg] instead of ՊԺԳ [pʒg] (= 1364/1365) (Дашкевич and Триярский 1973, 125–126).

Moreover, Հանդես Ամսօրեայ⁴ (Monthly Review) (Սրապեան 1903, 302–303), as well as Sukias Eprikean (Էփրիկեան 1903, 94) and Minas Bzhshkean (Բժշկեանց 1830, 104) note that, according to the above-mentioned church memorial, the Episcopal Residence Church of Armenians in Lviv⁵ was built with wood in AD 1183, and with stone in 1363.

However, for the year 1183, as the confirmation of Mańkowski’s version and the Armenian sources, there is another fact. In 1992, archaeological excavations revealed that Lviv has an older history and that the city has been inhabited continuously since the end of the 5th century (Hrytsak 2000, 47–48).

Moreover, it is not known how trustworthy the source is, but we can read in Sukias Eprikean’s *Illustrated Natural Dictionary* about gravestones from 1160

² In Armenian լուսաղբիւր [lusəbʲur], the author probably meant ‘well’ or ‘fountain’.

³ The Armenian alphabet transcription table is on page 25.

⁴ An academic journal that publishes research papers and articles on Armenian studies, especially history, art, social sciences, linguistics, and philology. It was established in 1887 by the Mkhitarian order in Vienna.

⁵ Իլովա [ilova], which means Լվով [Lvov] (cf. Սրապեան 1903, 301).

(Էփրիկեան 1903, 93).⁶ Indeed, there is also some information, although not entirely credible, about the Armenian traces in Ruthenia (Rus’)⁷ (later Polish territories) in 1062: namely, it mentions some so-called privileges presumably received from Prince Theodore Dmitrovich. This information does not appear to be accurate as we cannot find any definitive confirmation besides Zachariasiewicz (1842, 9–12) in any historically complete source.

Franciszek Zachariasiewicz claims to have even seen that document – the privileges of T. Dmitrovich – in the original Russian language, as well as the Latin translation. The document, however, was lost after Archbishop Szymonowicz’s death (Zachariasiewicz 1842, 10–11) and the author remembers only a portion of the text in which the Prince says *Prejdili na moju ruku dam vam wilnost na try lita* (Zachariasiewicz 1842, 10), which can be translated into the following in Russian: *прейдили на мою руку дам вам вилност на три лита* (Hambarcumian 1994, 3) – ‘come to me and I will give you freedom for three years’.

Oleg Leszczak gives some interesting arguments for the imprecision of the above text. He, in particular, questions the possibility of using a number of terms in a supposedly 11th-century text (in the form in which the oral message has reached us). According to him:

- *Преїдили*: the letter *ї* is a very late “invention”. Instead, *e* in the 11th century should be a *jat*’ Ъ] (it is an old-Slavic letter);
- *на мою*: the same is true for the letter *ю* in the endings. In the 11th century, it was still often confused with *jus*. The conversion of the majority of uses of *jus* [Ж, ж] to *ю* took place only in the 12th century;
- *руку*: in the 11th century they would not write the letter *у* (in this function it was used later). At that time they wrote *оу* (capital *jus* [Ж, ж];
- *дам*: here *jer* [ъ] should be at the end until the 12th century, but even later *jer* [ъ] appeared sporadically for many centuries;
- *вилност*: *и* instead of *о* is a Ukrainian feature, created after the 12th century (or even later after the collapse (disappearance) of the *jers* [Ъ, Б etc.]). Till the end of the 12th century, it would still have been written *вольностъ*. There is

⁶ Moreover, according to the priest Zohrab, in Lviv there were also Armenian headstones from 1130, 1183, 1184, 1200 and 1245, but there is no confirmation of this data in any other sources (Zachariasiewicz 1842, 78).

⁷ For more see: P. R. Magocsi, *A History of Ukraine: The Land and Its Peoples*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Buffalo, London, 2010; А. Назаренко, *Древняя Русь на международных путях*, изд. Языки русской культуры, Москва, 2001 etc.

no such word in Srezniewski's dictionary and Leszczak suspects that this is a kind of similarity to the Polish word *wolność* (freedom). In Rus' (Ruthenia), it would rather be *волю, вольное* or *вольство*;

- *на три*: in the 11th century this phrase was not in use;
- *лута*: until the 13th–14th centuries, even in Old Ukrainian (or rather Ruthenian) texts, this word was still being written with *jat* [Ѣ]; *u* instead of *jat* is a later Ukrainian feature (13th–14th centuries), etc.⁸

However, we cannot rule out that the text was translated into relatively modern Russian much later than it was originally written. This does not mean that it could not have been created in Old Russian and only in later times written in the above-mentioned version but there is no evidence for it.

This problem is rather complex and requires further and more thorough research (cf. Փոքրէլյան 1959, 232–246; Համբարձումյան 1984, 145–153; Միքայէլյան 1986, 51–74; Hambarcumian 1994, 2–5). Krzysztof Stopka considers this (alleged?) fact simply a myth and the existence of the above-mentioned document (the privileges) to be a counterfeit because the goal of the rich Armenian community was to achieve prestige in the eyes of other residents of the city of Lviv (Stopka 2010b, 115–116). Nevertheless, the year 1183 is not without significance for the history of the beginnings of the Lviv estate, especially in connection with the Armenian Evangelium, which was moved at that time from Armenia to Lviv in 1198 (Piotrowski 1925, 7–8).

The emigration of Armenians to Poland intensified especially after the Mongol invasion and the earthquake that destroyed the historical capital of Ani in 1319 (cf. “Archaeological Site...”), which was a scholarly and cultural center at that time. This emigration contributed to the creation of a large and strong Armenian diaspora in eastern Poland, namely in Lviv. “In the mid-fourteenth century, that is, when Lviv was in the Polish state during the reign of Casimir the Great (1349), the Armenian archbishop Hovannes (Jan) was already residing there, to whom Armenians in Lutsk and Kyiv were subject” (Machul-Telus 2008, 4).

⁸ Private correspondence with Professor Oleg Leszczak from 5.02.2019; cf. Magakian (2019a, 32).

Some linguistic features

Due to the different waves of Armenian emigration to Poland (or to contemporary Ukraine), it is necessary to also discuss the unique importance of the Kipchak language – the Turkic language of Polish Armenians.

It is highly probable that after the Sultan of the Seljuk Empire, Alp Arslan, conquered and destroyed Ani⁹ in 1064 (once a fortified town in Northeast Anatolia) (Մանսնդյան 1952, 59, 62, 63; Alp Arslān...; cf. İpek 2009, 371–380), large groups of Armenians emigrated from all over Armenia to Cappadocia, Cilicia, Asia Minor, the Black Sea Basin (including Crimea) etc. (cf. Kutalmış 2004, 35–42; Մանսնդյան 1952, 62–63): “During and after that, there were many Armenian migrations in important numbers, not only from the Ani area but also from the East Black Sea vicinities. The fact that Armenians gave importance to trade and arts, the idea of attaining a better life, and the big earthquakes in the regions where they lived, especially at Ani and around, were all reasons for their northward migration to Crimea and north of the Black Sea” (Kutalmış 2004, 37). By the 13th–14th century, Armenians represented such a large percentage of the Crimean population that the peninsula came to be known as *Armenia Maritima* or *Armenia Magna* (Nicholson 2018, 1: 32, 148, 1136; Ptolemy 1525, 188; Evans 2018, 88; Voss 2007, 11–12; Stopka 2016, 291, etc.). As Aleksandr Harkavets (Russian: Гаркавец; Ukrainian: Гаркавець) underlines, many Armenians, having been forced to leave Armenia, lived for a long time near the Kipchaks in Crimea and Bessarabia and learned (even absorbed) their language. Even earlier, in Armenia, the Armenians also closely communicated with the Kipchaks who had settled there under David the Builder.¹⁰ These Kipchaks, who played an important

⁹ “Anni, or Ani, the ancient Abnicum, a ruined city of Turkey in Asia, in Armenia, situated about 25 miles E.S.E. of Kars, in a rocky ravine, past which the Arpa-Chai, a tributary of the Aras or Araxes, flows. The private houses of Anni are now little more than heaps of loose stones, but in the ruins of the public buildings there is still ample evidence of the former size and greatness of the city. Several churches, mosques, and a building which was probably the palace, as well as the massive walls of the city, are the most perfect and conspicuous remains at Anni, and exhibit many points of great architectural beauty. Anni was the capital of the Pakradian or Bagratian dynasty of Armenian kings, and under their rule reached the height of its greatness. Alp Arslan captured it in 1064, and handed it over to a tribe of Kurds, from whom it was taken by the Georgians. In 1319 an earthquake completed the misfortunes of the city, reducing it to the state in which it now exists” (*Encyclopædia Britannica* 1875, 72).

¹⁰ David the Builder was David IV, from the Bagrationi dynasty, the king of Georgia from 1089 until his death in 1125.

role in the state that protected them, adopted local Christianity and a settled lifestyle but retained the Kipchak language. For centuries it was the mother tongue of the newly formed mixed ethnic language community (Гаркавец 2017, 1: 53). Today, it is hard to say who from that community has Armenian and who has Turkish origins.

The so-called Armenian-Kipchaks settled down in the Kamianets-Podilskyi¹¹ and Lviv region of modern Ukraine, with the Ottoman conquest of Caffa during the last quarter of the 15th century. Armeno-Kipchak, which had been used as the spoken and religious language until the 16th century, reached such a level that it could inherit (and develop – G.M.) an important written heritage between the 16th and 17th centuries (Eker 2009, 535; cf. Stachowski 2010, 213–227; Król-Mazur 2016b, 15–64; Çengel 2013, 32).

As A. Krimskiy emphasizes, Turkic-speaking Armenian colonies in the Galicia-Podolsk of contemporary Ukraine first appeared, probably, back in the Mongol era during the Golden Horde, somehow around the 14th century. The author explains that they were later joined by a colonization stream at the end of the 15th century when Ottoman Turks captured the city of Kaffa (now Feodosia) in Crimea (1475): the local Armenians left Kaffa in masses and moved to their coreligionists in the modern Ukrainian Podolia (center – Kamianets) and Galicia (center – Lviv). A. Krimskiy is convinced what language they spoke, which is noteworthy to us, by their numerous documents from the 16th and 17th centuries, which are written in the Turkic (Kipchak) language, but using Armenian letters: this literature is mainly the protocols of the Armenian court, but also we can find religious scriptures, chronicles, etc. As many as 32 books of the Kamianets-Podilskyi Armenian Court have been preserved since the 16th century (Кримський 1930, 157–196). The literature on the subject also states that the Armenian-Kipchak language was the Turkic language used by the community of Polish Armenians inhabiting the lands of Rus' (Ruthenia) Halicka since the 11th century, which, as we know, had been within the borders of the Republic of Poland since the mid-14th century, and it was written using the Armenian alphabet (cf. Stachowski 2010, 213–227; Król-Mazur 2016b, 15–64). “One of the most important factors in the history of Kipchak-speaking communities is that a printing company that published books in Kipchak at the turn of 17th century

¹¹ In the period of the Second Republic of Poland, the name of the Polish city was Kamianets-Podilskyi.

in Lviv continued its publications for a few years. The founder of the publishing house was Yovannes Karmadanets” (Çengel 2013, 29–43).

However, under the influence of new waves of Armenian emigrants already speaking Armenian as their mother tongue, among other factors, Kipchak disappeared in the 17th century (cf. Pisowicz 1999, 25; 2016, 269).

The Armenian colonies and some commercial features

The date of the formation of the organized Armenian colony in the above-mentioned regions of the former Polish Republic can be determined with relative precision – the building of Armenian cathedral in Lviv, which was completed in 1363 (Schneider 1871, 98). In 1364 – the head of the Armenian Church in Cilicia (see details in Ghazarian 2015) – Catholicos Mesrop I Artazeci (Օրսւսնիտսւն 1910, 13–14), created by a special ecclesiastical decision (orig. *kondak*) there an archbishopric, of course of the Armenian rite (Mańkowski 1959, 35; Sargsyan 2018, 174–178).

Outside Lviv, where according to Mańkowski there were three other medieval Armenian churches apart from the cathedral, more numerous Armenian colonies and Armenian churches within the borders of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth existed in Kamianets-Podilskyi and Yazlovets and later on also in Brody, Zamość, and Stanisławów not to mention the clusters of Armenians in other borderland cities (Mańkowski 1959, 35). So it was logical that Armenian archbishops sat in Lviv for half a year, and for the remaining half in Kamianets-Podilskyi, where they also had their residence (Այլսլսլսւն 2002, 720).

Despite their strong roots in Poland, the Armenians did not break ties with their homeland, which was under Turkish and Persian control. What is more, knowledge of Turkey and Persia predestined Armenians to act as an intermediary between the broadly understood Orient and Poland. Armenians’ knowledge of the rather peculiar (to Europeans) reality of the East and their travels even from Danzig (Gdańsk) and Lviv to Turkey and Persia was an important factor, among others, in international trade (cf. Mańkowski 1935, 12–13).

The effects of this did not have to wait long to be seen. “Already in the fourteenth century, Armenians monopolized the position of urban translators of oriental languages in Lviv, whose task was – in addition to providing translation

services – collecting customs and fees from foreign merchants, providing eastern rugs to decorate the town hall, capturing spies and agents, and presenting a list of all eastern merchants arriving and leaving the city to the mayor. Armenians played a similar role in the Crown Chancellery. It was customary that the king chose from wealthier Armenian Lviv merchants one who stood out for his cunning and agility and was familiar with the intrigues of both eastern capitals – Sultan and Khan. He had the title of ‘royal Turkish translator’ and was sent to Turkey as part of the legations of the nobility and magnates” (Stopka 2000, 54). Moreover, we must remember that huge areas of the Ottoman Empire were inhabited by Arabs. Armenians’ knowledge of Arabic was due to the fact that, until 1928 in Turkey, to put it simply, a modified Arabic (or Arab-Persian) alphabet was in force (Martin 2004, 60, 89; Özçelik). Thus, anyone who had even an initial education had to know at least (albeit distorted) the Arabic alphabet (modified). Although the official language of communication in the Empire was Turkish (contacts throughout the Empire had to be made only in this language), most of its inhabitants in the Arabic provinces did not know Turkish (Martin 2004, 60). The conclusion is rather obvious – Armenians, trading throughout the Ottoman Empire, had to know (at least basic) Arabic, so they even indirectly (maybe involuntarily?) introduced Arabic elements (better said: elements of Arabic culture) to Poland.

Armenians, who reached the territory of the Polish state, were very well organized and even had their laws, based on the first in Armenia collection of legal codes of Mkhitar Gosh from 1184, called *Datastanagirk*’ (cf. The Lawcode (*Datastanagirk*’) ... 2000; Mychitar Gosz). That resulted in the privilege of being adjudicated according to their own law, granted to them by Casimir the Great in the founding document of Lviv from 1356 (*Statut ormiański*).¹² This made them not only an ethnic group but also a state one (cf. Jurszo 2015). In addition, Armenians in Poland also had several other royal privileges granted by Polish rulers: Sigismund III in 1600, Vladislaus IV in 1641, John II Casimir Vasa in 1651, etc. Privileges were confirmed many times by other kings in 1604, 1647, 1658, 1676, 1677, and 1669, as well as in the parliamentary constitutions¹³ of 1649 and 1658 (Mańkowski 1935, 12–13). We are talking here about such important

¹² Later, this decision was approved and modified by regent Elżbieta Łokietkówna in 1379, Ludwik Węgierski in 1380, Jadwiga in 1387, Władysław Jagiełło in 1415, Kazimierz Jagiellończyk in 1461 (cf. *Statut ormiański*).

¹³ In Old Poland, the law passed by the Sejm was called a constitution (Sobol 1995, 588).

economic factors as exemption from customs duties, trade in fabrics from the East, the right of storage,¹⁴ etc. They traded in expensive fabrics, exquisite belts, unique carpets, weapons, and everything else. Polish nobility assumed the style of dress of the Armenians (cf. Jurszo 2015). However, the Armenian craftsmen often produced the same Eastern goods themselves but much cheaper and not only for the wealthy.

Also Armenian spiritual life was a sign of their independence and autonomy. In 1549, Father Andrzej Lubelczyk even paid special attention to the unsurpassed musical uniqueness of the Armenian liturgy and issued a dissertation on this subject (Kościów 2011, 23; see more: Lubelczyk 1544).

It is therefore impossible to deny that the numerous Armenian settlements in Poland were significantly influenced by, among others, the favor of Polish officials, the granting of numerous privileges, and the evidently higher level of civilizational development of the Polish state in relation to the Middle East, where Armenians spent a lot of time. An equally important determinant of Armenians concentration in the Polish Kingdom was the economic prosperity of cities in south-eastern areas of the country (Nieczuja-Ostrowski 2012, 15). “[S]ince the 16th century, the campaign waged by great landowners played an increasingly important role in the migration process [of Armenians – G.M.]. Polish magnates brought Armenians to their private cities to boost their economic situation and stabilize depopulated border regions. Armenians not only came from the East but also moved between existing urban centers in the country” (Stopka 2010b, 118). The opinion of E. Nadel-Golobič that the Armenians played the most important role in trade with the Orient and their treatment as a special topic chosen from the history of Lviv’s other trade minorities, whose role in oriental direction was (much) smaller (Nadel-Golobič 1979, 345–388), are therefore justified.

The waves of immigration continued for the next several hundred years and were driven by various factors so they did not resemble a chaotic flight or hasty and unorganized immigration. It is difficult to compare it in any way with modern immigration or so-called migration. No matter how disorderly the outflow of Armenians from devastated Armenia or other countries was, it had a pattern: as several Polish sources point out, the Armenian immigrants displayed all the features of a peaceful “colonization”. In the words of O. Balzer, “Armenians moved to Ruthenia and Poland not as homeless exiles seeking refuge and alms, but as

¹⁴ Medieval privilege, obliging merchants transporting the goods to put them up for sale in cities with this privilege (see: Prawo składu).

business colonizers perhaps invited, or at least welcomed, by local authorities” (Theodorowicz 1927, 13; cf. Rolle 1878, 19). It is, therefore, no coincidence that by the Middle Ages and Baroque Era, the Armenians in Poland were already known as exceptionally valuable people who had a huge impact on the country’s economic and even political and social development (Nieczuja-Ostrowski 2011, 133 etc.). Particularly in Polish Lviv, using their own language (Pisowicz 2000a, 135–142), having their own court (cf. Balzer 1909), endowed with many royal privileges (cf. Gromnicki 1889), clever and businesslike (cf. Pełczyński 2020) they created a distinct (rather Armenian) branch of the Orient within the middle class, keeping almost all of its trade with Poland in their hands (Czołowski 1932, 131). As early as the 16th century, Armenian merchants reached Poznań, that is, the western outskirts of Poland and even obtained Poznań (Wielkopolska province) citizenship, which was not so easy and resulted in many privileges (Hejnowicz 1933, 11–13; Hejnowicz 1990, 200–201; cf. Nawrot 2015) such as the organization of fairs (Bartoszewicz 2008, 121–136).

It can be boldly stated that in those days almost all of the Orient was under the monopoly of the Armenians, with many socio-economic consequences – social status, wealth, scope, influence, progress, noble titles, positions, etc. (cf. Mańkowski 1934b; Mańkowski 1935; Nieczuja-Ostrowski 2011; Łotocki 2005; Marciniak 2005 etc.). These facts confirm the assumption that the so-called oriental style “messengers” were the Polish Armenians, thanks to whom Polish aristocracy began to wear not only oriental clothing but also relish oriental dishes, carry weapons of the Levant, etc. (cf. Kroll 2013).

After the turmoil following the partitions of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth (from the year 1772 onwards), the post-partition order had an adverse effect on the location of Armenian settlements in Poland. Eastern trade collapsed; privileges and autonomy were abolished. During this period, some Armenians emigrated from Poland. They headed deep into Russia and the Russian-dominated areas of the Caucasus and Armenia, as well as to France, the USA, Great Britain, and other countries (Nieczuja-Ostrowski 2011, 75–91). However, it was in 1939, that the USSR annexed Lviv and the surrounding areas, which sealed the fate of Armenians from eastern Poland. Armenian centers eventually ceased to exist.

The Armenian bridge between Poland and the Levant

A separate issue is the justification of the position of Armenians between the East (broadly understood Orient) and Poland. This is an important issue, because “by the end of the fifteenth century, Eastern goods, before reaching Europe, passed through the hands of many agents. Eastern trade was a relay race for many convoys and caravans” (Kaczyńska and Piesowicz 1977, 84). This situation was somewhat conditioned not only by Armenian merchants but also determined by their organizational skills. In particular, it was a matter of the escort of commercial caravans in the Orient (cf. Rolle 1878). The problem was that “Armenian trade required a developed organization. Big capitals were needed to operate risky and distant routes, which were formed by creating trading groups with the participation as well of non-Armenian credit” (Stopka 2017a, 9). At that time, the mentioned trading groups, basically “merchant companies were [...] a combination of people, not capital. Mostly they were of ad-hoc nature, they were made for a joint expedition [...]. There was still no specialization among traders by industry; the average merchant traded all goods circulating within the geographical scope of his business” (Kaczyńska and Piesowicz 1977, 50). “[T]he trading companies of Polish Armenians had their proxies in various European and Asian countries. Armenian caravans, headed by an elected leader [the so-called *carvanbasha*, obviously from Turkish *karavan başı*¹⁵ – G.M.] set off east from Kamianets-Podilskyi. Along the way, many complicated safety procedures were followed (e.g., marking cars with white covers, no access for strangers). The import orientation of these trips required the transport of large amounts of money. They were hidden in barrels under a layer of iron axes” (Stopka 2017a, 9). As Marian Małowist emphasizes, despite the above-mentioned fact that the merchants travelled in caravans, often very numerous, and even additionally defended by armed escorts, this still did not always protect them against attacks by highwaymen (robbers) or, worse, harassment by officials. The author rightly concludes that such a huge risk left the prices unaffected, though, despite all these difficulties, the 16th century was a successful period for Polish-Turkish trade, and the outflow of money to the south-east, according to him, did not cause a serious financial crisis, which remained at a quite constant level until the second decade of the 16th century (Małowist 1993, 132). It is worth adding, however,

¹⁵ Cf. Łoziński (1902, 271).

that “exports played a smaller role in Armenian trade, especially after the 15th century” (Stopka 2017a, 9).

However, as an exceptionally interesting phenomenon, I will come back to the case of the role of *carvanbashas* more broadly, because, apart from natural obstacles (impassable roads, weather conditions, etc.), as it has already been emphasized, “untamed tribes and robbers looted the caravans” constantly (Kaczyńska and Piesowicz 1977, 68). Władysław Łoziński emphasizes that an Armenian was always the major of the caravan, he had the title of caravanbas¹⁶ and as long as he traveled through countries under the Crescent rule, he had almost discretionary power over the whole expedition as if the captain of a ship on the high seas (Łoziński 1902, 271). The author adds that caravanbas’ rights even had legitimacy in Turkish-Polish agreements – it was not only about passively escorting (given the quantity and quality of goods in an almost literal sense) the treasures. It was an extremely difficult duty because it was primarily about responsibility for the safety of goods and people. In addition, it could also be considered (as claimed by Łoziński, based on *Inducta Judicii Civilis*, XVI: 234) that the caravanbas exercised so-called extraterritorial rights and even in the case that “any conflict hit the camp, damage or brawl or bloody matter, then no office [...] is to hang on or go in, only the carvanbasha, the senior in the camp, was to arrange and reconcile it” (Łoziński 1902, 271).

Why did Armenians have that position? The determinants were the knowledge of the traditions and customs of the above-mentioned countries and also the language skills: the Armenians spoke the needed languages as the natives or, at least, near-natives (at least Polish, Turkish, Persian, Arabic, sometimes *lingua franca*,¹⁷ etc.). In 1677, John Fryer, a surgeon of the East India Company, even noted after traveling to Isfahan (which is still a large center of the Armenian diaspora) that the Armenians were addicted to learning foreign languages (Frye 1698, 269).

¹⁶ Łoziński is concerned in particular with *karavan-başı* (Turk.) which means ‘commander, chief, chief of the caravan’.

¹⁷ *Lingua franca*, in Italian, literally, the *Frankish language*, derived mainly from French, Italian, Greek, Spanish and Arabic, was a mixed language (rather of the pidgin type) that was used in the Mediterranean. G. Leibniz even describes that in Paris he conversed with an Armenian Dominican who spoke in a peculiar (rather self-developed) *lingua franca* based on Latin (see more: Leibniz 1921, 227; Leibniz 1996, 279; Couturat 1901, 59).

The Polish Armenian dialect

In addition to the *judicial* language (among others) of the Armenian Court of Kamianets-Podilskyi, we also have the dialect of the Armenians from Kutu¹⁸ – the most extensively documented and most familiar to researchers.¹⁹

Armenian,²⁰ a language from the family of Indo-European languages, belongs to the satem group (Meier-Brugger 2003, 130, 131, 132, etc.; Kapović 2017, 21, 28); however, it is an independent branch in it. “The Armenian language has been spoken in Europe outside of Armenia for at least 1500 years, that is, since the Armenian diaspora was first established in the South East of the continent” (“The Armenian language”).

Armenian is widely used in the territories of historical Armenia and by the Armenian diaspora (in France, Spain, Hungary, Italy, Switzerland, Greece, Belgium, Poland, Romania, Germany, Bulgaria, Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Palestine, Israel, Egypt, Russian, Georgia, Ukraine, Belarus, USA, Canada, Uruguay, Argentina, Brazil, Australia, etc.). The precise number of Armenian speakers is not known – it probably amounts to 7–9 million and, according to various sources, the entire Armenian population is between 10 and 12 million (cf. Armenian population ...).

Currently, there are two Armenian literary language standards (Dum-Tragut 2009, 1; Plungian 2019, 233–246) and almost 50–60 non-literary dialects

¹⁸ As I have already mentioned, it is a formerly Polish and present-day Ukrainian town. After the final constitution of the Armenian colony in Kutu in the 18th century, the town became one of the largest centers of this population. There used to be so many Armenians living there that the town was called the Armenian Republic of Poland. Every year in June, famous Armenian indulgences took place, attracting Armenians from Poland, Bukovina, Moldova, and Armenia. During the 1939 Polish Defensive War against Germans and Soviets attacking on two fronts, “[...] President Mościcki [...] and most of the important [Polish – G.M.] Government officials crossed the bridge at Kutu into Romania (September 17–18) [...]” (Couch 1970, 57; cf. Szarwiło 2012; Janiszewska-Jakubiak 2018; Sulimierski et al. 1884, 5: 6).

¹⁹ In the summer of 1885, Jan Hanusz went from Vienna, where he lived and worked, to Kutu to examine the Armenian language *in situ*. There he lived with an Armenian family and had the opportunity to hear the dialect for a few weeks from both old and young, and even from children, while the locals willingly helped him, sharing the so-called living material – their native language (cf. Magakian 2019, 13–26).

Jan Hanusz was born in 1858 in Kołodziejówka [kolodziejuvka], died in 1887 in Paris, Polish linguist, distinguished for his study of Indo-European languages.

²⁰ In Armenian – *huyłqłkū* [hajeren] (classical: *huyłqłtū* [hajeren], reformed: *huyłqłkū* [hajeren]).

(Մկրտչյան 2015, 17). The latter standards differ in the pronunciation of some sounds, as well as in verb conjugation and grammatical tenses (cf. Ավետիսյան 2007). Their names come from the place of their formation. Thus, East-Armenian is used in the Armenian Highlands at the foot of Mount Ararat and the modern Republic of Armenia (as well as in Iran), but West-Armenian was used before the Armenian genocide in Turkey in 1915–1921 in Anatolia and is currently only used by Armenians from the diaspora.

The Armenian language, according to the vast majority of linguistic studies, is considered to be an Indo-European language, which is marked by the strong influence of other languages in the region, including Aramaic and Middle Persian. Armenian in its early stage is called a proto-Armenian language, which separated in ancient times from the main trunk of Indo-European languages tree along with several other languages belonging to the Paleo-Balkan languages. In 1875, the German linguist Heinrich Hübschmann published *Ueber die Stellung des Armenischen im Kreise der indogermanischen Sprachen*, in which he showed that the Armenian language is a separate branch among the Indo-European languages, and similarities with the Persian language and other ancient languages are only the borrowings (cf. Անանյան 1940; Անանյան 1951; Անանյան 1953; Անանյան 1984; Гамкрелидзе and Иванов 1984, т. 1, 2; Diakonoff 1985, 597–603; Gray and Atkinson 2003, 435–439; Martirosyan 2013, 85–137; Martirosyan 2014; Մրաջյան et al. 2017; Martirosyan 2020).

The individual Armenian alphabet was introduced by Mesrop Mashtots²¹ and Sahak Partev²² in 405 CE.

For the needs of this book, and my other publications, I adopted the Armenian alphabet's transliteration and transcription into English according to the *Armenian Alphabet* from the portal mylanguages.org (Armenian Alphabet; cf. Magakian 2021, 223–224; Magakian 2022, 120–121, etc). The transcription reflects Eastern Armenian pronunciation.

²¹ Mesrop Mashtots was an early medieval Armenian linguist, composer, theologian, and statesman.

²² Sahak Partev was the catholicos of the Armenian Apostolic Church.

Table 1. Armenian alphabet transcription

Armenian alphabet	Transcription	Approximate sound in English (or other language)
Ա ա	a	like the <i>a</i> in <i>father</i>
Բ բ	b	like the <i>b</i> in <i>boat</i>
Գ գ	g	like the <i>g</i> in <i>goat</i>
Դ դ	d	like the <i>d</i> in <i>dog</i>
Ե ե	(j)e	like the <i>ye</i> in <i>yet</i> (at the beginning of words) or <i>e</i> in <i>bet</i> (in the middle or at the end of words)
Զ զ	z	like the <i>z</i> in <i>zebra</i>
Է է	ε	like the <i>e</i> in <i>end</i>
Ը ը	ə	like schwa in unstressed English syllables
Թ թ	t ^h	like the <i>t</i> in <i>tomorrow</i>
Ճ ճ	ʒ	like the <i>s</i> in <i>measure</i>
Ի ի	i	like the <i>ee</i> in <i>meet</i>
Լ լ	l	like the <i>l</i> in <i>lily</i>
Խ խ	χ	like guttural <i>ch</i> in German <i>Bach</i>
Ծ ծ	ts	like the <i>tz</i> in <i>Mitzi</i> (glottalized)
Կ կ	k	like the <i>ck</i> in <i>Micky</i> (intensive)
Հ հ	h	like the <i>h</i> in <i>hello</i>
Ձ ձ	dz	like the <i>ds</i> in <i>kids</i>
Ղ ղ	ʁ	like a guttural French <i>r</i>
Շ Շ	tʃ	like a hard, clipped <i>ch</i> (glottalized)
Մ մ	m	like the <i>m</i> in <i>mom</i>
Յ Յ	j	like the <i>y</i> in <i>year</i> or <i>y</i> in <i>buy</i>
Ն ն	n	like the <i>n</i> in <i>number</i>
Շ Շ	ʃ	like the <i>sh</i> in <i>shower</i>
Ո ո	(v)o	like the <i>vo</i> in <i>vocal</i> (beginning) or <i>o</i> in <i>low</i> (within a word)
Չ չ	tʃ ^h	like the <i>ch</i> in <i>church</i>
Պ պ	p	like the <i>p</i> in <i>pizza</i> (intensive)
Ջ Ջ	dʒ	like the <i>j</i> in <i>jeans</i>
Ռ ռ	r	like the rolled Spanish <i>r</i>
Ս ս	s	like the <i>s</i> in <i>sand</i>
Վ վ	v	like the <i>v</i> in <i>Victor</i>
Տ տ	t	like a hard <i>t</i> in <i>but</i> (intensive)
Ր ր	r	like the <i>r</i> in <i>red</i> or <i>rh</i> in <i>bother</i> (word endings in American English pronunciation)
Յ Յ	ts ^h	like the <i>ts</i> in <i>bits</i>
Դ Լ	u	see under <i>ու</i>
Փ փ	p ^h	like the <i>p</i> in <i>pear</i>
Ք ք	k ^h	like the <i>k</i> in <i>kite</i>
Օ օ	o	like the <i>o</i> in <i>dog</i>
Ֆ ֆ	f	like the <i>f</i> in <i>life</i>
Ու ու	u	like the <i>oo</i> in <i>cool</i>
Է	(j)ev	Combination of sounds (<i>y</i>)e and v

Source: My own elaboration based on: http://mylanguages.org/armenian_alphabet.php.

As a phonetics remark, in loanwords, the middle *r* was very often changed into the Armenian *ր* [r]; however, at the beginning of words, the Polish *r* was almost always the Armenian *ռ* [r] (cf. Խաչատրյան 2015, 20–22; Ղազարյան 1993, 168–171; Matasović 2009 etc.). One more phonetic note: Polish *ó* [u] and *ł* [w²³] (e.g. *stół*) are very often changed into *o* [o] and *l* [l] in Armenian, which seems to be a general trend (ex. *ոսոռ* [oboʒ] – *obóʒ* [obuz], *նակլամ* [naklad] – *naklad* [naklad] etc.) (cf. Magakian 2021, 225).

I do not use capital letters in Armenian words so as not to make them difficult to recognize for readers who do not know the Armenian language.

The research problem and some methodological details

Herein I will discuss another question which is at the same time the focus of my research, namely: Why has this issue, Polish borrowing in Armenian, become the subject of this book?

After many years of living in Poland and conducting research, I had to admit with heartache that “those who have studied various issues of Middle Armenian vocabulary have usually overlooked the words borrowed from Polish in the Middle Armenian period” (Ղազարյան 1992, 23). And now we can see the effects thereof – in some sources we can see a lot of (unintentional) errors, especially regarding Polish loanwords in Armenian. It is hard to accept that this approach only applies to Middle Armenian. Even modern Armenian contains, if not direct, at least indirect borrowings from Polish. But in some Armenian sources the matter is researched very superficially, even bypassing many rules of Polish grammar, phonetics, punctuation, and spelling. Often, there is also an open question of whether the borrowing is directly from Polish or through other languages. For example, in many academic studies, we can find hasty conclusions, particularly providing Ruthenian/Ukrainian²⁴ and Russian as the source of borrowing instead of Polish (Ղազարյան 1992, 23; Գրիգորյան 2017, 55–62). Polish borrowings in Armenian are also of German, Romanian, Ukrainian and Russian origin, but the internal distinction between loanwords from different European languages is

²³ Almost *w* as in *will*. This pronunciation (Polish *ł* almost like English *w*) is modern. In prior centuries Polish *ł* was pronounced like Russian *л*. And correctly rendered by Armenian *լ* [l].

²⁴ In order not to enter into a discussion whether something is Ruthenian or Ukrainian, in this book I will use the notation *Ruthenian/Ukrainian*.

rather a conditional one: it is often impossible to determine whether, for example, words with Latin roots are borrowed by the Armenians mainly from Latin, French, Italian, or German, or from Russian, Ruthenian/Ukrainian or Polish (Աբաղյան et al. 2017, 218–219), etc.

Being so deeply integrated into Polish society, as I showed it above, it is obvious that the language of Polish Armenians had to be influenced by the Polish language. I am not merely talking about the language of daily communication, but also about the official language – court and administrative documents, parish books, etc. Among the currently existing and available sources, it was possible to extract a number of words in the Armenian vocabulary that are of Polish (or presumably of Polish) origin. They are presented in the following pages.

The theoretical concepts that were used to formulate the above-mentioned research problem of this book are based on the fact that, according to the existing literature on the subject, the meaning of the vocabulary borrowed from the Polish language in Armenian (and not only by Polish Armenians) is reduced to two basic dimensions:

- translations (correct/incorrect) into Armenian,
- interpretations (correct/incorrect) in Armenian.

The above-outlined analytical system of the study determined the application of the following effective research methods:

- analysis of lexicographic materials, serving as a starting point for researching professional literature directly in the matter of discourse (the empirical analysis of books and dictionary materials);
- methods of source criticism, the task of which is to identify the correct or incorrect translations/interpretations made so far in Armenian sources (including lexicographic ones in the field of Polish loanwords);
- as sources providing reliable knowledge, the use of individual in-depth interviews with native speakers of the Western Armenian language, in order to make phonetic refinement regarding the details of the possibilities of certain nuances of West Armenian phonetics. I asked 15 native Armenians from the diaspora (but not from Poland) who speak Western Armenian to pronounce (independently of each other) the same words that Jan Hanusz presented in his research. However, it is also worth taking into account the fact that their perception of Armenian may differ from the perception of the Armenian inhabitants of Kutuy. In this case, I left the aspects of psycholinguistics without comment (cf. Magakian 2019, 13–26).

Historical comparative studies occupy a marginal place in the research. So in short, it can be said that:

- the purpose of this study is the elimination of the errors/lapses of perception/understanding of Polish (direct/indirect) loanwords and clarification of their proper origin/etymology;
- the subject of the analysis is the identification of Polish borrowings, especially in Polish Armenians dialect (but also in the Armenian language in general).

The Analysis Proper

The most commonly used abbreviations

In my book, Polish loanwords have been distinguished on the basis of several sources, among which the most important (but not the most unique) were:

- Jan Hanusz, “O języku Ormian polskich [About the language of Polish Armenians],” in: *Rozprawy i sprawozdania z posiedzeń wydziału filologicznego Akademii umiejętności*, t. XI, nakładem Akademii, Kraków 1886, pp. 350–381: the abbreviation used in the book is **ALPA** if necessary;
- Նորայր Պողոսյան, *Նորահայտ բառեր վաղաշխարհաբարդյան աղբյուրներում (16-18-րդ դդ.)*, ԵՊՀ հրատարակչություն, Երևան 2014 [Norayr Poghosyan, *New words in early Ashkharhabar²⁵ sources (16th–18th centuries)*, YSU Publishing House, Yerevan 2014]: the abbreviation used in the book is **NWEA** if necessary;
- Աշոտ Հայրապետյան, *Օտար բառերի բառարան*, Հեղինակային հրատարակչություն, Երևան, 2011 [Ashot Hayrapetyan, *Dictionary of Foreign Words*, Author’s edition, Yerevan, 2011]: the abbreviation used in the book is **DFW** if necessary;
- Ռուբեն Դազարյան, Հենրիկ Ավետիսյան, *Միջին հայերենի բառարան*, ԵՊՀ հրատարակչություն, Երևան 2009 [Ruben Ghazaryan, Henrik Avetisyan, *Dictionary of Middle Armenian*, YSU Publishing House, Yerevan 2009]: the abbreviation used in the book is **MAD** if necessary;
- Հրաչյա Աճառյան, *Զննություն Առտիալի բարբառի*, ՀՍՍՌ ԳԱ հրատարակչություն, Երևան, 1953 [Hrachya Acharyan, *Examination of Artial dialect*, Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the ASSR, Yerevan, 1953]: the abbreviation used in the book **EAD** if necessary;
- Վարդան Գրիգորյան, *Կամենեց-Պոդոլսկ քաղաքի հայկական դատարանի արձանագրությունները*, ՀՍՍՌ ԳԱ հրատ., Երևան 1963 [Vardan Grigoryan, *Minutes of the Armenian Court in Kamianets-Podilskyi*, Publishing

²⁵ Ashkharhabar is the direct continuation of Middle Armenian.

House of the Academy of Sciences of the ASSR, Yerevan, 1963]: the abbreviation used in the book **ԱՃԿՔ** if necessary, etc (cf. Magakian 2021; Magakian 2022).

Without the detailed work of the authors of the above works, my book would have never been written, for which I would like to thank them very much. They gave me the possibility to extract over 200 words in Armenian (Polish Armenian – Artial dialect, Eastern and Western Armenian in total), which are of Polish origin and have penetrated into Armenian directly or through other languages.

Other less frequent abbreviations used in the book are the following ones:

Ժհլրբ – Ղարիբյան Ա. et al. 1969–1980. *Ժամանակակից հայոց լեզվի բացատրական բառարան*. Երևան: Հ. Աճառյանի անվան լեզվի ինստիտուտ, ՀՄՄՀ ԳԱ հրատ., հ. 1–4.

SWO – Sobol E. 1995. *Słownik wyrazów obcych*. Warszawa: PWN.

Есум – Мельничук О. 1982–2012. *Етимологічний словник української мови*. Київ: вид. Наукова думка т. 1–6.

Сря – Евгеньева А. 1981–1984. *Словарь русского языка*. Москва: изд. Русский язык, т. 1–4.

The structure of the analysis

In the book, four types of information about each loanword are provided:

1. The **Loanword (L)** in Armenian letters with the transcription (according to the phonetic pronunciation that is the closest to Polish sounds) and the translations into Polish and English.
2. The **Armenian translation (AT)** contains the meaning(s) closest to the Polish language and mentality, with different options or equivalents (and often with their etymology/etymologies).
3. The item of **Polish meaning (PM)** contains the Polish sense of the loanwords and also often the etymology of the word that was borrowed by the Armenians.
4. **Remarks (R)** is a kind of additional analysis that did not quite fit into the above categories and includes the final conclusions of the borrowing source, which is not as obvious as it has been presented in some scientific sources (cf. Magakian 2021; Magakian 2022).

The loanwords are arranged in alphabetical order, according to a certain conventional division into different areas of life. Inside the Armenian-language texts, all bolded words and transcriptions are mine. If there is any derivative form of a word in bold in these texts, it is italicized (e.g. [**zdokladn**] from [**doklad**]).

Legal loanwords

1. **L: արելացիա** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 13) [apelats^hia] (Pol. *apelacja*, Eng. *an appeal* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 51; Ալզերեան 1868, 38; Wild 2006: 26–27)).

AT: the best translation of *արելացիա* [apelats^hia] seems to be *վճարել* (*գանգաւոյն*) [vtʃrabek (gangat)] or *բողոքարկում* [boʒokharkum] – an ‘appeal’, ‘conversion’ etc. (Սուքիասյան 2009, 83; Ծելյանյան and Մաղոյան 2010, 13; Մեյթիսանյան 1996, 13; Հայրապետյան 2011, 52). *Վճարել* [vtʃrabek] is a compound noun from *վճիռ* [vtʃir] and *բեկել* [bekel]: *վճիռ* is a loanword from Middle Persian *vičir* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 713; Olsen 1999, 911) – ‘decision’, and *բեկել* comes from Indo-European stem *bhe(n)g* – ‘to break, smash’, as Sanskrit *banákti* – ‘breaks, breakthroughs’, Old Irish *bongid* – ‘breaks, reaps, wins’, etc. (Ջահուկյան 2010, 124; Անանեան 1971, 1: 436; Olsen 1999, 702, 719, 744 etc.). *Գանգաւոյն* [gangat] – ‘claim’, is probably an Indo-European loanword from double form of *ghan* – ‘to yawn, open the mouth widely’ (Ջահուկյան 2010, 150). *Բողոքարկում* [boʒok^harkum].²⁶ In modern Armenian we can find the same word with the same meaning (Ղարսյան 2017, 6) but with a slightly different transliteration – instead of *ար[ɹ]ելացիա* [apelats^hia], we have *սայ[ɹ]ելացիա* with the same pronunciation [apeljats^hia] (with the softening sound *j* from Russian letter я [ja]).

PM: *apellacya* (now *apelacja*) in the present sense appeared in Polish even before the times of Casimir the Great,²⁷ who designated the castle of Cracow in 1356 as the place for submitting all appeals (Linde 1807, 1: 21; cf. Sobol 1995, 65). *Apelacja* in the Old Polish law was already known as a ‘complaint, reprimand the judge’ or ‘response, moving off, later appeal, appeal to a higher instance’, etc. (Gloger 1900, 1: 55).

²⁶ As in the case of **արլել(ու)** [arlel(u)] – entry no. 3.

²⁷ Casimir III the Great (Polish: Kazimierz III Wielki) reigned as the King of Poland from 1333 to 1370.

R: the words *արելյացիա* [apelats^hia] and *սուելյացիա* [apeljats^hia], both with the same meaning, suggest that two versions of the same noun could have come into Armenian two different ways. The source for Eastern Armenian is evidently the Russian *апелляция* [apeljats^hija] (Մելքոնյան 1996, 13; Հայրապետյան 2011, 52), which entered the Russian language from Polish (Фасмер 1986, 1: 81). For Polish Armenians, the source of the loanword was obviously Polish *apelacja* [apelats^hja] from Latin *appellatio* – ‘complaint, protestation’ (Մելքոնյան 1996, 13; Հայրապետյան 2011, 52). Today, only in some Armenian sources could I find the Polish (or Russian?) version of the noun *սուելյացիա* [apelats^hia] / *սուելյացիա* [apeljats^hia] (e.g.: “[...] թեև կարելի էր **սուելյացիա** [apelats^hia] սալ [...]” – ‘though it could be appealed’ (Արասխանեան, 1880: 939), “[...] համապատասխան **սուելյացիա** [apelats^hia] է ընդունել Հաագայի դատարանը” – ‘the Hague Tribunal has adopted a corresponding review/appeal’ (Գասպարյան 2016); “[...] մի կերպ արտասերեցին **‘սուելյացիա’** [apeljats^hia] բառը” – ‘the word “appeal” was somehow pronounced’ (Առավոտ 2010) etc.). We can observe this noun also in the Armenian court of Kamianets-Podilskyi (Stopka 2017a, 12; Գրիգորյան 1963, (149) 164–166, (163) 171–172, (164) 172–173, (297) 233 etc.). In its protocols, we can often read about ‘making an appeal against a case,²⁸ an action (a judgment)’ which was recorded in Armenian also as *սուել* [ablel], *արելյացիա* [apelats^hia], *արելյովա* [apelovt], etc. (cf. Գրիգորյան 1963, (198) 188–189, (271) 222–223 etc.) – similar to the Kutuy Armenians’ dialect.²⁹ Another proposal is to look for traces in Kipchak (*appelâciya/apelâciya* (Гаркавец 2010, 116, 119)) or in Ukrainian (*апелювати, апел(л)яція* (Мельничук 1982, 1: 79; Божко 1993, 84). However, these approaches seem to be problematic: as for Kipchak, the noun could have come from Armenian to it; as for Ukrainian, chronologically it began to use the appeal a little later.

²⁸ For example: “An Armenian court was usually recruited from the council of elders, usually adjudicating in a group of 2–4 jurors. The judgments of this court could be appealed to the entire council of elders or to the starosta (in Kamianets-Podilskyi) “[...] and finally to the king himself (sometimes also to the Crown Tribunal) or a court established by the private owner of the city” (Stopka 2017a, 11–12)

In Old Poland, the starosta was a high official of the Crown, in principle a nobleman, to whom was given in fief one of the domains, the starosty (see more: Kutrzeba 1903).

²⁹ As in the case of **արել(ու)** [apel(u)].

2. **L:** **աբելովադ, աբելովաա առնել** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 13) [apelovat, apelovad arnel]³⁰ (Pol. *apelować*, Eng. *to appeal*).

AT: *աբելովադ* [apelovat] / *աբելովաա առնել* [apelovad arnel] are the verbal forms of *աբելացիա* [apelats^hia] on the basis of the Polish verb *apelować* – ‘to appeal’, but the Armenian verb *առնել* ([arnel] ‘to do, to make’) was added to the second word from the Proto-Indo-European stem **ar-* (‘to adapt’) (Մալխասյան 1944, 1: 230; Ջահուկյան 2010, 75). So we have ‘making’ *աբելովաա* [apelovad] as a quasi-Armenian noun, as if we had a double verb (‘to make to appeal’).

PM: *apellować* (Linde 1807, 1: 22; cf. Sobol 1995, 65), or in Modern Polish *apelować* – ‘to appeal’, is the verb form of *apelacja* and means ‘to appeal to a higher court or authority to change a judgment or decision, or to make a request, call’ (Zgółkova 1995, 2: 191–192).

R: see *աբելացիա* [apelats^hia].

3. **L:** **աբլելու**³¹ (Hanusz 1886, 368) [aplel(u)] (no clear explanations either in Polish or English).³²

AT: was used only in the Kutuy dialect with the meaning of ‘to drop’, (possibly) ‘release’ or ‘let out’ (Hanusz 1886, 368). Jan Hanusz combines this verb with one of its classic meanings – *սալրել*, [aprel/abrel] apparently from *սալրա* ([abur] ‘salvation’, ‘to release’, ‘a deliverance’) – with an uncertain etymology (Ջահուկյան 2010, 70; Անստեան 1971, 1: 239). We can also find the already mentioned sense of ‘saving yourself (from danger, death), freeing yourself, getting rid of’ (Մալխասյան 1944, 1: 211), etc. The *appeal* (appealing that the court’s decision would change, that the court would give up) is equally applicable

³⁰ Here we have some examples of juxtaposed verbs. In order to express the borrowed word’s meaning, Polish Armenians in Middle Armenian added the verbs *առնել* [arnel] or *առնուլ* [arnul] with the meaning of ‘to do, doing’ (Գրիգորյան 2017, 58–59) (e.g. ‘to do an appeal’, etc.).

³¹ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *ablelù* [ablelu].

³² This verb is too close to *աբելացիա* [apelats^hia], *աբելովադ* [apelovat], *աբելովաա առնել* [apelovad arnel], so some arguments, facts and remarks are similar to each other.

in modern Armenian (Մուրիսյան 2009, 83). The apt Armenian equivalent is the verb *բողոքարկել* [boʁokharkel] or the noun *բողոքարկում* [boʁokharkum]: *բողոք*'s [boʁokh], whose source is Proto-Indo-European **bholo-ko-* from the onomatopoeic stem **bhel-* ('to sound, to speak') (Ջահուկյան 2010, 134). In the dialect of Armenians from Kutay, Hanusz noted the word *աբլելու* [aplelu], which he translated as 'to drop, to release' or even 'let go' (Hanusz 1886, 368). In a sense (which I do not find convincing), Hanusz combines this verb with one of its classic (now archaic) meanings of 'to live' (Arm. *սարկել* [aprel]), especially in the sense of 'rescuing himself/herself (from danger, death), freeing himself/herself, getting rid of', etc. (Մալխասեանց 1944, 1: 211; Ալգերեան 1868, 436; Աղայան 1976, 1: 99 etc.). MAD, however, based on Polish sources, interprets *aplel(u)*³³ as 'opposing' (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 71), that is, 'appealing' as 'taking back' (cf. Nitsch 1953–1955, 1: 148). It is worth adding that in Armenian dialects of Artial and Suceava,³⁴ *ablel(u)* means 'to bring/ to get lower something from a high place to reach or throw away, to throw' (Մարգարյան 2001, 94; Մալխասեանց 1944, 1: 209). Hanusz himself points out that the Nor-Nakhichevan Armenian dialect also has a construction very close to *ablel(u)* – *սարկու սարկ* [apul tal / abul tal³⁵] ('to resign, drop') (Hanusz 1886, 368). It is possible that Hanusz means the same word – *ablelacja/apelacja*.

PM: *apelować* ([apelovatʰ], from Latin *appellatio* (Sobol 1995, 65; Гаркавец 2010, 116) has been in use in Polish since at least the 14th century (Linde 1807, 1, 1: 21) – 'to go to a higher court having not agreed with the lower one' (Linde 1807, 1, 1: 22; SPXVI) or 'to appeal to a higher court to reconsider the case in order to exchange or set aside the judgment' (Sobol 1995, 65; SPXVI).

R: it is not out of the question that the verb was in Polish Armenian from the time of the Armenian Courts (Kamianets-Podilskyi or Lviv). Polish as the source of the loan seems to be unambiguous.

³³ Details in *աբլել(ու)* [aplel(u)].

³⁴ The Armenian dialect of Artial had four branches: Polish, Hungarian, Suceava, and Romanian and has been described by J. Hanusz, H. Acharyan and A. Pisowicz (see details: Martirosyan 2019, 77).

³⁵ *սարկ* [tal] – 'to give' (see: Աղայան 1976, 2: 1404).

4. **L:** **արենդա** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 69) [arenda] (Pol. *arenda*, Eng. *rent, lease* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 538, 786; Ալզերեան 1868, 428, 600; Wild 2006, 222, 169)).

AT: *արենդա* in Eastern Armenian means ‘rent, lease, temporary rent of land, building, etc. with payment of a certain amount’ (as in the dialect of Polish Highlanders in Bukowina, close to the town of Kutu (cf. Greń and Krasowska 2008, 26) or just ‘rent amount’, etc.

PM: in Polish the noun had several forms – *arenda* [arenda], *aręda* [arenda], *harenda* [harenda] (Linde 1807, 1, 1: 26–27) – and came into the language together with the officials of the court of Louis of Hungary in the 14th century (Sobol 1995, 72; Kopaliński 1990, 42). The word comes from Hungarian *árenda* (‘lease, lease rent’), which originated from Old-French *arrende, à rendre* (‘to be given’) from Latin *reddere* (Sobol 1995, 72; Brückner 1927, 1, 1: 6).

R: the word’s Polish origin is indubitable (even through Russian). In both Armenian dialects, the most appropriate equivalent is *վարձ* [vardz], which is still in use with its derivative of multi-member expressions with the same meaning as the Polish *arenda*: *վարձ ունենալ* ([vardz unenal] ‘to have a fee’), *ի վարձու տալ* ([i vardzu tal] ‘to rent’) (Rivola 1633, 349), *ի վարձու ունենալ* ([i vardzu unenal] ‘for rent’) (Անանյան 1979, 4: 322), etc. *վարձ* [vardz] is an Iranian loanword from Middle Persian, **varza* (‘interest, earnings’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 707; Անանյան 1979, 4: 322, Olsen 1999, 316, 500, 861). The word passed from Polish into Russian as *аренда* [arenda] (Фасмер 1986, 1: 85), into Ruthenian as *аренда* [arenda] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 5) into Ukrainian ([orenda/arenda] оренда/аренда – ‘rent, lease’) (Мельничук 2003, 4: 211–212), and, likely through Armenian, into Kipchak – *arenda* (Гаркавец 2010, 125).

5. **L:** բամեդնիյ³⁶ (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 108) [pametnij] (Pol. *pamiętne*, Eng. *court fee* (to start the hearing), but not only).

AT: դատական տուրք (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 108; Գրիգորյան 1963, (572) 338–339) ([datakan turkh] court fee) is a compound noun from *դատական* (from *դատ* – ‘judgment’), which is a derivative of an Iranian loanword (like Middle Persian *dāt*, Avestian *dāta* etc.) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 186; Olsen 1999, 876) and *տուրք* ([turk^h] tax) from *տուլ* ([tal] ‘to give’) as a derivative from Indo-European stems – *də*, *dō* etc. (like Sanskrit *dā*, Latin *dare*, Old Prussian *dāt* etc.) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 717; Անստեան 1979, 4: 357–358).

PM: the noun comes from *pàmeť* (‘memory, remembrance’), which has a Proto-Indo-European stem **mn-ti-* with the prefix **pa* (as Sanskrit *matī-* (‘mind, thought’) etc.) (Derksen 2008, 390–391). Since the 18th century, *pamiętne* [pamiętne] in Polish was ‘the payment to the judge for judging the case, court fee for listening to the oath or the winner party’s pay for the court’ (Urbańczyk 1970–1973, 6: 15–16; Krasnowolski and Niedźwiedzki 1920, 1: 303; Brückner 1927, 1: 392–393). As we can see, the meaning was a slightly broader than MAD interprets. In fact, the word also has other meanings – ‘souvenir’, ‘note’, ‘deposit’ (Krasnowolski and Niedźwiedzki 1920, 1: 303), etc.

R: the main sense in the Polish Armenians language is a kind of ‘court fee’, which is an obvious conclusion based on Armenian Court protocols in Kamianets-Podilskyi (Գրիգորյան 1963, (222) 199, (224) 200, (289) 230–231, (572) 338–339, (603) 351 etc.). Moreover, the juridical meaning was so dominant that even in Kipchak, at least in the 16th–17th centuries, the word passed as a ‘type of fee paid for making an entry in the act book’ (but not only) (Гаркавец 2010, 1116; Гаркавец 1993, 40, 44, 48, 51, 54, 55, 57 etc.). Polish seems to be the most possible source for the Polish Armenian borrowing; however, Oleksander Bozhko proposes Ukrainian as the origin of the noun (Божко 1993, 84; Բոժկո 2010, 112). Even if we accept the Ukrainian *пам’ятний* ([pamjatnyj] ‘memorable’) (Мельничук 2003, 4: 272), borrowing was possible rather from the Ruthenian period – *памятний* ([pamjatnyj] ‘memorable’) (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 599). The Ruthenian/Ukrainian source, however, is a very dubious

³⁶ The phenomenon of the added final letter *j* [j] occurs as a rule after (but not always) vowels (cf. Hanusz 1888, 7).

explanation of the source without evidence. At least phonetically, the Polish source seems to be the most reasonable (the Ukrainian transliteration *паментний* [pamentnij] is from the already mentioned Kipchak texts (Гаркавец 1993, 40, 44, 48, 51, 54, 55, 57 etc.), written in Armenian letters (Гаркавец 1993, 37)

6. L: բլենի բոդենի (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 120) [pleni potent] (Pol. *plenipotent*, Eng. (possible counterparts) *plenipotentiary*, *attorney*, *proctor*, *mandatory* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 65, 571, 707; Ալզերեան 1868, 53, 448, 542, 563; Bartoszewicz 1923, 452, 454, 659, 678)).

AT: the translation into Armenian could be *հավատարմատար* [havatarmatar], which means ‘plenipotentiary’ and consists of *հավատ* ([havat] ‘trust, faith’) – *հավատարիմ* ([havatarim] ‘loyal’) (Աճառեան 1977, 3: 70) with *ու* [a] (conjunction) and *տար* ([tar] ‘carry, take’). *հավատ* seems to be an Iranian loanword, which may have come from the Khotanese Saka language *hot* (‘can, be able to’) (also **fra-vat-*) or Sogdian *awat* (‘trust, faith’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 454). Hrachya Acharyan proposes another, but very close, interpretation that *հավատ* [havat] is from Avestan *hu* (‘good’) with *ā* and Persian *vāt* (‘word’) (Աճառեան 1977, 3: 70). The next component of *հավատարմատար* [havatarmatar] is *տար* [tar], whose origins are rather unknown (Ջահուկյան 2010, 720). Acharyan supposes, among other theories, that it could have come from Sanskrit and Avestan *tan* (‘to spread’) or Avestan *dar* and Sanskrit *dhar* (‘to carry’) (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 36).

PM: is based on Latin: *plenus* (‘full’) and *potens* (‘powerful’), which meant ‘a person with someone’s powers, authorized by the principal to act in his/her name, on his/her behalf; plenipotentiary’, but historically he or she was also ‘an authorized deputy, mandate’ (Doroszewski; Sobol 1995, 868; Arct 1899, 341).

R: explicitly a Polish loanword. Even in Kipchak *plenipotent* is obviously a Polish loanword (Гаркавец 2010, 1144), which could have penetrated the language through Armenian. In the Polish Armenian dialect it is transcribed from

the records of Kamianets-Podilskyi (e.g.: Գրիգորյան 1963, (441) 284–285) or other courts.

7. L: **բմոնչևա/բմոնցևա** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 123) [pomotʃ^hna/pomots^hna] (Pol. *pomocna/pomocne*, Eng. *court fees/court costs/legal costs*).

AT: *դատասկան տուրք* [datakan turk^h] or *դատասկան ծախսեր* [datakan tsaxser] means ‘court fees/court costs’ (mainly for trial but not only) (Գրիգորյան 2017, 60). For *դատասկան տուրք* [datakan turk^h] the same explanation is given as that for *բամետնիյ* [pametnij]. In the case of *դատասկան ծախսեր* [datakan tsaxser] (*ծախս* [tsaxs], ‘cost’ in singular was in everyday use as early as the beginning of the 17th century (Rivola 1633, 180)³⁷).

PM: from Proto-Slavic *pomogŭb* (a help), which is also from Proto-Slavic *pomogti* (‘to help’), since the 14th century, also means ‘to provide help, to support’ (Boryś 2008, 462; cf. Derksen 208, 321).

R: general meaning of *բմոնչևա* [pomotʃ^hna] / *բմոնցևա* [pomots^hna] is ‘court fees/court costs’ (Maciejowski 1846, 283). However, Waclaw Maciejowski’s text about Russian and Slavic laws (especially about *Russkaya Pravda*³⁸) may even suggest that the Armenians probably borrowed this term while still living in the Russian territory between the 11th and 13th century. Describing the constituents of the Slavic legacy of ancient Russian law from about the 11th to the 13th centuries, he also writes about the *pomocne* as ‘court payment/fee’ (Maciejowski 1846, 282–283). This last statement, however, calls into question the borrowing of this noun from the Polish language in favor of the Russian language. For precision, it is worth noting that *բմոնցևա* [pomots^hna] was also an ‘unspecified type of duty for the peasants, court fee paid by the winning party, a returnable

³⁷ This is similar to **նազլատ** [naklad] – entry no. 27.

³⁸ *Russkaya Pravda* (in the Old Slavic sense *legislation*) is the oldest collection of laws in Kievan Rus’. The first editions were made during the reign of Yaroslav the Wise (978–1054) (cf. Калачов 1846).

loan granted by the Master to *kmieć*³⁹ [kmiɛtʰ] for the development’ and ‘evidence justifying failure to appear in court’ (Urbańczyk 1970–1973, 6: 373–374). Among Armenians, as we can see, only the phrases linked with judiciary meanings were accepted (Urbańczyk 1970–1973, 6: 373–374) as “[...] եւ **բոմոյնան** [pomotʰnan] ետուր դատաստանին. գոր դատաստանն ընդունեց:” (‘[...] paid բոմոյնա ([pomotʰna] court fee) to the court, which the court accepted [...]’) (Գրիգորյան 1963, (21) 104–105), “[...] դատաստանն էտ ի Մենքոյէն **բոմոյնաչ** [pomotʰnaʃ] եւ ազատ առաւ զինքն:” (‘[...] the court accepted բոմոյնա [pomotʰna] (court fees/court costs) from Senko and released him’) (Գրիգորյան 1963 (527) 320), “[...] նա չկանգնեցաւ ի օրն եւ ոչ կատարեց զերդումն: Եւ ետուր **բոմոյնան** [pomotʰnan]:” (‘[...] he did not appear that day and did not swear an oath. I paid բոմոյնա ([pomotʰna] court fees/court costs’) (Գրիգորյան 1963, (553) 331), “[...] Հանուսն եղիր դատաստանին **բոմոյնա** [pomotsʰna]. գոր դատաստանն ընդունեց [...]” (‘Hanus gave the court *բոմոյնա* [pomotsʰna] (court fees/court costs) and the court accepted it’) (Գրիգորյան 1963, (498) 309–310) etc.

8. **L: բունտ** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 110) [bunt] (Pol. *bunt*, Eng. *rebellion* (cf. Magakian 2021, 225–226; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 767; Ալգերեան 1868, 588); Bartoszewicz 1923, 86)).

AT: *բունտ* is explained in Armenian as ‘riot, natural revolt, spontaneous rebellion’ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 110; Տէր-Ղազարեան 1908, 58; Մալխասեանց 1944, 1: 392) and has as its equivalents: *տարերային սպontանաբոյթումն* ([tarerajin apstambuthjun] ‘spontaneous rebellion’). *տարերային* is a derivative of *տարր*, probably from the Proto-Indo-European stem **der* (‘strip, slice, break up’) just as Sanskrit *dar-* (‘to divide’) etc. *սպontանաբոյթումն* is the derivative of *սպontանաբ*, an Iranian loanword (from Middle Persian *apa-* and Old Persian *stamba* (Ջահուկյան 1987, 515). *խռովումն* ([χrovuthjun] ‘riot’) probably comes from *խռով* ([χrov] ‘pout’) and might have come from Indo-European **(s)krāu-* (‘to accumulate, to hoard’), etc.

³⁹ In the 11th and 12th centuries, the word *kmieć* [kmiɛtʰ] meant princely dignitaries, but in the 14th and 15th centuries it only meant peasants who had their own farm with an area of at least 1 *tan* (from 18 to 24 ha) of land (see details: Kochanowski 1908, 47–89; *Encyklopedia PWN*).

PM: Polish *bunt* [bunt] or *bont* [bont] comes from *Bunt* of Upper-Middle-German *Bund* ('association, connection, alliance' etc.). The noun has been in use since the 16th century and later was changed into 'conspiracy, attack on legal authority' (Linde 1807, 1, 1: 194–195; Boryś 2008, 46) etc.

R: Stepanos Malkhaseants mistakenly assumes that the noun has entered into Russian from the German *Bund* (Մալխասեանց 1944, 1: 392) and then to Armenian. However, the Russian *бунт* [bunt] came from the Polish *bunt* (Фасмер 1986, 1: 241), but passed into Armenian as a Russian loanword (Մալխասեանց 1944, 1: 392). In Armenian, we can also find the derivative of *բուն* [bunt] – *բունասար* ([buntar] ('participant of the riot') – with very rare use and comes from only the Russian *бунтар* [buntar] (formed with the noun *бунт* [bunt]) and the suffix *-арь* [-ar] but not from the Polish *buntownik* ([buntovnik] 'rebel').

9. **L:** **բրինգիբալ** (Գազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 128) [prints'ipal] (Pol. *pryncypał* (Doroszewski), Eng. *principal, master, chief* etc. (cf. Ասմանզույան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 151, 576, 730–731; Ալգերեան 1868, 126, 452–453, 561; Wild 2006, 206)).

AT: there are some equivalents in Armenian: *տեր* ([ter] 'master, owner') is from **տիայր* [*tiajr], from **տէայր* [*tēajr], from **տէ-* ([*tē-] 'great') with *այր* ([ajr] 'man, human'); however, the first stem is of unknown origin (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 401; cf. Olsen 1999, 676). *վարպետ* [varpet] or *վարդապետ* [vardapet] is an obvious borrowing from a South-Western Iranian dialect's **vard(a)-pati* ('master of students' or 'master of work') (Ջահուկյան 2010, 707). It comes from the Old-Persian **varda* ('work', 'to work') (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 319) and Middle-Persian *pet* ('master') (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 74; cf. Olsen 1999, 328, 909). *դեկավար* [ɤekavar] consists of *դեկ* [ɤek] (Assyrian *lēqā-* ('ship handlebar') (Ջահուկյան 2010, 481; Աճառեան 1977, 3: 167)), with the conjunction *ու* [a] and *վար* ([var] an Iranian loanword **vaθ-* ('drive') (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 313)).

PM: 'boss, superior' comes from the German *Prinzipal* (Sobol 1995, 914).

R: the Polish loanword *բրիւցիբալ* [prints^hipal] (cf. Ղազարյան 1993, 169; Գրիգորյան 2017, 57, 60), however, was in use only among Polish Armenians which the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court files also suggest (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 128; cf. Գրիգորեան 1963, 284–285).

10. **L:** **բրիվիլեայ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 128) [privileaj] or **բրիվիլեկոս / բրիվիլեկաց** (Պողոսյան 2014, 49) [privilekos/privilekats^h] (Pol. *przywilej*, Eng. *privilege*, cf. Magakian 2021, 226; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 731; Ալգերեան 1868, 562; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 672; Bartoszewicz 1923, 651; Wild 2006, 207).

AT: the equivalent of the loanword *արտոնություն* ([artonuthjun] ‘privilege, right to something, permission’) comes from the Armenian *ունիլ* ([unil] ‘hold, get, own’) (Աճառեան h. 3 1977, 601) and is from the Proto-Indo-European **opn-*, which is from the stem **ēp-* or **ōp-* (‘to catch, to achieve, to take’) (Չախուկյան 2010, 750) with the suffix *-ություն* [-uthjun].⁴⁰ NWEA explains the noun as a Latin loanword in Armenian (Պողոսյան 2014, 49), but both NEW and MAD give illustrations from Polish sources. For instance, the noun *բրիվիլեկ* [privilek] (with its derivatives *բրիվիլեայ* [privileaj], *բրիվիլեկոս* [privilekos] and *բրիվիլեկաց* [privilekats^h]) must have been so unfamiliar for the Armenians that the author of the text Gh. Alishan⁴¹ explains it in parentheses as Latin *privilege* – “Հայր Կամբէնցացիք յայսմ ամի սկսան ի ձեռն **բրիվիլեկաց** ([privilekats^h] privilege) թազաւորացն Լէիաց” (Ալիշան 1896, 131). However, the noun was certainly well known among Polish Armenians because in, for example, Kamianets-Podilskyi Court’s protocol, the word is used without any additional explanation (“[...] գայսչափ **բրիվիլեան** [privilean] ետուն ի ձեռն նորա [...]” (‘[...] he got so many privileges [...]’) etc. (Գրիգորեան 1963, 95).

⁴⁰ As in the case of **լասկա** [laska] – entry no. 177.

⁴¹ Ghevond Alishan (Arm. Ղևոնդ Ալիշան [ghevond alifan]) was an ordained Armenian Catholic priest, poet, philologist, historian, geographer, and translator. In addition to having been a member of the Archeological Society of Moscow, the Venice Academy and the Archeological Society of Saint-Petersburg, he was awarded by the Legion of Honor of the French Academy (1866) and given honorary membership of the Asian Society of Italia (see details in: Երեմեան 1902; Շոիկյան 1970, 13–26, etc.)

PM: since the 14th century, the general meaning of *przywilej* [pʃyvillej] in Old Polish was ‘a document granting or confirming any rights or special rights’ (Urbańczyk 1973–1977, 7: 380; Boryś 2008, 500). In other words, ‘a special entitlement, the right to use special considerations to some extent’ (Boryś 2008, 500) or ‘the granting of special rights’ (Urbańczyk 1973–1977, 7: 380). For example, in Russian, it has been used in the above-mentioned meaning as a noun in Polish law since the 12th century (Ппп) and according to Max Vasmer the Russian *привилегия* [privilegija] (‘privilege’) could have even been borrowed from the Polish *przywilej* [pʃyvillej] (Фасмер 1987, 2: 363).

R: as the primary source we can see the Latin *privilege*, but it is hard to say why the Polish Armenian “took” the form *privilekos*. However, all examples in MAD also come from Polish sources (cf. Պողոսյան 2014, 49). So it is more likely that the word was borrowed from Polish than from Latin, and slightly distorted in Armenian. The noun *բրիվիլեյ* [pərvøletʃ] (from *privilege* of Old French) also occurs in Armenian of France in the 12th–13th centuries (Doïmadjian-Grigoryan 2015, 144).

11. **L: գազնայ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 131) [kaznaj] (Pol. *wieżenie*⁴² [vienzienie], so Eng. *jail* (cf. Magakian 2021, 227; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 507; Ալգերեան 1868, 413; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 487).

AT: the word *բան* [bant] also could be known by Polish Armenians of the Middle Ages and even earlier (Rivola 1633, 54; Մալխասեանց 1944, 1: 331; Աւետիսեան et al. 1837, 1: 437 etc.). *բան* [bant] comes from the Iranian loanword **band* (Avestan *banda*, Persian *band* – ‘fetter, chains’ etc.) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 118; cf. Անտեան 1971, 1: 410; Մալխասեանց 1944, 1: 331). According to MAD, the Armenian translation of the noun *գազնայ* [kaznaj] is correct. In Kamianets-Podilskiy Armenian Court Protocols we read: “[...] հրամանք առաւ Յովանէտին **զգազնան [zkaznan]** նստել եւ Նորինին այլ” (it is about putting in jail two guys who had a fight) (Գրիգորեան 1963, (118) 153) or “[...] նստել ի գազնեան” (‘to be in the jail’) (Գրիգորեան 1963, (549) 329), etc.

⁴² The translation/explanation is according to Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 131).

PM: in Polish we can find *kaznia* [kaznia] as the synonym of *kazń* ([kaznj], ‘execution’). The noun *kaznia* meant: ‘order, command; discipline, moral discipline, strict customs; authority, power; punishment, suppression; prison, dungeon, detention; treatment, way of handling someone’ (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 257, 259; Linde 1808, 1, 2: 986).

R: the noun has been in use in Polish since the 14th century and comes from Proto-Slavic **kazнь* (‘to punish’, ‘punishment, decision, order’) from Proto-Slavic **kazati* (‘allow seeing, watching’, ‘to show’, ‘to speak, to say, proclaim, recommend, order’), with the suffix *-нь* (Boryś 2008, 225; cf. Derksen 2008, 222). Bozhko insists that it is an Ukrainian loanword (Բոժկո 2010, 112), and there really is such a possibility. In Ruthenian (Желехівський 1886, 1: 330) / Ukrainian (Мельничук 1985, 2: 343), the equivalent is *казня* ([kaznja] ‘prison cell’) (Мельничук 1985, 2: 343), which is phonetically as close to Armenian *զազնայ* [kaznaj] as Polish *kaznia* [kaznia]. However, the Polish diacritical mark ´ on *ź* [ʒ] is always lost in Armenian, so we have *kaznia* [kaznia/kaznija] instead of *kazńia* [kaznia]. *զազնայ*, besides among Polish Armenians, it has never been in common use in any Armenian dialect. The word existed also in Kipchak (probably through Armenian) as *kaznâ* [kazna] (‘prison, arrest’) and has as synonyms *zîndan* [zəndan] or *zndan* [zndan] (Гаркавец 2010, 662, 1783), which are the equivalents of Armenian *զնդան* [zndan] (from Middle Persian *z(i)ndān* [zindan] / *zēndan* [zendan] (‘a narrow, dark, underground murk prison’) (Մայիսանյան 1944, 2: 28; Անանյան 1973, 2: 102)).

12. **L:** **զաբիս** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 196) [zapis] (Pol. *weksel*, Eng. *promissory note, loan note*⁴³ (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 736; Ալգերեան 1868, 566; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 677)).

AT: the Armenian equivalent of *պարտամուրհակ* ([partamurhak])⁴⁴ seems to be a limited interpretation, but not translation. The noun consists of *պարտ*(*p*) ([part(k^h)] ‘debt’), which comes from the Iranian loanword **partu-* (cf. Avestan *pāra-* (‘debt’), *par-* (‘to condemn’), *pəša-* / **prtā* (‘criminal, culpable, indebted’), Sogdian *prt̄k/əpartak* (‘guilty’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 633; cf. Ջահուկյան 1987,

⁴³ Both interpretations are according to: Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 196).

⁴⁴ As interpreted Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 196).

541; Անանեան 1979, 4: 68; Olsen 1999, 905), with the conjunction *ւ* [a] and *մարհակ* ([murhak] ‘bill’), is an Iranian loanword from **muhr* (‘seal’) – similar to Middle Persian *muhr(ak)* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 540; cf. Ջահուկյան 1987, 535; Անանեան 1977, 3: 364; Olsen 1999, 249). However, the second translation is much more accurate (Մնացականյան 2019, 315) – *արձանագրություն* ([ardzangruthjun] ‘record’): *արձան* ([ardzan] ‘statue, sculpture’) has an unknown origin and may be an Iranian loanword (Ջահուկյան 2010, 92), *ւ* [a] is a conjunction and *գիր* ([gir] ‘writing’), which is a derivative of *գրություն* [gruthjun], is rather from Proto-Indo-European **uēro-* from the stem **uer-* (‘tear, grate, shear’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 162) with the suffix *-ություն* [-uthjun].⁴⁵

PM: the main meanings of the noun *zapis* [zapis] (since the 15th century), which comes from Proto-Slavic **pъsati*, are probably ‘draw, engrave, draw signs, paint’ etc. (cf. Sanskrit *pimśāti* – ‘hew, carve, form’) (Boryś 2008, 437; Derksen 2008, 430–431). The noun had the meaning of ‘entry in the court book, letter, paper, document, fee submitted for entering in the court book or inscription’ (Urbańczyk 1995–2002, 11: 142–143). There were also those meanings proposed by Samuel Linde – ‘debt entry’ or ‘official record’ (something akin to ‘promissory note’ (Linde 1814, 6: 728)).

R: we can find the noun *zapis* [zapis] in fact in juridical records (Գրիգորյան 1963, (3) 93–94, (583) 344, (607) 352; Մնացականյան 2019, 315) rather as ‘an entry into the court record’. The precise translation of MAD’s proposal – the Armenian *պարտամարհակ* [partamurhak] is a slightly different notion: in Polish it means *weksel* [veksel], which is a German loanword (Klemensiewicz 2002, 136; Ludwig 1716, 2119). Linde sees clearly the differences between *zapis* [zapis] and *weksel* [veksel]: the last one was only ‘a hand-written card to satisfy the debtor for some time’ or even ‘a withdrawal of money’ (Linde 1814, 6: 165). A. Bozhko suggests that *zapis* [zapis] is an Ukrainian loanword with the meaning of ‘the list of debtors or debts’ (Բոժկո 2010, 112). With a relatively close meaning we can also find *zapys* [zapys] in both Ruthenian and Ukrainian etymological dictionaries (Желехівський 1886, 1: 262; Мельничук 2003, 4: 235, 375–376). In Zhelekhivski’s dictionary, *zapys* [zapys] more precisely means *registration* and *zapys* [zapys] – ‘prescription, written will, title deed’ (Желехівський 1886, 1: 262). We can sum up the Ukrainian meaning as at least an

⁴⁵ See details in լասկա [laska] – entry no. 177.

‘entry’ (e.g., administrative and legal, scientific) or a ‘note’⁴⁶. However, it is difficult to specify from which language the Armenians in Poland borrowed the noun *զարիս* [zapis].

13. **L: զարդան** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 196) [zadan⁴⁷] (Pol. *zadatek* [zadatek], Eng. *deposit, down payment, advance payment, earnest (money)* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 242; Ալգերեան 1868, 213; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 14, 291)).

AT: *կանխապահար* [kanxavtʃar] (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 196) is from *կանխա(ւ)* [kanxa(v)], a derivative of *կանխ* [kanx] (‘in advance’) of an unknown origin (Չահուկյան 2010, 383) with *վար* ([vtʃar] ‘payment’) a Middle Persian loanword – *v(i)čār* (Չահուկյան 2010, 713; Անանեան 1979, 4: 345).

PM: *zadatek* [zadatek] is a derivative of Proto-Slavic *dati/dàti, davati/dāvàti* (‘to give’) (Мельничук 1985, 2: 14) which R. Derksen derives from *dānъ* (‘tribute, tax’). As Linde explains, the word *zadatek* means ‘giving someone some money in advance’ (Linde 1814, 4: 625). In other words, ‘part of receivables (mainly for sale and purchase contracts) paid before the final performance of the contract, advance payment’ (Urbańczyk 1995–2002, 11: 63) similar to the ‘part of the amount due, paid or paid in advance as a guarantee of compliance with the contract’ (gofin.pl).

R: this noun we can find, for example, in Kamianets-Podilskyi Court’s protocol: “[...] մինչև ի Սուրբ Խաչն զայն իւրդին **զարդանն [zadann]** դարձնէ դամդանի Սարգսին [...]” (‘somebody will give back the *զարդանն [zadann]* till the Feast of the Holy Church in view of the Holy Cross’) (Գրիգորյան 1963, (1) 91–92). The noun passed also into Kipchak as *zadatok* – close to Ukrainian *задаток* [zadatok], *завдаток* [zavdatok] (Гаркавец 2010, 1756; cf. Мельничук 1985, 2: 13–15, 216) or rather Ruthenian *задаток* [zadatok], *завдаток* [zavdatok] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 232–233, 242) (as for example the *zawdatek* ([zavdatek] ‘earnest money, advance payment, down payment, deposit’) in the dialect

⁴⁶ Private correspondence with Professor Oleg Leszczak (5.05.2020).

⁴⁷ The word does not exist in Western or Eastern Armenian, so the sound *d* must have been pronounced as Polish *d* and not as Western Armenian *d* (like *t*).

of Polish Highlanders in Bukowina (Greń and Krasowska 2008, 245)). In these circumstances, we have a noun left – Polish *zadane*k [zadane]k, the synonym of *zadatek* (Urbańczyk 1995–2002, 11: 63–64). *Zadane*k [zadatek], the meaning of the above-mentioned ‘part of the amount due before the final performance of the contract, advance payment’, is in use in Polish since the 15th century (Urbańczyk 1995–2002, 11: 63). That noun (instead of *zadatek* [zadatek]), in the meaning *za dane* ([za dane] ‘before given’) with diminutive suffix *ka* [ka] could be the basis of Polish Armenians *զանաւն* [zadan]. Although Armenian also has diminutive suffixes like *-ւկ* [ak], *-իկ* [ik], *-ուկ* [uk] (Չահուկյան 1994, 55, 66; Չահուկյան 1995, 140; Գալստյան 1997, 77–82), the fall of the *ka* is a natural phenomenon in the Armenian mentality because the diminutive endings are not such a widespread occurrence therein as they are in Slavic languages (particularly in Polish) (cf. Bagasheva-Koleva 2013; Sakhno 2016; Bortliczek 2013; Bańko 2019, 32–43 etc.). The noun (or other derivatives thereof) never functioned in Eastern or Western Armenian. I could not find any traces of Polish *zadan*(ek) [zadan(ek)] or *zadatek* (even Ruthenian *завдаток* [zavdatok] / *задаток* [zadatok]) in any of them. This fact suggests that probably the short version of the Polish noun *zadane*k [zadane]k with the fallen suffix *-ek* (*զանաւն* [zadan]) was only known and used by Polish Armenians.

14. **L:** **ինվենդար** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 271) [inventar] (Pol. *inwentarz* [inventaz], Eng. *property*⁴⁸, *inventory* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 502, 737; Ալգերեան 1868, 409, 568; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 482, 679)).

AT: it was adopted to translate *ինվենտար* ([inventar] ‘inventory’) from the Polish Armenian dialect into Armenian as *գույք* ([gujk^h] ‘property’) (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 271; Ղազարյան 1992, 23; Գրիգորյան 2017, 60; Ղարսյան 2016, 30 etc.). Even a cursory analysis of two protocols from Kamianets-Podilskyi Armenian Court shows some divergence. For example, protocol no. 445 does not clearly specify whether it is an ‘inventory’ (*գույք* [gujk^h] as ‘property’) or ‘inventory list’ (with Armenian equivalent *գույքացուցակ* [gujk^hats^huts^hak]). The content of the protocol indicates rather the possible nature of *գույք* [gujk^h] (“Այս ի **ինվենդար [inventar]** ողորմած հոգոյ բանի Ազիզբոյին [...]” (‘This

⁴⁸ Translations according to Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 271).

is the inventory (property) of late Mrs. Azizk^{ho} [...]’ (Գրիգորյան 1963, (445) 286–287)). By way of another example, there is no doubt that protocol no. 163 means an ‘inventory list’ (“[...] ծախսեցէր զայն տավարն առանց զիտուրթեան դասաստանին եւ **ինվէնդար** [[**inventar**] ‘inventory list’] չարիր [...]” (‘[...] you have sold the cattle without knowledge of the court and you have not entered (wrote) [that fact – G.M.] into the inventory’) (Գրիգորյան 1963, (163) 171–172). So *ինվէնդար* [inventar] can (and maybe above all) also be translated as *գոյքացուցակ* [gɔjk^hats^huts^hak]. However, *ինվէնտար* [inventar] (Հայրապետյան 2011, 229; Աղայան 1976, 1: 491) is still in use in Eastern Armenian where it came through Russian *инвентарь* [inventar] (from French *inventaire* (Մալխասեանց 1944, 2: 159)) and has the meanings of ‘property, inventory, implements, stores’, etc. In Western Armenian, according to the *ISMA Online Encyclopedia*, the word *ինվէնտար* [inventar] is also in use as ‘sales directory, tool, fixings’; however, this is hard to find in the literature and scientific sources. The origin of *ինվէնտար* [inventar] is clean (Latin *inventarium* (see TLF)), but the question of *գոյքացուցակ* [gɔjk^hats^huts^hak] is a bit complicated. The noun consists of *գոյք* [gɔjk^h] with the conjunction *ու* [a] and *ցուցակ* ([ts^huts^hak] list): *գոյք* ([gɔjk^h] ‘property’) is a plural form and a derivative of *գոյ* ([gɔj] ‘existence’). Acharyan believes that it comes from the Proto-Indo-European stem *ves-* (‘to stay, to reside’) (cf. Sanskrit *vāsati* – ‘to stay, to reside, to spend the night’, Old Persian *ā-vahana* – ‘an abode’, etc.). However, *ves-* has not remained in Armenian, but we can observe, for example, in German *gewesen* (‘it was’). In Armenian, *գոյ-* [gɔj-] remained from the perfect form of Proto-Indo-European *vóse* (Աճառեան 1971, 1: 576; cf. Olsen 1999, 763). *ցուցակ* [ts^huts^hak], which is a derivative of *ցոյց* [ts^hɔjts^h] (Rivola 1633, 370) comes from an indigenous Indo-European stem – **skeu-sk-* / **(s)keu-* with the meaning of ‘to pay attention, to notice’ (cf. Sanskrit *ā-kuvate* – ‘intends’, Old Upper German *scouwon* – ‘watch’ etc.) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 744; Աճառեան 1979, 4: 461).

PM: *inwentarz* [inventaz] is from Latin *inventarium* (TLFI) and has meant ‘register, list, officially recorded things for inheritance (in the room of the deceased or at the debtor’s), farm inventory (farm cattle and farm movables)’ (Linde 1808, 1, 2: 912), etc. The contemporary meaning is almost the same – ‘business entity assets, statement of the facts of all assets, list of movable and immovable property (e.g. livestock, etc.)’ (Kopaliński 1990, 236; Sobol 1995, 487).

R: the noun was an obvious Polish loanword for Armenians in Poland. Other Slavonic sources of possible borrowing are rather impossible. In Russian and Ruthenian/Ukrainian (geographically possible and relatively close areas for borrowings), the noun appeared only in the 18th century (Фасмер 1986, 2: 130; Мельничук 1985, 2: 301), while in Poland it was already in use in the 14th century; for example, *bydło* ([bydlo] ‘cattle’) was named *inwentarz żywy* ([inventaz zivi] ‘livestock’) etc. (Brückner 1927, 1: 52). In Polish Armenian it has been in use at least since the 16th century (Գրիգորյան 1963, (163) 171–172, (164) 172–173). Neither does Kipchak seem to be the source of borrowing, because the form *inventar* [inventar] in this language rather resembles the Ukrainian *інвентар* [inventar] or Armenian *ինվէնտար* [inventar] (Гаркавец 2010, 619). The latter could be the source of the borrowing for Kipchak.

15. **L:** **խղիկովաղ (առնել)** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 274) [istigovat (arnel)] (Pol. *złożyć pozew*, Eng. *file a lawsuit*⁴⁹ (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 535; Ալգերեան 1868, 426)).

AT: for *խղիկովաղ առնել* [istigovat (arnel)] again we have the so-called phenomenon of double verbing: *խղիկովաղ* [istigovat] is a verb from Polish *istygować* [istygovatʰ] and *առնել* [arnel] is an Armenian verb with a wide spectrum of meanings – ‘to take, to purchase’, ‘to initiate’, etc. This (compound) verb had a very broad meaning in Polish. Bearing in mind the available sources of Polish Armenian (i.e., protocols from the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court) and the resulting reality, it can also be translated as follows: *վեղադրել* ([mɛvadrɛl] ‘to accuse’), *դատական գործ հարուցել* ([datakan gorts harutsʰɛl] ‘file a lawsuit’), *դատական պատասխանատվության կանչել* ([datakan patasxanatvutʰjan kantʃɛl] ‘to bring to justice’, ‘to summon to judicial liability’). Because of the complexity of the above-mentioned expressions, *դատական գործ հարուցել* [datakan gorts harutsʰɛl] or *դատական պատասխանատվության կանչել* [datakan patasxanatvutʰjan kantʃɛl], I will only analyze the first verb *վեղադրել* [mɛvadrɛl]. *վեղադրել* consists of *վեղ* ([mɛk] ‘sin, crime, offense’) with the conjunction *ու* [a] and *դրել* [drel], which is a derivative of *դնել* ([dnel] ‘to put, to place’). *վեղ* [mɛk] is from Indo-European **mel-* (‘to make a mistake’, ‘to cheat’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 521; cf. Աճառեան

⁴⁹ Translations according to Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 274).

1977, 3: 298). *դնել* [dnel] is from an Indo-European stem *-dhē-(n-)* (‘to put, to place’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 201; cf. Անտոնյան 1971, 1: 675).

PM: the verb *instygować* [instygovatʰ], *istygować* [istygovatʰ] or *ustygować* [ustygovatʰ] is from Latin *instigare* (Karłowicz et al. 1902, 2: 99) and could be understood as ‘incite, excite, instigate, stir, accuse, blame, persuade, encourage, stimulate’, additionally ‘inspire, eager to advise something, complain in court’ (Kwapień 2016, 187; Karłowicz et al. 1902, 2: 102) or ‘hidden inspiration’ (Doroszewski), etc. Linde even explains that *instigacja* [instigatsʰja] is what royal prosecutors do in other countries: in Poland the same did the *instygator* [instygator], so the noun was interpreted as *instigacja* [instigatsʰja] – synonym of the verb *foldrować* [foldrovaʰ] (Linde 1808, 1, 2: 909) (from German *fordern* – ‘to prosecute, to demand, to sue, to accuse, require’, etc. (Gloger 1900, 1: 161; Krasnowolski and Niedźwiedzki 1920, 72)). M. Arct mentions that besides having the meaning *instigator* [instigator], it was also ‘a kind of prosecutor’ (Arct 1916, 1: 451) like *instygatorja* ([instygatorja] ‘prosecutor’s office’) (Karłowicz et al. 1902, 2: 99).

R: MAD proposes another translation for the next verb, which is very close to *խոչընդոտել – խոչընդել* (infinitive of *խոչընդել* [isdikɛ]) [isdikɛl] – ‘to release, to refrain from anything’ (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 274). The entire protocol of the Armenian Court of Kamianets-Podilskyi (Գրիգորյան 1963, (549) 329–330) does not clearly indicate that *խոչընդել* [isdikɛl] means ‘release, refrain from anything’. The Court clerk could have been a bit messy, but, nevertheless, one can get the impression that *խոչընդել* [isdikɛ] could also have the meanings of ‘to release, disembarass, discharge’, etc. (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 274). For example: “[...] զի զիս ի յայսպիսի բանէն **խոչընդել** [isdikɛ] [...]” (‘release me from that’). The verb *խոչընդոտել* (*առնել*) [isdikovat (arnel)] in Polish Armenian is definitely a Polish loanword. In the earlier and later periods neither *խոչընդոտել* (*առնել*) [isdikovat (arnel)] nor *խոչընդել* [istikɛl] occurs in any geographical “Armenian” area. Kipchak, also borrowed the verb *istigovat* from Polish or Ruthenian/Ukrainian (most likely through Armenian) but, as Harkavets translates, only with the meaning of ‘to repay, to invalidate’ (Гаркавец 2010, 625), which is very close to the above-mentioned interpretation of *խոչընդել* [isdikɛl] in MAD (Harkavets could have been inspired by MAD, which is mentioned in his references).

One may get the impression that the verb *խոհկել* [isdikɛl] could be a slightly distorted form of *խոսակել* ('to clean, peel' in Eastern Armenian [istakɛl] and Western Armenian [istagɛl]) (Աճառեան 1913, 401)). However, this is a mere coincidence.

16. **L:** **լեգավի** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 244) [legavi] (Pol. *legawy*, Eng. *a dog like the English pointer* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 711; Ալգերեան 1868, 545; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 651)).

AT: the translation of *լեգավի* [legavi] has two meanings: 'hunting dog' or 'secret police officer, betrayer' (Հայրապետյան 2011, 244), and in Armenian both occur rather rarely and only in colloquial speech or in jargon.

PM: *legawy* [legavi] is a 'hunting dog (pointer)' (Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 16) or 'lazy, drowsy' (Linde 1808, 1, 2: 1244), or 'field hunting with a pointer' (Krasnowolski and Niedźwiedzki 1920, 1: 151). The noun comes rather from 'lazy, lethargic' or 'lie, lying' (Rejter 2006, 117; cf. Linde 1808, 1, 2: 1244; Brückner 1927, 1: 293; Фасмер 1986, 2: 473).

R: *лежавый* [legavyj] in Russian is rather a Polish loanword (Фасмер 1986, 2: 473) and also has two main meanings (similar to archaic Armenian) – 'hunting dog' or 'secret policeman, betrayer' (Евгеньева 1983, 2: 167–168), which proves that it is clearly a Russian loanword in Armenian (used sporadically).

17. **L:** **լիստրատոր** (Պողոսյան 2014, 88) [(j)ustrator] (Pol. *lustrator*, Eng. *inspector, controller, auditor* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 66, 193, 492; Ալգերեան 1868, 54, 172, 401; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 48, 195, 473)).

AT: the possible equivalents are: *քննիչ* [kʰnɪtʰ], which is the derivative of *քննի* [kʰnɪn] and has an uncertain origin (Ջահուկյան 2010, 784). It could have come from Sanskrit *čī* ('to look for, to seek', 'to interrogate') or Middle Persian *či* ('to notice, to observe'), etc. (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 583). The ending *-իչ* [-itʰ] is from the Indo-European **kiā* with the prior basic **-ī-* or **-ū-* vowels (Ջահուկյան

1994, 66). *mtumiz* [tesutʃʰ] is from the stem *mtu* ([tes] ‘to see, to look’), which is probably from the Proto-Indo-European stem **derk-* (‘to see’) with the fallen *-r-* (Ջսհուկյան 2010, 727; Աճառեան 1979, 4: 397) and *-niz* [utʃʰ] (the same as *-իչ*). *hulihiz* [hskitʃʰ], is the derivative of *ulki* ([skel] ‘to be careful, to watch, to stay awake’), which is probably from Hittite *hušk* (‘to wait’) (Ջսհուկյան 2010, 683) and the above-mentioned ending *-իչ* [itʃʰ]. *վերսհուլիչ* [verahskitʃʰ] is the same as *hulihiz* [hskitʃʰ], with the prefix *վեր(ս)* [ver(a)] from the Proto-Indo-European stem **uper-* (‘up, on’) (Ջսհուկյան 2010, 709; cf. Աճառեան 1979, 4: 330) etc.

PM: has been in the meaning of ‘lustration’ in Poland since 1562 (Брокгауз and Ефрон 1896, 18: 251–252) (from Latin *lustrare* (‘purifying, showing, reviewing’)) (Brückner 1927, 1: 304)), as ‘review of something, inspection made by the inspector, controller’ (Kopaliński 1990, 310; Doroszewski) or ‘review, revision; purification from sins, goods’ inspector’ (Arct 1899, 242).

R: the noun *լուստրացիս* [ljustratsʰia] (*լիստրատոր* or *լուստրատոր* [l(j)ustrator] is the person who implements the lustration) and borrowed not only in the Middle Ages for ‘inspector, controller’ but also again in the 20th century (Ларин 2014, 246–249) – in Armenian *լուստրացիս* [ljustratsʰia] as a French loanword – for ‘periodic listing of state property (for income accounting purposes)’ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 255) or ‘(periodic listing performed) to reveal “friends” and “enemies” in society’ (cf. Արրսահանյան 2017), etc. *լիստրատոր* [l(j)ustrator], however, did not have a fundamental application either in Western or in Eastern Armenian. This borrowing clearly originates in the language of Polish Armenians, and even the example of the noun’s use in the NWEA comes from the area of residence of Armenians in Poland: ‘Հրամանաւ թագաւորին երեք իշխանք եկին ի Կամենիցս, որք էին **Լիստրատորներ** [l(j)ustratorner⁵⁰] (քննիչք) [...]’ (‘[...] By the order of the king three princes, who were **Լիստրատորներ** [[l(j)ustratorner] (investigators)] came to Kamianets [...]’) (Ալիշան 1896, 39). The author’s explanation of the meaning of *Լիստրատորներ* [l(j)ustratorner] in parentheses (as *քննիչք* – [tsʰnɪtʃʰtsʰ] ‘investigators’) also indicates that Armenians (outside Poland) generally could not understand the word’s meaning.

⁵⁰ The suffix *-նիչ* [-ner], mentioned here and hereafter, is the Armenian plural noun form.

18. **L:** կիլէյ (Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան 2015, 30) [gilej] (Pol. *klej*, Eng. *glue*⁵¹).

AT: the conclusion that կիլէյ [gile(j)] means *սոսինձ* ([sosindz] ‘glue’) is at least surprising. Phonetically, it resembles Polish, Russian, etc. *klej* ([klej] ‘glue’), but this is a mere coincidence.

PM: in Polish I did not find the noun *gilej* [gilej] with the meaning of *klej* [klej] as ‘glue’ even in dialectal forms (Boryś 2008, 233–234; Derksen 2008, 224).

R: from the context of the protocol of Kamianets-Podilskyi Armenian Court (“իմ վերայ կիլէյ [gilej] առաւ” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (272) 223–224) – ‘made a complaint against me’) we can easily deduce that it is the noun *gile* (with the Armenian final semivowel addition *j*) that meant ‘a complaint, grievance’, etc. in Kipchak (Гаркавец 2010, 544; cf. Յովհաննիստանց 1895, 205). What is more, in Osman Turkish *gile* (probably a Persian word) meant ‘to whimper’, so something similar to ‘to complain’ (*Osmanlıca sözlük* [online PDF file] pos. 2784). The correct Armenian translation is *գանգատ* ([gangat] ‘appeal, complaint’), which is also proposed by Harkavets (Гаркавец 2010, 544). The noun is probably from the Proto-Indo-European stem **ghan-* (‘open the mouth wide, yawn’) as a double form (Չախուկյան 2010, 150). However, the right etymology is not clear (Անանյան 1971, 1: 515). The Armenian Courts protocols exclude Polish *klej* [klej] as ‘glue’ (Boryś 2008, 233) because all of them use the meaning ‘complaint’ (cf. Գրիգորյան 1963, (3) 93, (5) 95, (272) 223–224, etc). In any event, it is also worth analyzing another (probable) etymological possibility (which, however, appears to be a random coincidence). In the 16th century, Polish *gleit* (Armenian կլէյտ [glejt]) was also interpreted as ‘personal safety or vehicle assurance, security letter’, etc. (cf. SPXVIW 1973, 350; Arct 1899, 128; Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 414). So, it can be assumed that կիլէյ [gilej] could come from the noun *gleit* which was widely used in the Polish legal system of the 16th century, especially since in Polish *gleit* is stressed at the beginning of the word and the last letter is unstressed (*gleit* = կիլէյ [gilej]).

⁵¹ Translations according to Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան (2015, 30).

19. **L:** **կվալդ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 389) [gvalt] (Pol. *gwalt*, Eng. *violation, turmoil*). (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984: 1028, 1066; Ալգերեան 1868, 739, 783; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 891, 944).

AT: no nouns meaning *կվալդ* have been identified, but there are some other words: *աղմուկ* ([aʁmuk] ‘noise’), *աղաղակ* ([aʁaʁak] ‘shout’), *կռիվ* ([kriv] fight), *վեճ* ([vetʃ] ‘argument’), *սուղբուղիք* ([surdmpʰotsʰ] ‘fighting, broil’, ‘mix-up’) (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 389; Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան 2015, 30; Գրիգորյան 2017, 57, 59, 61; Linde 1808, 1, 2: 805) etc. The closest translation of *կվալդ* [gvalt] in Armenian could be *բռնուլայուն* [brnutʰjun] meaning ‘violence’ or ‘outrage’ (cf. Աղայան 1976, 1: 205; Խնդրունի and Գուշագնեան 1970, 66; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 654). This noun is a derivative of *բռնել* [burn] and comes from the Indo-European stem **bhōr* or **bhōr-no-/*bher-* (‘bring, take it’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 140; cf. Աճառեան 1971, 1: 486).

PM: *gwalt* [gvalt] has been in use since the 14th century (noted in Russian as *кзвалть* [kgvalt] in 1388 and borrowed into Polish (Фасмер 1986, 1: 398)) with the meaning ‘violent crime, illegal, act of violence’ (Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 524) or (since the 15th century) ‘rape (of women), force, power, insolence, impudence’ (Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 526). The noun comes from Middle Upper German *Gewalt* (walten) – ‘to wield’ (Brückner 1927, 1: 164).

R: Kipchak *gwalt, givalt* has the above-mentioned meanings (with an additional one: ‘bewilderment’), but the author of the dictionary Harkavets points to Polish (*gwalt* [gvalt]) and Ukrainian (*гвалт* [gvalt]) (Гаркавец 2010, 557), a two possible sources for the loanword, bypassing the Ruthenian *гвалт* [gvalt] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 167). Moreover, Bozhko even supposes *կվալդ* [gvalt] to be only a Ukrainian loanword in Armenian (Բոժկո 2010, 112). Of course, it cannot be entirely excluded, but it is unlikely that this noun has Ukrainian origins, because even in Ukrainian (and Russian (Фасмер 1986, 1: 398)) *гвалт* [gvalt] is a Polish loanword (Мельничук 1982, 1: 485). The Ukrainian *гвалтувати* (Мельничук 1982, 1: 485) probably gave the impression that *կվալդ* [gvalt] is a Ukrainian loanword. The noun in Armenian appears only in the Polish dialect of Armenians. Geographically and chronologically, it appears to be a Polish loanword.

20. **L:** **կվալդովառ առնել** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 389; Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան 2015, 30; Գրիգորյան 2017, 61) [gvaltovat arnel] (Pol. *gwaltować*, Eng. *to make an uproar*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 1051; Ալգերեան 1868, 773).

AT: *կվալդովառ* [gvaltovat] is the verb derived from the above-mentioned *կվալդ* [gvalt]. The second member of the verb is *առնել* [arnel] and is similar to *առնել* in the case of **խդիկովառ առնել** [istigovat (arnel)]. We have a so-called double verb.

PM: is the same as in case of above-mentioned noun **կվալդ** [gvalt] – ‘to commit rape and acts of violence’ (Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 526) or ‘to make noise, scream, to demand for something, to press’ (Arct 1916, 1: 401; Doroszewski; Linde 1808, 1, 2: 805) etc.

R: similar to **կվալդ** [gvalt] analyzed above.

21. **L:** **հրանիցա** (Պողոսյան 2014, 126) [hranits^ha] (Pol. *granica*, Eng. *frontier, border, boundary*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 108, 110, 374; Ալգերեան 1868, 88, 89, 319; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 97, 373).

AT: the Armenian equivalent *սահման* [sahman] (Rivola 1633, 332) is rather a Middle Persian (Pahlavi) loanword – *sāhmān* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 664; Անստեան 1979, 4: 162).

PM: has been in use since the 13th century, likely from Proto-Slavic *granь* (‘sharp edge’) with the suffix **-ica* (-its^ha) as ‘border, line, strip separating two areas’ (Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 484; Boryś 2008, 177).

R: NWEA suggests Polish or Russian origins for this loanword. The borrowing of Russian *граница* [granits^ha] (Պողոսյան 2014, 126; Погосян 2017, 174) and Polish *granica* [granits^ha] as *հրանիցա* [hranits^ha] (as Gh. Alishan wrote in Armenian transliteration in his *Annals* (Ալիշան 1896, 45)) is rather unlikely. Because of the pronunciation of the first letter *h* [h], the Ukrainian (or more likely

Ruthenian) *границя* [hranytsʰja] (Мельничук 1982, 1: 584; Желехівський 1886, 1: 157) is more possible as a source of borrowing. The soft я [ja] in the last syllable could have very easily been changed in Armenian into vowel *u* [a].

22. **L:** **հրիւնայ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 441) [hrivnaj] (Pol. *grzywna*, Eng. *fine* [gzivna]⁵²).

AT: *հրիւնայ* [hrivnaj] was a monetary unit for Polish Armenians (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 441; Գրիգորյան 1963, (16) 102, (127) 158, (136) 160–161 etc.). In modern Armenian, *գրիվնա* [gzivna] is only the Ukrainian currency's name.

PM: *grzywna* [gzɨvna] (rarely *krzywna* [kʃɨvna]) comes from Proto-Slavic **grivьna* ('neck ornament', 'necklace' or 'fine', 'unity', 'measure of weight for silver') (Boryś 2010, 187; Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 417; cf. Derksen 2008, 189). Since the 14th century, the noun was used with the meaning of a monetary unit (consisting of a certain amount of expensive ore, usually silver, or money), cash penalty but also as a unit of weight for money (Boryś 2008, 187; Nitsch 1956–1959, 2: 518; Brückner 1927, 1: 163; Derksen 2008, 189; Фасмер 1986, 1: 458; Linde 1808, 1, 2: 800).

R: MAD suggests that the noun is a Polish loanword, but phonetically the Armenian *հրիւնայ* [hrivnaj] is closer to Ruthenian or Ukrainian *гривна* [hryvna] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 159; Мельничук 1982, 1: 593). Moreover, if the Armenians borrowed *grzywna* (գժիվնա [kʒivna]) from Polish, they would have likely retained the pronunciation of either *grzywna* (կժիվնա [gzivna]) or *krzywna* (գժիվնա [kʒivna]). In Armenian, the transition of *q* [g] to *h* (h) – [gzivna] > [hrivnaj], is not recorded (see details: Ջահուկյան 1987, 345–348; Ղազարյան 2006, 86–90; Արաջյան et al. 2017, 84–87). Thus, *հրիւնայ* [hrivnaj] could have been borrowed by the Armenian from Ukrainian (still in the period of Ruthenian *гривна* [hryvna] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 159)) and “transferred” to Kipchak as *hrivna* (Гаркавец 2010, 598).

⁵² According to the translation of Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 441).

23. **L:** **մահարիչնիք/մահրիչնիք** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 486) [maharitʃ^hnik^h/mahritʃ^hnik^h] (Pol. *świadek (naoczny)*,⁵³ Eng. *(eye)witness*) (cf. Ասմանզուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 326, 1097; Ալգերեան 1868, 285, 802; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 968).

AT: *վկա* ([vka] ‘witness’) is a Persian loanword – *vīkay* (cf. Avestian *vīkaya* or Middle Persian *vīkay*) (Ջսհուկյան 2010, 712; Olsen 1999, 910). The second is *սկսանստես* [akanates], which is a compound noun – and a derivative of *սկն* ([akn] ‘eye’) with the conjunction *ս* [a] and the verb *տես* ([tes] ‘to look, view’). *Ակն* [akn] is Proto-Indo-European **oku-n-* (**okuī-*) (Ջսհուկյան 2010, 30), comparable to Old-Slavic *oko* (Աճառեան 1971, 1: 107; Boryś 2008, 386). *տես* [tes] is probably from the Proto-Indo-European stem **derk* (‘to look’), but after the dropping of *r*, as in Sanskrit *darç-*, *drç-* – ‘to see’ (Ջսհուկյան 2010, 727) or in Avestian *darəsa* – ‘to glance’, *dādarəsa* – ‘to look, to watch’ (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 397) etc.

PM: *świadek (naoczny)* [ʃviadek (naotʃ^hni)] consists of a noun *świadek* [ʃviadek] and adjective *naoczny* [naotʃ^hni]. The word *świadek* [ʃviadek] has been in use in Polish since the 14th century. In Old-Polish, it was also *świedek* ([ʃviedek] – ‘a person appointed by a court to give evidence (under oath) or means of proof’). It comes from Proto-Slavic *svědokъ* (‘one who knows something, who has learned something’) (Boryś 2008, 620; Linde 1812, 3: 473; Urbańczyk 1995–2002, 11: 46). The adjective *naoczny* [naotʃ^hni] is a derivative of the above-mentioned Proto-Slavic *oko* – ‘eye’ (like Latin *oculus* – ‘eye’, Avestan *aši* – ‘eyes’ etc.). It has been in use since the 14th century (Boryś 2008, 386; Brückner 1927, 1: 377).

R: the Kamianets-Podilskyi Armenian Court’s report, mentioned in MAD, clearly shows that the noun *մահ(ս)րիչնիք* [maharitʃ^hnik^h] (coming from *մահ(ս)րիչ* [mah(a)ritʃ^h]) concerns a testimony – it is about the ‘witness of a specific event’. And, despite the fact that, according to the same and other protocols of the Court (Գրիգորյան 1963, (182) 181–182), the Armenians of Poland knew in parallel the Armenian word *վկա* ([vka] ‘witness’), in Court’s documents they used the noun *մահ(ս)րիչնիք* [mah(a)ritʃ^hnik^h] only as a legal term.

⁵³ In medieval Poland, they also used the noun *mohorycznik* [mohorytʃ^hnik] (Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 324).

Example: “[...] զի Վասիլն **զմահարիչնիրներն** [zmaharitch^hnik^hnerⁿ]⁵⁴ դնէ. զի վկայեցէն [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (547) 328) – the *մահարիչնիրներ* ([maharitch^hnik^hner] ‘witnesses’) *վկայեցէն* (‘testified’). Moreover, in Harkavets’s dictionary we can find *maharič* (which he obviously also derives from Arabic *maḫāridž* (‘expenses’) or Hebrew *māhar* (‘sold’) (Гаркавец 2010, 938)) as equivalents of Armenian *մահ(ա)րիչնիր* [mah(a)rit^hnik^h] / *մահարիչնիր* [muharitch^hnik^h]⁵⁵ with an indication that these nouns’ counterparts are in Ukrainian *магарич* [maharyt^h], *могорич* [mohoryt^h] (Мельничук 1989, 3: 494), Russian – *магарыч* [magaryt^h], *могорыч* [mogoryt^h] (Фасмер 1986, 2: 635), Polish – *mohorycz*,⁵⁶ *magarycz* etc.: its derivatives is *maharičnik* (Ukrainian *магаричник* [maharyt^hnyk], *могоричник* [mohoryt^hnyk], Polish *mohorycznik*⁵⁷ [mohoryt^hnik], *magarycznik* [magaryt^hnik], etc. (Гаркавец 2010, 938)). The conclusion is that in Polish Armenian, the word *մահարիչ* [maharitch^h] also had, at least from a jurisprudence perspective, the following legal senses of ‘usual strengthening of the purchase and sale contract traditionally in the form of refreshments (habit of drinking liquor) or penalty for breach of contract and even a certain percentage of the transaction’s value intended for the intermediary’ (Bağ et al. 1982, 14: 572). Then, the *մահ(ա)րիչնիր* [mah(a)rit^hnik^h] was the witness of purchase (sale), exchange, etc. (Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 324). It seems that *մահարիչ* [maharitch^h] (from Polish) and *մահարիչ* [maharitch^h] in modern Armenian (in terms of serving a purpose from Russian *магарыч* (Մալխասյան 1944, 3: 243–244)) penetrated into the Armenian language by different ways. In Armenian literary language, instead of *մահարիչ* [maharitch^h] or *մագարիչ* [magaritch^h] another equivalent – *ավետչեկ* [avett^hekh] (Աղայան 1973, 2: 960; Սուքիասյան 2009, 723) – is used. It is a form of *ավետչյա* [avett^hja] (Մալխասյան 1944, 1: 296) from the Proto-Indo-European stem **aued-* of **auēid-* (‘to talk, speak’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 101). Acharyan, however, doubts the certainty of such an etymology of the word (Աճառեան 1971, 1: 358–359).

⁵⁴ The final letter [n] is the definite article.

⁵⁵ The noun is according to Գրիգորյան (1963, (182) 181–182).

⁵⁶ *Mohorycz* in Polish was also *litkup* (cf. Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 324).

⁵⁷ *Mohorycznik* in Polish was also *litkupnik* (cf. Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 324).

24. **L:** **մետրիկա** (Հայրասպետյան 2011, 362) [metrika] (Pol. *metryka*, Eng. *metrics, certificate, specification, public register*).

AT: in Armenian it is an obsolete noun which meant ‘prosody’ or a ‘certificate of birth’ (Աղայան 1976, 2: 1001; Ժիրք 1974, 3: 523; Հայրասպետյան 2011, 362).

PM: according to Linde *metryka* [metryka] was ‘the common name of church registers where baptisms, funerals, etc. were noted and saved or it was the official book to which documents issued by the royal prince’s office or other offices were recorded’ (Linde 1809, 2, 1: 59; Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 182). It was also the ‘chancellor and sub-chancellor books containing public documents coming from the royal office’, simply a ‘royal office’ or even ‘crown archives or Lithuanian state acts’ (Sobol 1995, 716), etc. *Metryka* means an ‘extract from a marital status file regarding a person’s birthday, baptism, marriage or death’ and can also have the sense of ‘a document confirming the pedigree of a thoroughbred animal’, etc. (Sobol 1995, 716).

R: the Russian *метрика* [metrika], which means an ‘excerpt’ from a metric book or birth certificate’ (Евгеньева 1983, 2: 261; Ефремова) is evidently a Polish loanword (Фасмер 1986, 2: 611), but in Armenian it is obviously a Russian one.

25. **L:** **մինուդայ** (Գազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 519) [minutʰaj] (Pol. *minuta*, Eng. *statement, copy of judgment*).

AT: there is no literal equivalent: we have *քաղվածք* [kʰaɾvatskʰ] (excerpt) or *դատարանի պատճեն* ([datavtʃiri pattʃen] ‘an excerpt of court decision/sentence’). *քաղվածք* [kʰaɾvatskʰ] is a noun of general meaning. It is a derivative of *քաղ* [kʰaɾ] which comes from Indo-European **squel-* **skʰel-* (‘cut, divide, break up’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 773; cf. Աճառեան 1979, 4: 541). *Դատարանի պատճեն* [datavtʃiri pattʃen] is a two-element expression of a legal nature: the noun *դատ* ([dat] ‘judgment’) is an Iranian loanword – *dāt* (cf. Middle Persian *dāt*, Old Persian, Avestan *data*) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 186; Olsen 1999, 876, 1857), which comes from the Iranian verb *dā* (‘to give, to put’) (Աճառեան 1971, 1: 629).

The conjunction *u* [a], with the verb *վճռի* ([vtʃri] – ‘decision/sentence’, the genitive case of *վճիռ* [vtʃir])⁵⁸ and *պատճեն* ([pattʃen] ‘copy’) is also an Iranian loanword – **patčēn* from the form **patičayana-* (cf. Late Middle Persian *pačēn* – ‘complete copy/imitation’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 627; Աճառեան 1979, 4: 45; Olsen 1999, 902).

PM: *minuta* (since the 15th century) is ‘the concept, the initial editing of the document, which has no legal force’ (Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 278). In other words, it is an excerpt, a short gathering of something, an original description of something you have for a clean elaboration, for instance: *minuta* (‘excerpt’) of sentence, sealed *minuta* (with legal force), *minuta* without a seal (without evidential value) etc. (Linde 1809, 2, 1: 106; SPXVI). Linde explains this word as “[...] small in Slavic” (Linde 1809, 2, 1: 106), similar to Latin *minutus* for Kipchak *minuta*’s etymology (‘small, minor, minute, insignificant, empty, petty, cowardly, plain, meticulous’ (SPXVI)).

R: obviously a Polish legal (short and exact) term, *minuta* (‘as an excerpt from the original act, also a brief record of the case and its course’ (SPXVI)) for the Armenians of Poland was better and more precise than Armenian (*դատավճռի*) *պատճեն* ([[datavtʃri] pattʃen], ‘a copy of the judgment’), or (*դատավճռի*) *քաղվածք* ([[datavtʃri] kʰævatskʰ], ‘an extract of the judgment’).

26. **L:** **մոցնիյ (մոցովանըյ)** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 529; Գրիգորյան 1963, (102) 145, (322) 242, (324) 243) [motsʰnij (motsʰovanəj)] (Pol. *mocen*, Eng. *by the power of the court* similar to the *authorized* or *eligible*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 67, 300; Ալգերեան 1868, 56, 257; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 61, 297).

AT: *մոցնիյ* [motsʰnij] (as a legal Polish loanword) or *իրավագոր/իւսագոր/ւած անձ* [iravazor/liazorvats andz (authorized person)] (Գրիգորյան 2017, 58, 60) (as a legal Armenian loanword). The first, *իրավագոր* [iravazor], is a derivative of *իր* [ir] (the Indo-European **kui-ro-* from the pronominal stem **kui-* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 287; Աճառեան 1973, 2: 250)), with the conjunction *u* [a] and *գոր* [zor], which is a loanword from Iranian (cf. Avestan *zāvarə*, Old Persian **zavar*, Middle

⁵⁸ See **աբելաջիա** [apelatsʰia] – entry no. 1.

Persian and Persian *zōr* – ‘power, might’ etc.) (Աճառնեան 1973, 2: 114; Olsen 1999, 365, 592, 881 etc.). The next word is *անձ* [andz] and comes from the Indo-European stem *ang’hen-* (‘soul, person’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 59) from the primary stem *anə* (‘blow, breathe’) (Աճառնեան 1971. 1: 203; Olsen 1999: 120). For *լիազորված* [liazorvats], we also have ‘proxy, plenipotentiary’ (Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 707, 742).

PM: *mocny, mocen* (‘legally valid, final, obligatory, giving a guarantee, one who can do something because of the law that allows it’ (SPXVI)). The word has been in use since the 14th century and comes from Proto-Slavic **mogъ* (‘strength, power, force’) from the Proto-Slavic verb **mogti, *mogō* (‘to be able to do something’) (Boryś 2008, 333–334) and has different meanings: ‘physical and political strength, wealth, robust, brave, good quality, effective, great, big’ (Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 312, 314, 315), etc. But the most important for *անցնիլի* [mots^hnij] are the above-mentioned meanings (authorized, entitled, having legal significance, final, binding (Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 314)).

R: Bozhko stresses that *անցնիլի* [mots^hnij] / *անցնիլանիլի* [mots^hovaniij] / *անցնիլանիլի* [umots^hovaniij] (‘rank’, but not only in the Army) is a Ukrainian loanword (моцувати [mots^huvaty]) (Բոժկո 2010, 112), which appears rather to be a Ruthenian one (as the same моцувати [mots^huvaty]) (Гаркавец 2010, 980; Желехівський 1886, 1: 455). I could not find any explanations of this word in Есум (Мельничук 1989, 3: 526; cf. Желехівський 1886, 1: 455 etc), but, for example, we can find *моцувати* [mots^huvaty] as ‘to fight, struggle’ in Hutsul (Дуда 2008, 146) or, in *Практичний словник синонімів української мови*, we see *моцуватися* (the derivative of *моцувати*) as a synonym for ‘to make an effort, tension, help’, etc. (Караванський 2014, 441). Even in Kipchak, we can find *mocovat/et-* (a derivative of *անցնիլի* [mots^hnij] (Գրիգորյան 1963, (322) 242, (324) 243 etc.)) as the Ukrainian explanation of the noun, which is, however, more Polish (*mocować* [mots^hovat^h]) than Ruthenian or Ukrainian (*моцувати* [mots^huvaty]) and can be treated as a Polonism.⁵⁹ The noun probably passed to Kipchak through Armenian.

⁵⁹ Private correspondence with Professor Oleg Leszczak (23.03.2020).

27. **L:** **նագլխաւ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 561) [naklad] (Pol. *naklad*, Eng. *cost*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 201; Ալգերեան 1868, 179; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 203).

AT: *ծախս* ([tsaxs] cost) is a derivative from *ծախ(ք)* [tsax(k^h)] (Olsen 1999, 90) with an unknown etymology (Ջահուկյան 2010, 357).

PM: has been in use in Polish since the 15th century with the meaning of ‘costs, outgoings, expenses, payment for something, funds needed to do something’ (Urbańczyk 1965–1969, 5: 53; SPXVI).

R: Harkavets proposes Polish *naklad* or the Ukrainian *наклад* [naklad] as sources for Kipchak *naklad* (with the same meaning as in Polish) (Гаркавец 2010, 998), which somewhat complicates the establishment of the source for the Armenian borrowing as Polish or Ruthenian/Ukrainian (Желехівський 1886, 1: 479–480). However, geographically and administratively (as the Court’s Protocol shows (Գրիգորյան 1963, (401) 268–269)) Polish seems to be closer to the source of the loanword.

28. **L:** **սղեքքայ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 693) [stepk^h(k)a(j)] (Pol. *stepka*, Eng. *isolation ward/separate cell* for arrested people⁶⁰) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 144; Ալգերեան 1868, 118; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 131).

AT: *նկուղ* [nkuɤ]: ‘basement, cellar’ but here, with the figurative meaning ‘for arrested people’⁶¹. According to MAD, the noun *սղեքքայ* [stepk^h(k)a(j)] is a ‘dungeon’. Actually, Kamianets-Podilskyi Armenian Court’s protocol points to ‘dungeon’ (as the logical conclusion).

PM: according to MAD, *սղեքքայ* [stepk^h(k)a(j)] is *stepka* [stempka] (also as ‘basement, cellar’ but rather with the meaning of a ‘place for arrested people’ (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 693)). The problem is that *սղեքքայ* [stepk^h(k)a(j)] does not mean *stepka* [stempka], because the latter means ‘mortar

⁶⁰ Both translation are according to: Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 693).

⁶¹ According to *ibidem*.

and pestle’ (Brückner 1927, 1: 515; Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 422; Linde 1812; 3: 416; Greń and Krasowska 2008, 97). The noun has been used in Polish since the 14th century as ‘kitchen, pharmacy utensil with pestle, used for grinding fine powder of kitchen spices and medicinal products, mortar’ (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 442) and is a Proto-Slavic borrowing from German *Stampfe* (Brückner 1927, 2: 515).

R: in MAD the noun is identified as a Polish loanword with the mistaken transliteration as *stepka* [stempka] and is interpreted as ‘incarcerate (in cellar, crypt)’. The very logical conclusion, which is suggested by the example from the Kamianets-Podilskyi Armenian Court’s protocol cited in the dictionary, is ‘an arrest, a detention in cellar, crypt’ (“... Է ԼԱՍՏԱՐԵԿ ՂՆՈՒՄ ԽՆԴԻՐՔՆ Է ԻՐԱՄԱՅԼԱՍ ԽԱՆԷԼ ՂՆՈՍԱՅ Ի **ստեփայէն [stepk(k^h)ajɛn]**” (somebody ordered to get someone out of *stepka* [stepka]) (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 693, Գրիգորեան 1963, (146) 163)). So, it is easy to notice that the Polish transcription *stepka* [stempka] in the Armenian dictionary is incorrect and must be as in above-mentioned Armenian Court’s protocol *stepka* [stepka] – *e* [e] instead of nasal vowel *ɛ* [ɛn]. The noun *stepka* [stepka] (and not *stempka* [stempka]), which (probably) also passed from Ukrainian (or Ruthenian) *стебка/стенка* [stebka/stepka] (Мельничук 2006, 5: 404) to Kipchak, possibly by the intermediary of Armenian, meant ‘a room, cell (for infectious patients or detainees)’ (Гаркавец 2010, 1319). The *Малоруско-німецький* dictionary also points out that *stepka* [stepka] (like ‘separate cell’) is a ‘mossed wooden cellar, storage’ (*hölzerne mit Moos aus gefütterte Vorratskammer*) (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 918), especially the *Vorratskammer* is a ‘food cellar, pantry’. A possible Polish equivalent of Ukrainian *стебка/стенка* [stebka/stepka] is *izdebka*⁶² ([izdebka] ‘a cubbyhole’), the diminutive form of *izba*, which is still in use in Polish, for instance: *izba zatrzymań* ([izba zatɕyman] ‘detention center’), *izba chorych* ([izba ɕoryɕ] ‘sick-bay, infirmary’), *izba wytrzeźwień* ([izba vytɕɛzven] lit. chamber of sobering up, ‘drunk tank’) etc. It is also worth emphasizing that *stebnik* [stebnik] was in use in Polish with the meaning of ‘dungeon’ (Linde 1812, 3: 414; Мельничук 2006, 5: 404) but, as we see, was not borrowed by the Armenians.

⁶² Cf. *jbstbà* in: Derksen (2008, 211) and *izba* in: Boryś (2008, 200–201).

29. **L:** սվեդիյ (Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան 2015, 30) [svetij] (Pol. *świadek*, Eng. *(eye)witness*).⁶³

AT: with the meaning of *witness*, this noun does not appear in the Armenian language/dialect.

PM: with the meaning of *witness*, this noun does not appear in Polish.

R: սվեդիյ [svetij] appears in the Protocol of the Armenian Court in Kamianets-Podilskyi as “սվեդիյ [svetij] Բեդրեի յետև Բ (2) շաբաթ” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (122) 155–156) with the meaning of ‘two (2) weeks after Saint Peter’s Day’. Bozhko is certain that the names of church holidays were used in the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court Protocols for certifying acts relative to specific dates as in սվեդիյ Բեդրեի ([svetij Petre] St. Peter) day (Божко 1993, 85; Բոժկո 2010, 112). I believe that this refers more precisely to the Day of Saints Peter and Paul. However, in Ruthenian we have *святый* [svjatyj] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 858) and the same in Ukrainian – *святый* [svjatyj] (Мельничук 2006, 199–200). սվեդիյ [svetij] with the sense of a *saint* is reminiscent of the borrowing from Polish *świąty* [ʃvienti] but without Polish diacritics – instead of *ś* [ʃ] – *s* [s] and instead of *ę* [en] – *e* [e] – a phenomenon commonly found in Polish borrowings in the dialect of Polish Armenians. *Świąty* [ʃvienti] is from the Proto-Slavic adjective *svęťь* (‘holy, sacred’) from Proto-Indo-European **kuen-to-*, which is a derivative of Proto-Indo-European **kuen-* (‘to celebrate, solemnly celebrate’), known in Polish since the 14th century (Derksen 2008, 476; Boryś 2008, 623). In Armenian, we have *սուրբ* ([surb] ‘pure, holy’) (Մեդրեցի 1698, 289) which is from the Proto-Indo-European stem **kubro-* (cf. Sanskrit *çubhrá-* (‘shiny, bright’, ‘beautiful’)) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 690; Olsen 1999, XIi).

⁶³ Translations according to Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան (2015, 30).

30. L: ումոցովանը (Գազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 618) [umots^hovanəj] (Pol. *pełnomocnik*, Eng. *proxy*, *plenipotentiary*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 707, 742; Ալգերեան 1868, 542, 571; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 647).

AT: MAD proposes *լիազո(n)ր* [liazor], which consists of *լի* ([li] ‘full’) with the conjunction *ու* [a] and *զոր/զոր* ([zor] ‘power, strength’ (cf. Olsen 881; Պալասեցի 1826, 75)). Literally, it means to give someone the full power of attorney. *լի* [li] comes from the Proto-Indo-European stem *pel-` *pelə-, *plē- (‘fill, imbue, pervade’), which we can compare also with Old Persian *paru-* (‘much, many’), Middle Persian *par-* (‘to fill’) *pərəna* (‘full’), Sanskrit *prā*, *piparti*, *prnati*, *pūrnā* (‘fill up’, ‘to enrich’, ‘to make luxurious’), Albanian *plot* (‘full’), Old Slavic *рѣнь* or *ръ’нь (‘full’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 296; Աճառեան 1973, 2: 279; Derksen 2008, 426), etc. *Ջոր* [zor], as an Iranian loanword, could come from Middle Persian *zāvarə* (‘force, power’) or Old Persian *zavar-*, but more the Middle Persian *zōr* (‘force, power, violence’) is more likely (Աճառեան 1973, 2: 114).

PM: *umocowany* [umots^hovany] has been in Polish since the 14th century and comes from the Proto-Slavic noun **mogtь* (‘force, power’), which derives from the verb **mogti*, *mogō* (‘to be able to do something, to be in power’) (Borys 2008, 333; Derksen 2008, 321). Linde explains that it means ‘to give someone power: whoever does not want to do it personally may do so through the authorized person (representative) from him or her, expressly giving him or her one’s own power and will – plenipotentiary’ (Linde 1814, 4: 57).

R: MAD translation is absolutely correct as a legal term. The Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocol indeed informs that “[...] եւ կանկաստ առաւ Միլլոյի Վերայ. Որ է ումոցովանը [umots^hovanəj] Իսաչուէն կնոջէ [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (29) 110) (it is about the lawsuit against a lady’s plenipotentiary). Though it seems that there was no legal term for proxy in the Armenian language during the period under review, the nouns *լիազո(n)ր* [liazor] (Աճառեան 1973, 2: 27), *հավատարմատար* [havatarmatar] or *կամակատար* [kamakatar] are relatively new creations. For example, neither *լիազո(n)ր* [liazor] nor *հավատարմատար* [havatarmatar] exists in the dictionary *Նոր բառգիրք հայկազգեան լեզուի* (New dictionary of Haikazyan language) even in 1836 (Աւետիսեան et al. 1836, 1: 885; 1937, 2: 77). *Հավատարմատար* [havatarmatar] consists of the noun

havišun [havat] with the verb *inušuti* [tanel], which literally means ‘carry something with faith’ (the main meanings are ‘a person authorized to act on behalf of anyone or faithfully fulfilling one’s assignments’ (Աղայան 1971, 1: 834, Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 83)). *havišun* [havat] is an Iranian loanword (cf. Khotanese Saka *hot* – ‘can, to be able to’; Sogdian *awat* – ‘faith’ etc.) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 454, Աճառեան 1977, 3: 70–71), while the etymology of *inušuti* [tanel] is not completely certain. In Sanskrit and Middle Persian, we have *tan* (‘to spread, fend away’) and Persian *tanūdan* (‘to fend away’), but there is also Middle Persian *dar* or Sanskrit *dhar* (‘to have, carry’), etc. (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 368, cf. Ջահուկյան 2010, 720). *Կամակատար* [kamakatar] literally means ‘to do somebody’s will’ (fulfilling the will of the others (Ալետիքեան et al. 1836, 1: 1039)). The noun comes from Middle Persian *kāmkār* (‘absolute’, ‘voluntary’) > *kāmkārīh* (‘absolute power’) – cf. Persian *kāmgār* (‘voluntary’, ‘happy’ etc.), *kāmgārī* (‘happiness’, ‘power’), Sanskrit *kāmakārā* (‘free, freely, having free will’), etc. All comes from *kāma* (‘will’) and *kār* (‘to do, to act’) (Աճառեան 1977, 2: 499; Մալխասեանց 1944, 2: 373). In Armenian, *nušgnušun* is not found anywhere else except in the dialect of Polish Armenians.

31. **L:** **ուստանեա** (Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան 2015, 30; Գրիգորյան 1963, (324) 243) [ustanea] (Pol. *przerwa*, Eng. *break*)⁶⁴ (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 112; Ալգերեան 1868, 93; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 123).

AT: the most appropriate translation into Armenian is proposed by the authors – *դադար* ([dadar] ‘pause, break’) (Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան 2015, 30; Rivola 1633, 83) from the duplicate Indo-European stem **dher-* ‘to keep, maintain, save’ (Ջահուկյան 2010, 179) or ‘abiding, tarrying’ (Olsen 1999, 209).

PM: known in Polish since at least 1466 with the meaning of ‘get tired, lose strength, weaken, or stop or to appear on the court date (in the absence of the opposing party)’ (Urbańczyk 1982–1987, 9: 458), ‘silence’ (Karłowicz et al. 1919, 7: 216), ‘stand no more, exhaust it, break it, stop it, stop it forever’ (Karłowicz et al. 1919, 7: 373).

⁶⁴ Translations according to Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան (2015, 30).

R: is obviously a Polish loanword that was only in use in the Polish Armenians dialect.

32. **L:** **ուստանեա առնուլ** (Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան 2015, 30; Գրիգորյան 1963, (333) 246, (349) 251) [ustanea arnul] (Pol. *umorzyć, zakończyć, przerwać*, Eng. *discontinue, terminate*)⁶⁵ (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 259, 980; Ալգերեան 1868, 277, 715; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 216, 31).

AT: the best Armenian interpretations are the proposals by the above-mentioned authors – *(ընդ)հատել* ([əndhatal] ‘to interrupt, suspend’) or *կարճել* ([kartʃel] ‘discontinue, terminate’). *(ընդ)հատել* [əndhatal] consists of *ընդ* [ənd] and *հատել* [hatal], whereas *ընդ* [ənd] is a widely used preposition rather from Proto-Indo-European **anti-* and possibly **ndhos-* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 548), but *հատել* [hatal] has no clear etymology. *կարճել* [kartʃel] is a derivative of *կարճ* ([kartʃ] ‘short’) with the suffix of the infinitive *ել* [el]. *կարճ* [kartʃ] probably has an Iranian source – **kart-čā* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 394); however, Brigit Olsen is unsure of its origin (Olsen 1999, 887). The second element of the verb (*առնուլ* [arnul]) is analyzed as in the case of **սաչովաղ առնուլ** [satʃ^hovat arnul].

PM: as in the case of *ուստանեա* [ustanea].

R: it is undoubtedly a Polish loanword.

33. **L:** **ուվեազանեայ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 622) [uveanza-neaj] (Pol. *uwięzienie*, Eng. *imprisonment, confinement, incarceration*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 183, 473; Ալգերեան 1868, 160, 382, 385; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 181, 451, 454).

AT: *կալանք* [kalank^h] – the Armenian source of this noun is *կալ* [kal], a Proto-Indo-European word **guol-* from the stem **geu-* (‘to bend, tilt, stoop’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 373, Աճառեան 1973, 2: 484).

⁶⁵ Ibidem.

PM: *uwięzienie* [uvienzienie] (‘confinement, incarceration’) comes from *więzić* [vienzitʰ] (Urbańczyk 1988–1993, 10: 221; Linde 1814, 4: 111, 230), which has been known in Polish since the 14th century and comes from Proto-Slavic *vęzъ* (‘tying, binding, connecting’) (Boryś 2008, 700; Derksen 2008, 521).

R: *ուվեազանեայ* [uveanzaneaj] was used by Polish Armenians, which does not mean that it was necessarily borrowed from Polish. The noun in Polish Armenian sounds more Ruthenian (*ув’язнений* [uvjaznenyj]) / Ukrainian (*ув’язнення* [uvjaznennja]) than Polish. It resembles a distorted form of the Ukrainian *ув’язнення* (*в’язати*) [uvjaznennja (vjazaty)] (Мельничук 2012, 6: 442) or Ruthenian *ув’язнений* [uvjaznenyj] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 1001). The Armenian pronunciation does not seem to be an accident (or oversight of a court clerk) because it is repeated several times in the same form – *ուվեազանեայ* [uveazaneaj] (Գրիգորյան 1963, (84) 136, (231) 204, (343) 248 etc.). However, I cannot completely rule out a possible Polish borrowing.

34. **L:** **ռեգլամենտ** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 475) [reglament] (Pol. *reglament*, Eng. *order, regulations*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 648, 779; Ալգերեան 1868, 503, 596; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 714).

AT: the equivalent of *ռեգլամենտ* [reglament] in modern Armenian is *աշխատակարգ* [afxatakarg] (‘working order’): *աշխատ* [afxat] (from Middle Persian **axšāt* – ‘work, tribulation, torment’) (Անտեան 1971, 1: 216; Olsen 1999, 864) with *ու* [a] (conjunction) and *կարգ* [karg] (probably of unknown origins) (Ջառուկյան 2010, 391; Olsen 1999, 562, 680, 960. The *ռեգլամենտ* [reglament] is also in use in modern Armenian, albeit infrequently, and means ‘the set of rules of any kind of work or order of activity, regulation, or procedures for conducting meetings, sessions’ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 475).

PM: at the beginning of the 19th century, Linde describes *regulament* [reglament] (a word related with *reglament* [reglament]) as ‘a set of rules or regulations’ (Linde 1812, 3: 24). We also find in Doroszewski’s dictionary *reglament* as ‘regulations’ with the note that, in the past, the noun *regulament* (Doroszewski) was in use, too.

R: Polish *reglament* comes from French *règlement* (Zgółkowa 2002, 35: 353) but the Armenian *ռեգլամենտ* [reglament] appeared in the language rather under the influence of Russian *регламент* [reglament] where it came from Polish (Մալխասեանց 1945, 4: 158; Фасмер 1987, 3: 457).

35. **L:** **սաչովաղ առնուլ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 686) [satʰovat arnu], **օսաչովաղ առնել** [osatʰovat arnel] (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 825)⁶⁶ (Pol. *szacować, oszacować*, Eng. *to value, evaluate, appreciate, estimate, to give a mark*) – both are juxtaposed verbs (cf. Ասմանզույան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 52, 313, 1055; Ալգերեան 1868, 39, 272, 776; Ալգերեան and Պրէստեան 1821, 1: 42, 315, 935).

AT: the most appropriate translation seems to be *գնահատել* [gnahatel], which consists of *գին* ([gin] ‘price’) and *հատել* ([hatal] ‘to cut’) (Մալխասեանց 1944, 1: 452). *Գին* [gin] is from Proto-Indo-European **wesno-* ‘price’ or **ues-no-* ‘to sell’ (cf. Sanskrit *vasná* – ‘price’, *vesnám* – ‘fee’, Middle Persian *vahāk* or Persian *bahā* – ‘price, value’, Ancient Greek *ῥῆνος* – ‘price’, Latin *vēnum* – ‘for sale’ etc.) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 161; Աճառեան 1971, 1: 557). *հատել* is from *huun* [hat],⁶⁷ which is already analyzed, so we have only *ել* [el], as an infinitive form.

PM: *szacować* [[atsʰovatʰ]] (or *oszacować* [ofatsʰovatʰ], *wyszacować* [vyfatsʰovatʰ]) has existed since the 15th century and comes from Middle High German *schatzen* (‘to collect, accumulate treasures, money’), *schatzen* (‘to estimate, evaluate’, ‘tax’), contemporary German *schätzen* (‘to estimate, evaluate, value, respect, believe, judge’) and is used to specify the value of something (usually assets) (Boryś 2008, 591; Brückner 1927, 2: 538; Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 528) etc.

R: judging by the number of protocols from the Armenian Court in Kamianets-Podilskyi, one can say that cases related to the ‘estimation of some values’ were quite common. For example: “[...] եւ զեզն **օսաչովաղ առին** [osatʰovat arin] Ժ (10) Ֆրրին [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (362) 255), “[...] զկովն գորդովն

⁶⁶ *Առնել* – the same for *առնուլ*, is already analyzed in the case of **աբելովաա առնել** [apelovat arnel] – entry no. 2.

⁶⁷ Similar to *huun* in the case of **շրուքայ** [ʃʰukʰaj] – entry no. 205.

սաչոս առին [satʰoat arin] Գ (3) գայլառէ [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (389) 263–264), “[...] որպէս բարի մարդիկք **սաչովս** [satʰovat] արասցնն [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (615) 356) etc. All of these were about the estimation of payments’ values. No doubt that the expression is borrowed from Polish but it was used only by Polish Armenians.

36. **L: ստադուդ**⁶⁸ (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 693) [statut] (Pol. *statut*, Eng. statute) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 924; Ալգերեան 1868, 682).

AT: *կանոնադրություն* ([kanonadrutʰjun] – ‘statute’), consists of *կանոն* ([kanon] ‘rule’), conjunction *ու* [a] and *դնել* ([dnel] ‘to set’) from Greek κανων [kanon]. In Armenian we have *կանոն* [kanon] (possibly either with an Assyrian (*kanūntā*) or Middle Persian intermediary) (Աճառեան 1079, 4: 552; Olsen 1999, 925) and *դնել* [dnel] is similar to the case of *խոհիկոս* (*սոնել*).

PM: *statut* [statut] is as ‘collection of statutory law, statutes, legal provision’ (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 430) and comes from Latin *statutum* (‘decided, established’) (Sobol 1995, 1037; Kopaliński 1990, 480; TLFi).

R: MAD gives as illustration a fragment of the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocol where we can read about the *ստատուդ* [statut] given to Armenians by Sigismund I Augustus (Գրիգորեան 1963, (6) 95; cf. Balzer 1910). Armenian sources claim that *ստատուդ* [statut] is a Polish borrowing (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 693; Գրիգորյան 2017, 58, 60), but Ukrainian researcher Bozhko states (Բոժկո 2010, 112) that it is a Ukrainian one, and this noun came through Polish from Latin (Мельничук 2006, 5: 402). In Polish, the noun has been in use since the middle of the 15th century (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 430), in Ukrainian

⁶⁸ I will not consider the version **սգադուդուդ** [skatutuk] of *statute*, which only appears in the online edition of the publication of Վ. Գրիգորյան, *Շամենեց-Պողոսյան քաղաքի հայկական դատարանի արձանագրությունները*, pub. ՀՍՍՌ ԳԱ հրատ., Երևան 1963 (cf. *Շամենեց-Պողոսյանի հայկական դատարանի արձանագրությունները*, American University of Armenia). I could not find the **սգադուդուդ** [skatutuk] of *statute* in other sources available to me (see: bibliography). It is either a casual error or, at best, it can be presumed that it is some distorted form of the Ukrainian or Polish genitive of *статут* (gen. *статуту* [statutu]) / *statut* (gen. *statutu*) (Гаркавец 2010, 1317; Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 430; Мельничук 2006, 5: 402).

by the end of the same century (Мельничук 2006, 5: 402), and in Armenian (according to the official documents), probably since the beginning of the 16th century (cf. Balzer 1910; Stopka 2017a, 12). Of course, it is possible that the Armenians borrowed from Ukrainian, which was known at that time as Ruthenian. However, for example, in the dictionary of E. Zhelekhivskiy and S. Nedil'skiy (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2) there is no word *статум* [statut]. It is more likely that Polish is the source of the loanword because of closer, at least geographical, relationship with Armenians. Nevertheless, the word *statut* in Armenian had to be so rooted, that even in Kipchak (with the same meaning as in Polish). *Ztatuta* and *zstatuēn*, which are the nouns with Armenian accusative prefix *q* [z], are next to the word *statute*, *statut*, or *statuta* (Гаркавец 2010, 1317).

37. **L:** **սեքրեթար** (Պողոսյան 2014, 181) [sek^hret^har (seɡret^har?)] (Pol. *sekretarz*, Eng. secretary⁶⁹) or **սեգրըդար** (Պողոսյան 2014, 181) [sekrɛtar] (Pol. *doradca*, *pisarz*,⁷⁰ Eng. *advisor/adviser*, *amanuensis/penman*⁷¹) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 31, 684, 841; Ալգերեան 1868, 15, 26, 526, 636; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 23, 28, 761).

AT: the first equivalent *քարտուղար* ([k^hartuɰar] *secretary*), which seems to be the best translation, comes from Greek *χαρτουλάριος* as ‘letters’ superintendent, scribe, secretary’ (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 565; Չահուկյան 2010, 779). *խորհրդակցան* ([ɰorhrdakan] ‘advisor’) is also a possible interpretation and is probably from Sanskrit *kratu* (Avestan *χratu* and Armenian *χrat* (Աճառեան 1973, 2: 409)). The last one – *դպիր* ([dpir] *amanuensis*), which is from Middle Persian *dip̄r* or Persian *dab̄r/dib̄r* (Աճառեան 1971, 1: 688), is the last possibility as the interpretation of the nouns *սեքրեթար* [sek^hret^har (seɡret^har?)] or *սեգրըդար* [sekrɛtar].

PM: *sekretarz* [sekretaʒ] is from *sekret* (*secret*), which in 15th and 16th centuries was known as *privy* (i.e., *toilet*) and this meaning was closer to its Latin origin – *secretum*, that is, *seclusion*, but since the 15th century it has also had the meaning of *secretary* (Brückner 1927, 2: 484). Linde interprets *sekretarz* [sekretaʒ]

⁶⁹ The meaning is interpreted according to the example chosen by Պողոսյան (2014, 181).

⁷⁰ Literally means ‘writer’, however, not in the sense of creative literature.

⁷¹ In both Polish and English, the meaning is interpreted according to the explanation of: Պողոսյան (2014, 181).

as ‘somebody for writing all sorts of things which often demand keeping secrets’ (Linde 1812, 3: 212). The illustration (example) in NWEA also indicates the possibility of a similar application of *սեքրետար/սեգրեդար* [sekʰretʰar (segretʰar?)]/[sekrətar]: “Մինն ի նոցանէ եկաւ ի եկեղեցին Հայոց, որ էր թագաւորին **սեգրեդար** [sekrətar] (խորհրդական կամ դպիր) (the text is about a prince “who came to the Armenian church and who was the king’s secretary (advisor or amanuensis)” (Պողոսյան 2014, 181; Ալիշան 1896, 39). The above statement *խորհրդական կամ դպիր* ([xorhrdakan kam dpir] ‘advisor or amanuensis’) was added by the author of the text – Gh. Alishan, as an explanation of *սեգրեդար* ([sekrətar] ‘secretary’) and indicates that in Armenian the use of the *սեգրեդար* [sekrətar] / *սեքրետար* [sekʰretʰar] was not common and needed some clarification, whereas it was a term understood by Polish Armenians.

R: as the source of this loanword, NWEA suggests first Polish *sekretar* then Russian *секретарь* [sekretarʲ]. It is impossible to completely negate the Polish stem source, but here, for at least some phonetic reasons (*sekretar* in NWEA and not *sekretaz*, as it could be in Polish⁷²), not only the Russian (which is also the conclusion of the author of NWEA: N. Poghosyan (Погосян 2017 176)) but also the Ruthenian *секретар* [sekretar] (Желехівський and Недільский 1886, 2: 859) seems to be more reliable. Moreover, Harkavets in Kipchak (so a language close to Polish Armenians), besides *sekretar* and *zakritar* (Гаркавец 2010, 1256, 1760), shows also the Armenian noun *k’arduyar* (քարտուդար [kʰartuɖar]) as ‘clerk, secretary’ and even ‘notary’ (Гаркавец 2010, 656). The question is open – why having the Armenian word *k’arduyar* (which was in use even in Kipchak certainly through the Armenian) Polish Armenians borrowed the word *sekretar*?

38. **L:** **սումա(յ)** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 711) [suma(j)] (Pol. *suma*, Eng. *sum*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 952; Ալզերեան 1868, 697; Ալզերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 840).

AT: *գումար* [gumar] (cf. Մեղրեցի 1698, 69; Rivola 1633, 78) according to Acharyan, the noun is definitely an Iranian loanword, which in Middle Persian was *gumārtan* (‘to order, to appoint, to assign, to hand’), *gumāretan* (‘to authorize,

⁷² About the Polish formant *-arz* [-aʒ] (mainly used to construct the names of professions) see in details here: Kaproń-Charzyńska (2007, 111–112); Krucka (2002, 53).

to order’) and could have entered there from Accadian (Assyrian?) *gamāru* or *gammaru* (‘completeness’), *gamartu(m)* (‘assembly, whole’), *gummurt+u(m)* (‘completeness’), etc. (Ջահուկյան 2010, 172; Աճառեան 1971, 1: 591).

PM: *suma* [suma] (from Latin *summa*) has been in Polish since the 15th century and means ‘some amount of money or the counted result’ (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 505; Brückner 1927, 2: 526; Linde 1812, 3: 463).

R: it may be presumed that if the noun was a Russian loanword, it would rather be spelled with a double *m* [m] – *сумма* [summa]. Moreover, Vasmer also allows the possibility of Russian borrowing of the noun *сумма* [summa] from Polish (Фасмер 1987, 3: 802). At least in Kamianets-Podilskyi Court Protocols, only *suma* (սումայ [sumaj] / սումա [suma]) but not *summa* (սումմայ [summaj] / սումմա [summa])⁷³ is present. In the light of the above, it is also worth considering the proposal of Bozhko about Ukrainian (*сума* [suma]) as the source for *սումա* [suma] (Բոժկո 2010, 112), where the noun has existed since the 15th century (Мельничук 2006, 5: 473) or Ruthenian *сума* [suma] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 934).

39. **L:** **սօճույշ, սոճույշ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 724) [soduʃ] (Pol. and Eng. *the person from whom the discussed item (thing) was bought*).

AT: in Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 724 for **սօճույշ, սոճույշ** [soduʃ] (which is given as a Polish loanword), there is no translation besides the above-mentioned very logical, however not very precise, explanation.

PM: there is no equivalent in Polish but only the already quoted clarification/explanation.

⁷³ In the following examples I have bolded *սումա(j)* [suma(j)], ex: “[...] գոր սվել էի Սարգսին. որ է սուման ԴՃՂ (490) ֆլորին. այժմ գայսչափ սուման հասոյց ինձի [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (113) 151–152), “[...] մնամ պարտական սումայ դատաստանին այլ վճարել [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (119) 154), “[...] գոր սուման կանի այս իրաց Խ (40) դայյառ [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (283) 228–229), “[...] Եւ գայսչափ սուման էտուր [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (6) 95–96), “[...] գայս սուման նաղտ սախտակով [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (3) 93–94), “[...] Չայսչափ սուման վնառեց Անտրիյին [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (582) 343), “[...] այժմ հասոյց ինձի գայսչափ սուման Գրիգորն [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (100) 144) etc.

R: Kamianets-Podilskyi Court reports abound in (*q*)*uounniz* [(z)soduʃ].⁷⁴ The example of Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 724 – “[...] Որպէս Եագուպին Պետրոսին որոյ օր սվել էին վասն այն եզին համար. զի **զսօսուշն [zsoduʃn]** դնէր. [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (392) 265) (‘somebody goes to court with a complaint’), allows us to interpret the noun *uounniz/ununniz* [soduʃ] as ‘somebody who sold something moot’. However, the Polish origin of the word is very debatable. Kipchak’s version of *soduš* [soduʃ] or *suduš* [suduʃ] suggests a slightly different translation – ‘chief defendant, actual defendant, instigator’ (Гаркавец 2010, 1290). Harkavets also adds Ukrainian versions of the nouns *codyuu* [soduʃ] or *cydyuu* [suduʃ] (Гаркавец 2010, 1290) without Polish equivalents. Leszczak continues to suggest that *cydyuu* [suduʃ] (as the derivative of *cyd* ([sud] – *court*) in old Ukrainian could mean ‘a person who has a court case’, but the word has not remained in contemporary use.⁷⁵ In the light of the above, it can be presumed that the word has either Ukrainian or (at last for Armenians) Kipchak origins and could be close to the meaning of ‘plaintiff’.

40. **L:** **տիլեցիա** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 759) [dilets^hia] (Pol. *dylacja*, Eng. *delay*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 236; Ալզերեան 1868, 208; Ալզերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 238).

AT: MAD proposes a very apt translation for Modern Armenian – ‘extension, delay’. At the beginning of the 17th century in Armenian *յետանիլ* [hetanil] and *յետ դնիլ* [het dnel] (Rivola 1633, 273) was used with both the meaning of ‘step back, set apart’ and ‘separated from’, which could be equivalents of *տիլեցիա* [dilets^hia]. It is almost impossible to find out whether the verbs were used at all in legal terminology at the time, but the general (common) meaning was and is still the same – ‘postpone’. So, I can only hypothetically assume that, at that time, the above-mentioned verbs were the equivalent of *տիլեցիա* [dilets^hia]. *Յետանիլ* [hetanil] must be divided into *յետ/հետ* ([het] ‘back to’) and *անիլ* ([anil] ‘to do’). First, *յետ* [het] is from the Proto Indo-European stem **pedo-* (‘foot’) – cf. Sanskrit *pād-* (‘foot’), Avestan *pādam* (‘trace’), Old Icelandic *fet* (‘step’), Hittite *pedan*, Balochi *padā* (‘in the back, later, at the end’) (Ջահուլյան 2010, 458;

⁷⁴ Գրիգորյան 1963, (22) 105, (112) 151, (203) 191, (218) 197, (362) 255, (376) 259, (389) 263–264, (392) 265, (465) 294–295, (494) 308, (527) 320 etc.

⁷⁵ Private correspondence with Professor Oleg Leszczak (23.09.2019).

Անանտյան 1977, 3: 83–84; Olsen 1999, 21, 22 etc.). Անիլ [anil] is a derivative of *աննիլ* [arnel] and comes from the Proto-Indo-European stem *ar* (‘to do, make’) (Անանտյան 1971, 1: 262).

PM: the noun comes from Latin *dilation* (‘postponing’, ‘to delay’) (*Encyklopedia PWN*), and since at least the 16th century in Old Polish law, it has meant ‘postponement, postponing the deadline (in principle, judicial)’ (Bąk 1972, 6: 282). However, the claimant had to be right and acting according to the law (Gloger 1901, 1: 88).

R: Harkavets proposes *dilacja* [dilatsʰja] as the Polish version of *dylacja* [dylatsʰja] next to Kipchak *dilaciya* [dilatsʰija] (Гаркавец 2010, 427). The Armenian protocol does not distinguish which version should be considered as the source of the borrowing (“[...] այժմ եկաւ առաջի դատաստանին եւ խնդրեց սիլեցիա [diletsʰia][...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (164) 172–173) (someone in court asked to postpone the case). Apart from Polish Armenian, this term has never been used in Eastern or Western Armenian dialects.

41. **L:** **ուօղլաս** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 769) [doklad] (Pol. *dokładka*,⁷⁶ Eng. *makeweight/addition*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 568; Ալեքեան 1868, 447).

AT: MAD’s proposal to translate **ուօղլաս** [doklad] as *հավելում* [havelum] (also *հավելումթ* [havelujtʰ]), in this case, is accurate. The classical form in Old Armenian was *յաւելել* [havelel], which we can also find in 17th-century dictionaries (cf. Rivola 1633, 272; Մեղրեցի 1698, 223). The verb comes from the Proto-Indo-European stem **obhel-* (‘to add’) – cognate with Greek *ὀφείλω* (‘to increase, to add’), etc. (Ջահուկյան 2010, 101).

PM: in Polish it would be *dokładka* instead of *dokladka* [dokladka] as in MAD (printing error?). We also have the noun *dokład* [doklad] with the meaning of ‘more, added to something, an addition to some quantity’ (Doroszewski), ‘the inquiry for a conclusion/adjustment, etc.’ (Doroszewski; Urbáńczyk 1956–1959, 2: 114).

⁷⁶ According to: Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 769).

R: in the text of 1438, we can also read *nadoklad* (Akta grodzkie... 1887, 12: 34) with the above-mentioned meaning of an ‘inquiry for a conclusion/adjustment’. In the case of the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocol, it is obviously referring to *doklad* in the sense of ‘makeweight’ (as ‘interest due to debt/loan’): “[...] զի **գոօգլասն [zdokladn]** այլ վնարէ. որ է Գ (3)-ական սպիտակ: [...] եւ զթօրպան. եւ զայն **ոօգլասն [dokladn]** այլ Ժ (10) ֆորինին եւ այսպէս ազատ առաւել զինքն” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (152) 168) (except for substantial debt, somebody must pay also the *doklad* – ‘makeweight’). There is also a possibility to find sources of the loanword in Ruthenian/Ukrainian where *доклад/докладка* [doklad/dokladka] has almost the same (additive) meaning as in Polish (Желехівський 1886, 1: 194). For Kipchak (where I think it could have come through Polish Armenian), Harkavets also adds another meaning (related to legal terminology) – ‘clause’ (Гаркавец 2010, 433).

42. **L:** **փրօքուրատոր** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 794) [p^hrok^huratur] (Pol. *prokurator*, Eng. *public prosecutor*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 739; Ալգերեան 1868, 569; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 680).

AT: the translation *դատաչազ* ([dataχaz] ‘prosecutor’) is not entirely precise for this case. *դատաչազ* [dataχaz] is an Iranian loanword *dāt(d)-χvāz* or *dādχvāh* (‘prosecutor’) – *dāt* (‘judgment’) and **χvāz* from the stem *χvāstan* (‘to want’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 186; Անտեան 1971, 1: 629) and means ‘foe, adversary, accuser’ (Մեղրեցի 1698, 74; Մալխասեանց 1944, 1: 493; Olsen 1999, 876).

PM: in the 16th century, in the lawful world, the word *prokurator* (a loanword from Latin *procurator*) in Poland was not so much a ‘prosecutor’ (though the word definitely has this meaning today) but a ‘law enforcement officer, a spokesman for the law’. As an equivalent of the Polish *prokurator*, Linde proposes the Russian *стряпчей* [strjapčej], which in the 16th–19th centuries had the rank (position) of a Russian civil servant (Linde 1811, 2, 2): 1042; Успенский 1818, 2: 169–171; Sobol 1995, 904). Antoni Krasnowolski and Władysław Niedźwiedzki also confirm the fact that *prokurator* was a ‘lawyer’ or ‘legal representative’. The *փրօքուրատոր* [p^hrok^huratur] could have also been the ‘protector’ of one of the parties to the trial like ‘patron’ (Krasnowolski and Niedźwiedzki 1920, 1: 407).

R: the protocol of Kamianets-Podilskyi Court (mentioned in MAD as the illustration of the word *փրօքուրատոր* [p^hrok^huratur]) clearly demonstrates that *փրօքուրատոր* [p^hrok^huratur] means ‘proxy, legal representative’ (as in the 15th century) (Urbańczyk 1973–1977, 7: 56). In the text we can also see that Armenians still used the equivalent of *փրօքուրատոր* [p^hrok^huratur] – the above-mentioned Armenian *դատախազ* ([dataχaz] modern ‘prosecutor, accuser’), which we can understand also as ‘proxy, legal representative’. This fact proves that Armenians from Poland knew the Armenian word for *փրօքուրատոր* [p^hrok^huratur] and used the noun as a legal term in both languages. Here we have: “[...] զնոցա բանն առաջ տանել եւ **դատախազ [dataχaz]** լինել վասն ամենայնի. [...] եթէ կամիցեն ընդունել զայսպիսի մոցովանեան. զոր առել է իւր մերձաւորն. [...] քո տեղդ ուրիշ մարդ դնել որպէս **փրօքուրատոր [p^hrok^huratur]** [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (322) 242) (‘[...] to move his things forward and to be a **prosecutor** (*դատախազ* [dataχaz]) for all. [...] if they want to accept such credentials (trust deed) that his relative has given . [...] put another person in your place as a legal representative (**փրօքուրատոր [p^hrok^huratur]**) [...]”). In Kipchak, besides *prokurator* ([prokurator] as ‘representative, attorney, authorized person, lawyer’ etc.), we can also find *prokuratoroka* ([prokuratoroka] ‘representative, attorney, authorized defender, protectress’) (Гаркавец 2010, 1181) – the feminine form of *prokurator*. Bozhko presents *փրօքուրատոր* [p^hrok^huratur] as a Ukrainian loanword (Բոժկո 2010, 112), which is uncertain. In Ukrainian, the noun *прокурор* [prokuror] / *прокуратор* [prokurator] is rather a French loanword (Мельничук 2003, 4: 595–596). Russian also acquired *прокуратор* (as ‘proxy, legal representative’) from Polish (*prokurator*) or German (*Prokurator*) (Фасмер 1987, 3: 374).

43. **L: բօմորնիք** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 821) [k^homornik^h] (Pol. *komornik*, Eng. *bailiff*) (Ասմանզուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 73; Ալգերեան 1868, 59).

AT: (*դատական*) *կատարածու* [(datakan) kataratsu] – ‘bailiff’. Here, *դատական* [(datakan] ‘judicial’) is a derivative of *դատ* [dat]⁷⁷ and *կատարածու* ([kataratsu] ‘executor’), which is possibly Proto-Indo-European **gu-od-* from the stem **geu-* (‘to bend, tilt’, ‘build an arch’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 389).

⁷⁷ Similar to the case of **փրօքուրատոր** [p^hrok^huratur] – entry no. 42.

PM: since 15th century *komornik* [komornik] was the ‘clerk at the side of the voivode, castellan, chamberlain, judge, performing auxiliary judicial activities, court janitor, peacekeeper, courtier’ (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 324). *Komornik* (*քօմօրնիկ* [k^homornik^h]) is a derivative of *komora* (*քօմօրայ* [k^homoraj]): in Old Polish somebody who ‘was administrating, looking after the komora (chamber/քօմօրայ)’, which also meant ‘treasurer or a clerk for various actions/claims/messages’ (Boryś 2008, 246–247). The noun also had the same meaning in Kipchak (Гаркавец 2010, 712).

R: *քօմօրնիկ* [k^homornik^h] in this court protocol (“Չոր դատաստանն զայս Չ (6) ֆորիինն ետուր եւ Ա (1) խալի գնեց եւ ետուր վոյվոսային մարդոյ: Եւ այլ ետուն այս Չ (6) ֆորինէն Ա (1) դայլառ եւ Ա (1) օրդ խալիու **քօմօրնիկին** [k^homornik^hin]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (417) 276)) is very difficult to interpret unequivocally, but the point is probably that the representative of the voivode – bailiff (for case handling/enforcement etc.) got (or got back) a commission for buying a carpet for the voivode.

44. **L:** **քօմօրայ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 821) [k^homoraj] (Pol. *komora*, Eng. *chamber*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 146; Ալգերեան 1868, 121; Ալգերեան and Պրէստեան 1821, 1: 135).

AT: there is no direct translation into Armenian, so the proposal of MAD for *քօմօրայ* [k^homoraj] as *փոքր սենյակ* [p^hok^hr senjak] (‘a small room’) seems to be the best. *փոքր* [p^hok^hr] is from Proto-Indo-European **phuku-*, which comes from the stem **pōk* (‘small’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 769) and *սենյակ* [senjak] (derivative of *սենեակ* [seneak]) is probably from the Indo-European stem **sk'i-* ‘light shine, shade’ (Ջահուկյան 2010, 676) (on the other hand, we can also compare it with Urartian *šir-sini* – ‘stone house’, *sini* – ‘house, room’, *šina* – ‘house’, etc. (Անտեսան 1979, 4: 201)). The noun *քօմօրայ* [k^homoraj] also has some other meanings: ‘a room or a living room, storage space for household items’ (or even ‘cellar, inn, cell’). The word meant additionally ‘a treasury, the treasure of a prince or state’, etc. (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 322–323). In Kipchak (rather from Armenian), we also can see the form *komara* in the sense of ‘a customs office (customs warehouse), a small room for ship’ or just ‘a room’ (Гаркавец 2010, 711, 712; Boryś 2008, 246). The meaning of ‘customs office’ can also be found in

Linde’s dictionary (Linde 1808, 1, 2: 1058). Thus, in the case of the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocol, the translation ‘small room’ is accurate. However, as we saw, there were also other meanings of the noun.

PM: the Polish meanings were presented above, but it is worth adding that the word has been in use in Polish since the 14th century and is a (Middle) Latin loanword – *camara/camera* (‘vault’, ‘roof’, ‘chamber, room’, ‘flat’, ‘dining room’, ‘bedrooms’, ‘treasury’) (Boryś 2008, 246).

R: the fragment of the Armenian Court protocol is obviously about renting a small room: “[...] զի վարձեն մեզի Ա (1) **քօմօրայ** [**k^homoraj**]: [...] եւ վարձեցին մեզի Ա (1) **քօմօրայ** [**k^homoraj**] եւ ես վճարեցի զհախն զիմ հալլալ սպիտակով [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (67) 128). In Polish, since the 16th century *mieszkanie komorq* meant also ‘not to live at own home / in own house’ (Brückner 1927, 1: 250).

45. **L:** **օրէքուն** (Ռազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 822) [opek^h(k)un] (Pol. *opiekun*, Eng. *protector, guardian*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 416, 740; Ալգերեան 1868, 345, 570; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 404, 681).

AT: *խնամակալ* ([χnamakal] ‘legal guardian’) is a loanword derived from *խնամ* [χnam] of an unknown origin (Ջահուկյան 2010, 335; Անտոնյան 1973, 2: 378; Olsen 1999, 16), with the conjunction *ու* [a] and the verb *կալ* [kal] from Proto-Indo-European **guol-* from the stem **geu-* (‘to bend’), and is rather a cognate of the Ancient Greek ἐγγυαλιζω (‘put into the palm of the hand’) and Latin *vola* (palm) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 373; Olsen 1999, 541, 565 etc).

PM: *opiekun* (since the 15th century (Boryś 2008, 393)) in Polish is *somebody* ‘who cares for someone, cares for something, has something or somebody in his power, effort, defense’ (Urbańczyk 1965–1969, 5: 600). Wiesław Boryś claims that *opieka* (since the 14th century) has only occurred in Polish (Boryś 2008, 392), but the stem of the noun is probably from Old Russian (*некуся* [pekusja] ‘to take care’) (Фасмер 1987, 3: 143). However, Nikolay Shanski and Grigoriy Krilov

emphasizes the fact that, in Russian, the word is a Polish loanword (Словарь Шанского; Словарь Крылова).

R: MAD explains *օրեքունի* [opek^hun] as a Russian loanword (*опекун* [opekun]) (Ղալաբաբյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 822), but it could also be a Polish loanword (*opiekun*), as it is extracted from the Kamianets-Podilskyi protocol, where the Court appoints a young girl's 'legal guardian' (Գրիգորյան 1963, (84) 136, (201) 189–190). The probability of borrowing from Russian is high, but rather only for Eastern Armenian. The Russian *опекун* [opekun] in the Eastern Armenian spelling was still in use at the beginning of the 20th century (e.g. Իսահակյան 1975, 3: 240). Although, sometimes, even during the later half of the 20th century, when writing about the past, *օպեկունի* [opekun] appeared in parentheses (Ահարոնյան and Միքայելեան 1926, 16; Մազմանյան 2005, 222). In the Polish Armenian dialect, it seems highly likely that *օրեքունի* [opek^hun] was borrowed from Polish, although one of the most outstanding researchers of the Polish Armenian language, Hanusz, does not mention the word in his works, neither as a noun (e.g. *opieka*, *opiekun* – ‘care’, ‘protector’) nor as a verb (e.g. *opiekować się* – ‘to take care after’) (cf. Hanusz 1886, 350–481; Hanusz 1889, 214–296). It is also very likely that the word passed to Kipchak through Armenian. For a Kipchak explanation of *opêkun*, *opekun* Harkavets suggests Armenian *աղիպիսուն* [aṙip^hatos], *աղիպիսուն* [ap^hiatos], etc. (Гаркавец 2010, 1057), which is a Greek loanword in classic Armenian (Համբարձումյան 2015, 81). Some Armenian sources also propose the Ukrainian *опікун* [opikun] (although not chronologically Ruthenian *опікун* [opikun] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 572)) as the source of the borrowing (Աբաջյան et al. 2017, 218–219; Գրիգորյան 2015, 31). These suggestions seem to be misguided because it is also a Polish loanword in Ukrainian (Мельничук 2003, 4: 199).

Musical art

46. **L:** **բանդուրա** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 84) [bandura] (Pol. *bandura*, Eng. *bandura* (cf. Ալգերեան 1868, 428)).

AT: *բանդուրա* in Armenian is the name of a Ukrainian, multi-stringed, musical instrument (Հայրապետյան 2011, 84). The dictionary ԺՀԼԲԲ gives only the Ukrainian origin (shunning the Ruthenian (Желехівський 1886, 12)) of the musical instrument – *բանդուրա* [bandura] – without its etymology (Դարիրյան 1969, 1: 282). The Armenian Encyclopedia, however, gives the 16th century as the origin of the word *bandura*, emphasizing its Polish roots (ՀՄՀ 1976, 2: 279).

PM: Aleksander Brückner argues that the word *bandura* has passed into Polish from the Italian *pandora* and was Latin *pandura* or Greek *πανδοῦρα* (Brückner 1927, 1: 14). Although Brückner claims that in the 17th century this noun passed from Poland to as he wrote Little Ruthenia (Ukraine) (Brückner 1927, 1: 14; Мельничук 1982, 1: 132; Желехівський 1886, 1: 12), Linde points to the Ukrainian (rather Cossack) use of the instrument (Linde 1807, 1: 50). SWO also emphasizes the Ukrainian origin of this instrument and points out that it has also been known in Polish since the 15th century. The dictionary also suggests a possible Dutch origin of the word (*bandoor*) which came from Spanish (*bandurria*) and there from Latin (*pandura*) (Sobol 1995, 108). However, the Есум emphasizes that *bandura* is borrowed from Greek or, via Polish, from Italian (*pandura*) and has been functioning in the language since the 18th century (Мельничук 1982, 1: 133). Vasmer is also of the same opinion – *bandura* is a borrowing from Polish (Фасмер 1986, 1: 120).

R: chronological approach shows that the source of *bandura* could however be Polish. But its lack in Polish Armenians' vocabulary raises the question whether it could be a relatively recently borrowed from Russian *бандура* [bandura] (being a Ruthenian/Ukrainian musical instrument). In Armenian we find also a Polish

explanation of *бандура* as the Ukrainian musical instrument – in the source of the word (the origin of the noun) we read ‘Polish bandura’ (Մելիք-Վրթանեսյան and Տոնյան 1989, 22).

47. **L:** **տ(թ)ելեմբաս**⁷⁸ (Hanusz 1886, 465) [telembas/t^helembas] (Pol. *dobosz*, Eng. *drummer* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 287; Ալզերեան 1868, 248; Ալզերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 286)).

AT: *թմբկահար* [t^hmbkahaɾ] is a compound noun from *թմբուկ* ([t^hmbuk] ‘drum’) from Iranian **tuməbak*, *tānbuk*, *tunbak*, *tanbak* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 268; Անանեան 1973, 2: 189–190) and *հարել/յարել* ([harel] ‘to hit’) a Proto-Indo-European verb from the stem **per-* (‘to hit’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 450; Անանեան 1977, 3: 53).

PM: *telembas* ([telembas] drummer (of Turkish ‘drum with bells’)) was also known as *tolombas* [tolombas], *tolumbas* [tolumbas], *tulumbas* [tulumbas], *tolombasy* [tolombasy], etc. and is a Turkish loanword (Hanusz 1886, 465; Linde 1812, 3: 634; Karłowicz et al. 1919, 7: 98; Sobol 1995, 1113; Kopaliński 1990, 515) that comes from *tulum* (‘leather bag’) from Mongolian (Nişanyan; cf. Kubbealti Lugati) or *timpani* and *bāz* (‘playing’) from Persian (Фасмер 1987, 4: 118).

R: it is difficult to say whether the noun is borrowed from Polish or from Turkish. Despite the right and logical associations, it should not be confused with the use of the Turkish loanword in Armenian *թուլումպա* ([t^hulumba] ‘pump’, ‘leather water bag’ etc.), which also has different transliterations with different literary and dialectal forms (Kubbealti Lugati; Անանեան 1902, 138; Մալխասեանց 1944, 2: 123; Սարգսյան 2002, 2: 141).

48. **L:** **լյուտնյա** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 254) [ljutnja] (Pol. *lutnia*, Eng. *lute* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 563; Ալզերեան 1868, 443; Ալզերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 525)).

⁷⁸ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) written by Hanusz was *telembas* [telembas].

AT: a very apt description is the DFW explanation – ‘plucked string musical instrument, which originated from the Arab-Iranian instrument *ud*’ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 254; cf. ՀՄՀ 1978, 4: 647). The English *lute* is also given in Armenian as *լիլի* (Գեորգեան, 1989: 100), with possible sources in Sanskrit *vīṇā*, Middle Persian *vīn*, Khotanese Saka *bina* or Sogdian *vyn* (Մայրապետյան 1945, 4: 343; Ջահուկյան 2010, 712).

PM: *lutnia* [lutnia] has been known since at least the 15th century as ‘a stringed instrument, lutnia (in some cases maybe also other stringed instruments, for example, zither or dulcimer’ (Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 84). The noun was borrowed into Polish from either Middle-Upper-German *Lūte* or probably Italian *liuto* (Sobol 1995, 668), where it penetrated from Old French (1275 *le’z*, 1380 *luth* etc.), being originally the Arabic noun ‘*al-’ūd* (‘wood’, ‘lute’), which was likely borrowed into the intermediary of Provençal or Spanish (TLFI; Turek 2002a, 98) or *oud* (Գեորգեան 1989, 100; Nişanyan; Brückner 1927, 1: 304).

R: the phonetics suggest a Russian loanword in Armenian – *лютня* [ljutnja], but the origin of the Russian word was Polish (Фасмер 1986, 2: 546; Հայրապետյան 2011, 254). In Harkavets’s Kipchak dictionary, instead of the expected Turkish *ut* (Nişanyan; cf. *Osmanlıca sözlük* pos. 10664), *lutnâ* (Гаркавец 2010, 931) is also given (the borrowing probably came through Armenian).

49. **L:** **կրակովյակ** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 313) [krakovjak] (Pol. *krakowiak*, Eng. *krakowiak* or *cracovian* – ‘Polish national dance/rhythm from Cracow’).

AT: *կրակովյակ* [krakovjak] is from the name of the city of Kraków (also confirmed by Brückner (Brückner 1927, 1: 264)). It is a Polish fast-paced national dance or the music that accompanies it (Աղայան 1971, 1: 773; Հայրապետյան 2011, 313; Դարապետյան 1978, 30; Brückner 1927, 1: 264).

PM: “[t]he dance dates back to the 16th and 17th centuries when it was included in organ and lute tablatures, as well as songbooks, under such titles as Chorea polonica or Polnisch Tanz. [...] In the mid-19th century, the *krakowiak* became

a popular ballroom dance in Austria and France and raise to prominence as the national dance of Poland” (Trochimczyk).

R: the borrowing of the Polish noun is through the intermediary of Russian due to the lack of Polish-Armenian cultural relationships in the 16th–17th centuries.

50. **L:** մազուրկա (Հայրապետյան 2011, 342) [mazurka] (Pol. *mazurek*,⁷⁹ Eng. *mazurka*).

AT: մազուրկա [mazurka] in Armenian, it is interpreted as ‘Polish national dance type or music written with that dance bar (or measure)’ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 342). A more detailed explanation includes that “it appeared in the Mazovia region in Poland, is a fast, dynamic dance which in the 19th century [and] became an international ballroom dance” (Դարպասյան 1978, 34–35). It is a Russian loanword (*мазурка* [mazurka]) in Armenian that appeared in Russian from Polish (Հայրապետյան 2011, 342; Фасмер 1986, 2: 558).

PM: “[m]azur, walc, polka [...] are mostly used in noble courts and among city meetings” (Kolberg 1884, IV). In fact, *mazurek* [mazurek] is ‘a short musical piece, stylized mazur, oberek or kujawiak, derived from Polish folk dances’ but *mazurka* [mazurka] (from *mazurek*) is a ‘fashionable dance in the mid-19th century in France, created from a combination of polka and *mazurek*’ (Zgółkowa 1999, 20: 386; sjp.pl).

R: of all the possible Polish forms (*mazur*, *mazurek*, *mazurka* (Мельничук 1989, 3: 360)) only *mazurka* appears in Armenian (and apparently also through Russian). The problem in the translation of DFW is only the following confusion: *մազուրկա* [mazurka] (the above-mentioned Polish musical form) is not *մազուրկնկ* [mazurek] (‘sparrow’, ‘cake’ etc.), but we can find this inaccuracy even in the dictionary of such an outstanding linguist as St. Malkhasyants (Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 233).

⁷⁹ Translation according to Հայրապետյան (2011, 342).

51. **L:** **պոլոնեզ** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 444) [polonez] (Pol. *polonez*, Eng. *polonaise*).

AT: is a Polish loanword with the meaning of ‘Polish solemn dance which was developed on the basis of folk dance of march, as well as its music’ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 444; Աղայան 1976, 2: 1222; Ժիլլը 1980, 4: 211; Դարպասյան 1978, 28).

PM: the *polonez* [polonez] (from French *polonaise*) or *polinoz*, *polomez*, *pol-ezon*, etc., is also known as ‘the Polish dance’: since the early 19th century, “the polonaise has been commonly considered as the oldest Polish national dance, its form cultivated among the upper classes as an elevated version of dances traditionally performed in Poland” (tance.edu.pl).

R: it is highly probable that this Polish noun has passed into Armenian through Russian *полонез* [polonez].

52. **L:** **ցիմբալ** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 583) [ts^himbal] (Pol. *cymbał*, Eng. *cymbal*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 220; Ալգերեան 1868, 196).

AT: *ցիմբալ* [ts^himbal] is used in Armenian as the musical instrument’s name with the equivalents *ծնծղա(յ)* [tsntsʰa(j)] from Assyrian *sessālā* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 366) and *սանդղոր* [sant^hur] from Turkish *santur* which passed there probably from Arab or Persian (Nişanyan; Մալխասեսյան 1945, 4: 464; ՀԱՀ 1984, 10: 28; Հայրապետյան 2011, 583).

PM: *cymbal* [ts^himbal] is a musical instrument that has been in Polish since the 15th century (Nitsch 1953–1955, 1: 339–340) which comes from Latin *cymbalum* (and is also still understood – in the colloquial meaning – as ‘silly idiot, jerk’ etc.) (Brückner 1927, 1: 69). The noun of that musical instrument was in use also in Ruthenian – *цимбал* [ts^himbal] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 1053), Kipchak *cymbal* [ts^himbal] (Гаркавец 2010, 358) etc.

R: *цимбал* [ts^himbal] is obvious a Polish loanword in Russian (Фасмер 1987, 4: 306) but passed into Armenian from Russian.

Clothes, fabrics, garments

53. **L:** **ստամաշքա** (Դազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 82) [adamaʃk^ha] (Pol. *adamaszek*, Eng. *damask* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 222; Ալզերեան 1868, 197; Ալզերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 225)).

AT: *ստամաշքա* [adamaʃk^ha] (Գրիգորյան 1963, (445) 286–288) is ‘a kind of fabric’ (Դազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 82) and has an apt translation in Armenian – *դամասկ* [damask] from the name of Damascus⁸⁰ as the ‘flowered fabric of satin’ (Մալխասեանց 1944, 1: 484; Աղայան 1976, 1: 272). The more precise equivalent is *կերպաս* [kerpas], which is a Persian loanword: *karpās/ karbās* – ‘cotton’ (Ջահուկյան 2010, 401; Olsen 1999, 435–436; Rivola 1633, 198; Մեղրեցի 1698, 161). There is also another possible translation *սալրշում* [apɾʃum] / *աբրշում* [abrʃum] / *աբրեշում* [abreʃum] / *աբրիշում* [abriʃum] (‘silk’) from Persian *abrišum* (Աղայան 1976, 1: 1; Մալխասեանց 1944, 1: 3).

PM: *adamaszek* [adamaʃek] or *jadamaszek* [jadamaʃek] has been used in Polish since the 15th century and is ‘a one-color silk fabric, the pattern is woven with a different weave’ (SPXVI; Nitsch 1953–1955, 1: 21). It was also a fabric named after the city of Asian Damascus (Linde 1807, 1, 1: 4; Gołębiowski 1861, 91). The word’s primary origin is Arabic (Turek 2002b, 98–101).

R: *ստամաշքա* [adamaʃk^ha] is definitely a loanword only in Polish Armenian. The basic vocabulary of Eastern and Western Armenians has had the mentioned equivalent – *դամասկ* [damask]. It is difficult to say unequivocally whether the noun has penetrated from Polish to Armenian or from Armenian to Polish because, beyond doubt, in the Middle Ages and from about the 14th to about the 17th century, Armenians trading with the Orient also brought *damask* to Poland (Bornińska

⁸⁰ The capital of Syria.

2020).⁸¹ Even Polish King Sigismund I went to major ceremonies in red damask and was buried in a damask dress (Gołębiowski 1861, 91). Moreover, in textile “nomenclature” there were also *metlik adamaszkowy* [metlik adamaʃkovi] (Turnau 1987, 603) (must be rather *mętlik* [mentlik], a kind of dress or coat (Popliński and Łukasiewicz 1842, 21)), “ornate fawn damask with gold” (Turnau 1987, 606; Gołębiowski 1861, 14), “damask dolman” (Turnau 1987, 606) or “crimson red damask żupan” (Gołębiowski 1861, 16), etc.⁸² In this situation, it can be presumed that the noun was first introduced into Polish by the Armenians, which does not mean that the Armenians themselves could not borrow it back later.

54. **L: բլախօթ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 120) [plaχod/plaχot] (Pol. *plachta* – ‘duża bawełniana chusteczka’⁸³, Eng. *sheet, canvas, cloth* – ‘large cotton handkerchief’ (cf. Ասմանգույյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 135, 162, 859; Ալզերեան 1868, 108, 138, 646)).

AT: *բայթան* ([k^hat^han] ‘canvas’, ‘cotton’) is the noun form of the adjective *բայթանի* [k^hat^hane], used by MAD and comes from Iranian *katān/kātan* (Մալխասեանց 1945, 4: 572). Of course, we can also take into account the possible equivalent of *կտավ* ([ktav] also as ‘canvas’, ‘cotton’) which probably comes from Indo-European *kut* (‘seed’), which has spread throughout Central Asia and Europe, yielding various derivatives. There is also the contrary opinion that all forms are

⁸¹ As noted by Mańkowski, Lviv, Brody and a number of other smaller towns, especially those where Armenians, and Greeks settled, such as Stanisławów, Jazłowiec, Kamianets-Podilskyi, and Zamość (in general the south-eastern borderlands), in the 17th and 18th centuries were the vestibule of the artistic culture of the Muslim Orient in Poland. At the fairs in these places, eastern goods met those “imported” from the West – Italy, Flanders, etc., and were popular. In the first half of the 17th century, they were imported from the East and the **złotogłów** [zlotogluw], **scarlets**, half-scarlets, **granats**, and half-granats colors gradually replaced the older, trimmed Venetian and Genoese or Lucca velvets, **tabinets** with gold, in **kanafas**, Neapolitan uncropped velvets, damasks from Lucca, and Florentine satins. Under the commercial “blows” of the Muslim Orient (very often “inflicted” through the Armenians). For example, in 1649 in Lviv a powerful and famous warehouse and company of Italian fabrics, Filia Duci, went bankrupt (cf. Mańkowski 1935, 46). For further information on terms **in bold**, see the explanation at the end of this chapter (pp. 106–107).

⁸² The translations of the fabrics by the author.

⁸³ Both the translation and the explanations are according to Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 120).

from the Sumerian *gada*, from which came the Akkadian *kitū(m)* and so on. But none of these explain the Armenian form. Moreover, the Assyrian *gəttau* (‘cotton’) is not from Akkadian but Armenian (Ջահուկյան 2010, 432).

PM: the etymology is clear: the noun comes from Proto-Slavic (or Old-Slavic (Мельничук 2003, 4: 433)) *plachъta* (a large wide piece of thick fabric) which also comes from Proto-Slavic *placha* (something flat and wide) (Borys 2008, 422; Фасмер 1987, 3: 275–276). At least since the 15th century *plachta* means ‘big sheet, canvas, cloth, a piece of canvas used for various duties, e.g. for carrying grass, covering a horse or type of fishing net’ in Polish (Urbańczyk 1970–1973, 6: 115). It is also possible to interpret it as ‘bedsheet, kerchief around the head of countrywoman, linen raggedy, ugly shawl, bedsheet, cloth, lobe’ etc. (Linde 1811, 2: 721).

R: only the ‘large sheet (canvas, cloth) handkerchief’ translation proposed by MAD narrows the meaning of the word. The above-mentioned Polish explanation just suggests that the translation in the Armenian dictionary is not entirely accurate. The Armenians definitely had access to the other meanings of that noun. Brückner claims that this is a general Slavic word (Brückner 1927, 2: 419). For Kipchak (*plaxta*) Harkavets gives only the Ukrainian meaning (not mentioning the Ruthenian *плахта* [plaxta] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 657)) and only in the sense of Ukrainian women’s decorated clothes, which also narrows the field of application of the noun (Гаркавец 2010, 1143).

55. **L:** **զբօնքա, զփօնքա** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 203) [z^h(p)onk^ha], **սփօնքա** (Գրիգորյան 1963, (298) 233) [sp^honk^ha] (Pol. *zaponka*, Eng. *cufflink* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 216; Ալզերեան 1868, 192; Ալզերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 219)).

AT: *նարմանդ* [tʃarmand] is interpreted by Acharyan as coming from Persian *karmand* (‘strong, steadfast’) (Անանեան 1977, 3: 192) but Gevorg Jahukyan is not convinced of the source of the borrowing (Ջահուկյան 2010, 490). Olsen interprets *նարմանդ* as ‘loop’, which, she believes is derived from the root **k^velh₃*- (turn) with the suffix *-mand* (Olsen 1999, 893).

PM: *zaponka* [zaponka] has had different meanings – ‘cufflink, decorative buckle, buckle, bump, button, hairpin, safety pin, fastening pin, necklace, bracelet, hook and eye clasp, hook’ etc. (Urbańczyk 1995–2002, 11: 158–159; Linde 1814, 6: 755). The noun is a common Slavic word which, according to G. Krilov, is a diminutive of the now lost Proto-Slavic noun *запона* ([zapona] ‘metal buckle’), formed from the verb *занати* ([zapati] ‘to hold up, to delay’) (Словарь Крылова; Мельничук 1985, 2: 237)

R: *զբօնքի* [zph(p)onk^ha] / *զփօնքի* [zphonk^ha] / *սփօնքի* [sphonk^ha] is obviously a Polish loanword. In Armenian, the vocabulary of indigenous or Indo-European origin for thematic classification of clothing and ornamentation (the semantic field) is poor (Աբաջյան et al. 2017, 136). Thus, from its appearance, *zaponka* (cf. Ferriere 2016), *cufflink* (*զբօնքի* [zph(p)onk^ha] / *զփօնքի* [zphonk^ha] / *սփօնքի* [sphonk^ha] / *նարմանի* [tʃarmand]), was rather used among Armenians who had close ties with Europe, primarily those who lived there. In one of Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocols, we see all of these terms – *զբօնքի*, *զփօնքի*, *սփօնքի*: “[...] սովել էր **սփօնքաներ** [sp^honk^haner] [...] ոսկեղբերու **զփօնքաներն** [zphonk^hanern] [...]: [...] գոր **զբօնքաներն** [zph(p)onk^hanern] առել է ի Հաննայէն [...]: [...] զի **զբօնքաներն** [zph(p)onk^hanern] դարձնէ ոսկեղբած [...]” (‘[...] gave սփօնքաներ [...] to gold plate զփօնքաներն [...]. [...] took զբօնքաներն of Hanna [...]. [...] to give back gold plated զբօնքաներն [...]’) (Գրիգորյան 1963, (298) 233). In Eastern Armenian, along with the literary form, *նարմանի* [tʃarmand] occurs as a slang term borrowed from the Russian *затинка* [zapinka], the nouns *զատինկա* [zapinka] / *զապոնկա* [zaponka] with the same meaning. It was possible to see that noun in media till the 1920s and 1930s (sometimes in quotation marks (Յոսկյան 2004, 182) but not always (Արուստյան 1935, 4)).

56. **L:** **կուրտկա** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 320) [kurtka] (Pol. *kurtka*, Eng. *jack-et*). (Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 507; Ալգերեան 1868, 412; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 487).

AT: there is not an Armenian equivalent for *կուրտկա* [kurtka], and it can be described as a man’s (but not only) ‘short outerwear’ (Աղայան 1971, 1: 786). It is still used today as *կուրտկա* [kurtka].

PM: the diminutive of *kurta* [kurta] is *kurtka* [kurtka]. The noun has been in use in Polish since the 16th century and is probably a Romanian (*scurtă*) or Hungarian (*kurta*) loanword, which possibly comes from Latin *curtus* – ‘shortened, cut (off)’ (Boryś 2008, 275–276; Brückner 1927, 1: 284).

R: in Russian, *куртка* [kurtka] is an obvious Polish loanword (Brückner 1927, 1: 284; Фасмер 1986, 2: 430). As a primary source, Vasmer even surmises the Iranian origin of this noun (cf. Фасмер 1986, 2: 430). The noun is a Russian loanword in Armenian.

57. **L:** **կրավեց**⁸⁴ (Hanusz 1886, 429) [kravets^h] (Pol. *krawiec*, Eng. *tailor*). (Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 968; Ալգերեան 1868, 709).

AT: the right translation *դերձակ* [derdzak] (cf. Rivola 1633, 91–92) is rather an Iranian loanword (cf. Middle Persian *derzīk*, Persian *derzī* – ‘tailor’), but it is possible that Armenian *դերձակ* [derdzak] comes from Proto-Indo-European stem **dhergh-*/**dherǵh-* (‘to rotate, twirl, turn, contort’) (Ջահնկյան 2010, 195; Աճառեան 1971, 1: 656; Olsen 1999, 291).

PM: *krawiec* [krav(i)ets^h] has been in use since the 15th century (‘craftsman sewing clothes’). It comes from South-Slavic **kravьcbь* (‘one who cuts, cuts fabrics and sews clothes from them’), and is the name for the activity’s performer with the suffix **-ьcbь* from Proto-Slavic **kravati* (‘to cut’) (Boryś 2008, 257; Linde 1808, 1, 2: 1122–1123).

R: *կրավեց* [kravets^h] has never been in use independently in Armenian. Hanusz deduces *kravec* (in Armenian *կրավեց*) from Ruthenian *кравець* [kravets^h] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 374). However, there is no reason to completely reject Polish *krawiec* as the source of the borrowing. Kipchak *kravec* [kravets^h] (Гаркавец 2010, 752) could also have been borrowed from Armenian.

⁸⁴ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *kravèc* [kravets^h].

58. **L:** **կօշքար** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 393) [goʃkʰar] (Pol. *woźnica*, Eng. *coachman*⁸⁵); **կօշկար**⁸⁶ (Hanusz 1886, 407) [goʃkar] (Pol. *szewc*, Eng. *shoemaker*).

AT: according to MAD this noun is from Old Polish and means *սայլապան* ([sajlapan] ‘coachman’) (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 393). The word consists of *սայլ* ([sajl] ‘car, cart’), which is most likely a Phrygian loanword (**sattilia* from Indo-European stem **kʷat-*) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 666), the conjunction *ա* [a] and the noun *պան* [pan] with probably the Iranian affix *-pān* (later *-bān*) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 59; cf. Olsen 1999, 627) as in the noun ‘keeper’.

PM: I could not confirm in Polish sources MAD’s translation of *կօշքար* [goʃkar] (with the pronunciations goʃkʰar, goʃgar, koʃgar or koʃkʰar) in the meaning of Polish *woźnica* ([voʒnitsʰa] ‘coachman’).

R: on the same page of *կօշքար* [goʃkʰar] in MAD we can find the Armenian word *կօշկար* with the meaning *կոշկակար* ([koʃkakar] ‘shoemaker’) (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 393; Մալխասեանց 1944, 2: 512; Անառեան 1973, 2: 687). It is rather certain that the noun *կօշքար* is just ‘shoemaker’ and not ‘coachman’. The authors of MAD explain the word *կօշքար* as a ‘coachman’, probably under the influence of the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court trial documents (cf. Գրիգորյան 1963, (613) 355); however, from the texts of the court protocols, it is not unequivocal that *կօշքար* [goʃkʰar] is a ‘coachman’. Let us have a look at some excerpts of the said texts. “Ի յայս աւուր դատաստանին առջեւն եկաւ Ուլուխաթունն՝ Չլթիին կինն եւ գանկատ առաւ Իսաչերեւսին վերայ **կօշքար** [goʃkʰar]. Եթէ վարձել էր զինքն. զի տանէր ի Իտթինն եւ երբ եկաւ ի Իտթինն. նա արապայի մէջ ունէր կտաւ ԺԸ (18) կանգուն. նա կորսվել է եւ ոչ գիտեմ զինչ եղաւ եւ այժմ ես ի Իսաչերեւսն <եւ> գիտեմ:” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (613) 355). The protocol says that lady Ulukhatun, the wife of Chlthk, complained about the *կօշքար* [goʃkʰar] Khacheres whom she paid to take her to a certain town. The claim concerns the fabric which got lost from the carriage. It is not clear from this context that *կօշքար* [goʃkʰar] means ‘coachman’. It could simply identify the professional identity (could ‘shoemaker’ be also or ‘coachman’) of the person

⁸⁵ Both translations are according to Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 393).

⁸⁶ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) provided by Hanusz was *goškàr* [goškàr].

who accepted the lady's order of the transport. Another excerpt: “Եկաւ Անդոն ըռուզ՝ Միսքոյին որդին **կօշքարին** [goʃk^harin⁸⁷] եւ վկայեցոյ դատաստանին զիւր վերն. որ էր ձախ ձեռին վերայ դրով խոցած: Չոր այսպիսի վերքն. սասց թէ Սարգուլայէն ունի. որ է Սուվինիչին դռն: Եւ վասն այսպիսի գրոյս եւ վկայութեան ետուն դատաստանին բամեղնից:” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (40) 115). The protocol concerns the complaint of Ando, the son of *կօշքար* [goʃk^har] Misko, who sustained a hand wound with a sword by Sargul. Again, we are dealing with the professional identity of the complainant (*կօշքար* – ‘shoemaker’). The last example: “Եկին Բ (2) կողմն՝ Նորսէսն. էրեցփոխանին որդին. եւ Տօնիկն. **կօշքար** [goʃk^har] Իսաչերեսին որդին. իւրեանց մէջ միաբանելով եւ իւրեանց բարի կամաւն իրեր առաւ Տօնիկն” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (608) 353). One of the parties to the trial was the son of *կօշքար* (rather the ‘shoemaker’ and not the ‘coachman’) Khacheres. It is not clear from this context that *կօշքար* [goʃk^har] means ‘coachman’. There are a number of other obvious facts proving that *կօշքար* [goʃk^har] means ‘shoemaker’ and not ‘coachman’. The noun *կօշկար* [goʃk^har] as *կոշկակար* ([goʃk^hkakar] ‘shoemaker’) is also explained by other Armenian dictionaries (Մալխասեանց 1944, 2 512; Աճառեան 1973, 2: 687 etc.). The outstanding Armenian linguist Acharyan particularly emphasizes that the *կոշկակար* ([g/koʃk^hkakar] ‘shoemaker’) is called *կօշկար* [goʃk^har] by Polish Armenians (Աճառեան 1973, 2: 687; Աճառեան 1953, 75–76), which is confirmed by Hanusz – an expert on the dialect of Polish Armenians. He interprets the word *goškàr* [koʃk^har] in the dialect of the Polish Armenian town of Kutuy as *kòškakar* ([koʃkakar] ‘shoemaker’) (Hanusz 1886, 407). Moreover, Kristóf Szongott writes that the Hungarian Armenian surname *Goskár* [koʃk(g)ar] comes from Armenian language and means ‘shoemaker’ (Szongott 2016, 120). The difference of pronunciation between J. Hanusz’s *goškàr* [koʃk^har] and MAD *կօշքար* [goʃk^har] could be a mistake or specific personal pronunciation of *k* like *k^h* by the Court clerk (*ք* [k^h] instead of *կ* [k]). Unfortunately, this misinterpretation of meaning has been somewhat preserved in different Armenian sources (Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան 2015, 30; Գրիգորյան 2017, 60). The word *կոշիկ* ([g/koʃik] ‘shoe’ (Olsen 1999, 457, 888)), whose derivative is *կօշկար* [goʃk^har], comes from Pahlavian *kafšik* (or *kafšak* and Persian *kafš*) with the meaning of ‘shoe’. Moreover, from Persian *kafšgar/kawš-gār* (*kawš* – ‘shoe(s)’, and *kār* – ‘do’) comes the noun ‘shoemaker’, which was borrowed from the Turkish as *köşgër* (‘shoemaker’) (Աճառեան 1973, 2: 687; Nişanyan). Similarities are evident.

⁸⁷ The suffix *-in* is the dative ending in Armenian.

So, even if we take into account the Turkish influence on Armenian (although, as we have seen, the word came into both languages from Iranian sources), I am even more convinced that we are talking about a ‘shoe(maker)’. Moreover, the Polish *szewc* comes from Proto-Slavic *šьvьcьb (‘the one who sews clothes, footwear’) and has been in use in Polish since at least the 14th century (Boryś 2008, 603; Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 599). This noun has nothing in common with *կօշկար*. Finally, one may also suppose that *kosz* [koʃ] in Old Polish also meant ‘wagon/car basket’ (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 357) and somehow we could derive (translate?) from it the word *կօշքար* [goʃkʰar]. However, in my opinion, it could be an overinterpretation. There is also a resemblance with Kipchak *koš* (Tatar ‘tabor, camp’) (Гаркавец 2010, 719) with some distant associations (speculations?): the Ottoman *kâr* means ‘work’ and added to the *koš* gives the *koškâr* (coachman). Of course, Kipchak was close to Armenian; however, chronologically speaking, this is a false, yet conceivable, assumption. In other words, the noun *կօշքար* [goʃkʰar] is obviously not a Polish loanword as MAD suggests.

59. **L:** **հաշքա** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 409) / **հաշքա** (Գրիգորյան 1963, (136) 160–161) [hatʃʰkʰa/haʃkʰa] (Pol. *zaponka*, Eng. *cufflink*⁸⁸) like **զբօնքա** [zɸʰ(p)onkʰa], **զփօնքա** [zɸʰonkʰa] (cf. Ասմանզունյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 216; Ալգերեան 1868, 192).

AT: the Armenian translation of MAD is the same as that already examined **զբօնքա** [zɸʰ(p)onkʰa], **զփօնքա** [zɸʰonkʰa] – *հարմանդ*.

PM: *zaponka* as in the case of **զբօնքա** [zɸʰ(p)onkʰa], **զփօնքա** [zɸʰonkʰa].

R: if we interpret the noun *հաշքա* [hatʃʰkʰa], as MAD suggests, as *haczyk* [hatʃʰik], we will have unequivocally a ‘fork with bent ends or poker (fire hook)’ (Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 534). The Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocol (Գրիգորյան 1963, (136) 160–161), however, shows that it is neither about the above-mentioned meaning, nor about ‘fire hook’ (Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 534), but *haczki* [hatʃʰki], which may be considered to have come from *haftka* ([haftka] ‘hook and eye, hook and eye clasp’), *zapinka do ubrań* (‘clasp for clothes’) or *fibula* (Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 534) (‘fibula’ [pin for fastening garments]) – ‘decorative,

⁸⁸ Both translations are according to Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 409).

metal clasp for fastening clothes, function and shape similar to modern safety pins (used instead of the buttons)’. As we can see, in the case of *գրօնքի, գիօնքի* [zph(p)onk^ha] the meaning ‘cufflink’ was obvious, but now we have a broader meaning. The Armenian translation *նարմանի* ([tʃarmand] ‘cufflink’) in this case appears to be incomplete and narrow-minded *հաշքի/հաշքի* [hatʃk^ha/haʃk^ha] seems to be a Polish loanword, but we cannot exclude the Ukrainian *зачка, зачок* ([hatʃk^ha, hatʃhok] Glosbe; Kyiv Dictionary) as another source of borrowing. Kipchak *hačka* [hatʃk^ha] (Гаркавец 2010, 599) is probably from the Armenian.

60. L: **հարսու** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 322) [harus] (Pol. *arus, harus, haras*, Eng. *arras*⁸⁹; cf. Ալգերեան 1868, 44). Do not confuse with *արսու* [arus] with the meaning of ‘a very fragrant incense resin’ which was used in perfumes and medicines – *liquid ambar* (Մալխասյանց 1944, 1: 279).

AT: *հարսու* [harus] primarily came from the name of the French city Arras and has no other equivalent in Armenian. It is explained as ‘a type of woolen soft winding thread’ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 322). I could not find it in modern Armenian.

PM: in Polish, *arus* [arus] (also old forms *harus* [harus], *haras* [haras], *harasz* [harash], *aras* [aras], *rasa* [rasa], *rasza* [rasha]) is ‘a type of light wool cloth’ (Linde 1808, 1, 2: 820, 823; Linde 1812, 3: 14) and was used for women’s dresses and skirts or for outer clothing (cf. SPXVI). The noun has been known since at least 1384 (Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 540; *Encyklopedia PWN*).

R: in Russian, *гарус* [garus] is a loanword from Polish (*haras* [haras] or *harus*) (Фасмер 1986, 1: 39) as well as in Ruthenian (Желехівський 1886, 1: 138) and Ukrainian *гарус* [harus] (Мельничук 1982, 1: 478) and in Kipchak *haras* [haras] (rather through Armenian) (Гаркавец 2010, 568), etc. However, the DFW explains it as a Russian loanword in Armenian. The analysis seems logical, although there is one problem. In Russian, it is *гарус* [garus] but in Armenian it is *հարսու* [harus], similar to Polish (*harus/arus* – known to us as a kind of textile (Linde 1807, 1, 1: 28; Linde 1808, 1, 2: 823) or Ruthenian *гарус* [harus] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 138), which suggests likely a direct borrowing from either Polish or Ruthenian

⁸⁹ In English, it means ‘tapestry’ or ‘wall hanging’, which is the nearest meaning of Armenian *արսու* (Pearsall 1999, 74). I could not find other appropriate translations.

(Ukrainian). However, in modern Armenian there is also an obvious direct Russian borrowing instead of *հարու*: it is *գարու* [garus] – ‘high quality woolen thread’ (Ժիլը 1969, 1: 377) or ‘a cotton fabric that gives the impression of a wool when touched’ (Աղայան 1976, 1: 223).

61. **L: նահաւիցա** (Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան 2015, 30; Գրիգորյան 2017, 57) [nahavitsa] (Pol. *ściąg*, Eng. *stitch*⁹⁰) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 201; Ալգերեան 1868, 179; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 203).

AT: the meaning of *ասեղնազործել* [aseɣnagortsɛl]⁹¹ is a combined derivative from *ասեղ* ([aseɣ] needle) (an unknown source) and *զործ* ([gorts] ‘work’) – Indo-European **uorgo-* or **uergʰo* from the stem **uerg-* – ‘to act, operate’ (cf. Avestan *varəza-*, Greek *ἐργον*, Old Upper German *werk* – ‘to act, operate’ (Ջահուկյան 2010, 170)). Entire translation is erroneous.

PM: the meaning proposed by the above-mentioned Armenian sources – *ściąg*, has been in Polish since the 18th century (from Old Polish *ścięgać* since the 15th century, which is from dialectal Proto-Slavic **stęgb* (Boryś 2008, 612)) and has nothing in common with *նահաւիցա* [nahavitsa]. In fact, *նահաւիցա* means ‘a piece of clothing covering the leg’ (Urbańczyk 1965–1969, 5: 37).

R: the correct Polish source of the loanword could be *nogawica* [nogavitsa] in the sense of ‘a piece of clothing covering the leg’, which has been in use in Polish since the 15th century (Boryś 2008, 367) (the Proto-Indo-European stem was *h₃nog^{wh}-eh²* – ‘foot, leg’ (Derksen 2008, 355)). Moreover, the ending *-ica* in *նահաւիցա* [nahavitsa] is typical for nouns in the feminine form, but not for verbs – *uczennica* (‘schoolgirl’), *różnica* (‘difference’), *okolica* (‘area’), *prostownica* (‘hair? straightener’), etc. Thus, the translation of *նահաւիցա* [nahavitsa] as the verb *ասեղնազործել* [aseɣnagortsɛl] ‘to stitch’, is not correct. Furthermore, the text of the protocol lists what the tailor has sewn, including one *նահաւիցա* (Գրիգորյան 1963, (136) 160–161) – the noun and not the verb.

⁹⁰ Polish and English primary translations are on the basis of Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան (2015, 30, esp. 27–33); Գրիգորյան (2017, 57).

⁹¹ According to Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան (2015, 30); Գրիգորյան (2017, 57).

The phonetic construction suggests that the source of loanword is more likely Ukrainian *ногавиці* [nohavycsi] (Мельничук 2003, 4: 108; cf. Гаркавец 2010, 997). Bozhko also proposes Ukrainian as the source of the borrowing (Բոժկո 2010, 112), which we can also specify as *нагавиці* [nahavytsi] / *ногавиця* [nohavycsja] in Ruthenian (Желехівський 1886, 1: 469).⁹² Harkavets quite precisely suggests Armenian *անդրաշարտիք* ([andravartikh] ‘pantaloon’) or *վարտիք* ([vartikh] ‘pants’) as the equivalent of *նահաճիցա* [nahavitsa] (Гаркавец 2010, 997). Harkavets’s proposal – *անդրաշարտիք* [andravartikh] – consists of Armenian *անդր* [andr] or Persian *andar* (both ‘inner’) (Աճառեան 1971, 1: 192) and Iranian **varti* (from the stem *var-* – ‘to cover’) (Ջահնկյան 2010, 708). Middle Persian is also very likely, with **andravartikh* (‘underwear’) (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 325). One more substantive detail: *nogawica* [nogavits^ha] (in Polish: ‘a trouser-leg’, archaic), in a figurative sense, in the past meant in Polish ‘imprisonment in a narrow place where neither sitting, nor lying down is possible’ (Arct 1920, 253; Linde, 1809, 2, 1: 327). The noun existed only in the Polish Armenian dialect.

62. **L:** **շպիկա** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 402) [ʃpilka] (Pol. *szpilka*, Eng. *pin, stiletto heel, stiletto*).

AT: here are some usages of Russian *шпилька* [ʃpilka] (as a loanword in Russian from Polish *szpilka* [ʃpilka]) proposed by DFW with their modern Armenian equivalents (still in use). The first is *ծամկալ* [tsamkal]. In the 17th century it was also known as *ծամկապ* [tsamkap] (cf. Rivola 1633, 181; Մալխասեսյան 1944, 2: 325) – ‘hairpin, barrette, crest’: *ծամ* [tsam] – and is probably a borrowing from a Caucasian (Kartvelian language) source (cf. Ջահնկյան 2010, 358) and *կալ* [kal], as in the case of *նվեազանեալ* [nveazanɛaj] or *կապ* [kap], which could be from the Proto-Indo-European stem **ghabh-* or **gabh-* (‘to catch, take’) in parallel with the possible stem **kap-* (Ջահնկյան 2010, 384). We also have *վարսոնգ* [varsots^h] – ‘special shoe nail’. *վարսո* is an Iranian borrowing (cf. Middle-Iranian or Sogdian *vars*, Avestian *varəsa* etc.) (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 324; Olsen 1999, 909). However, the translation of the whole word (with the suffix *-ng* [ots^h] (*վարսոնգ* [varsots^h])) is uncertain because the same noun in Armenian means, primarily, ‘a metal or bone blunt knitting needle for making fabrics’ (Աղայան 1976, 2:

⁹² Also private correspondence with Professor Oleg Leszczak (28.03.2020).

1369). It seems that the translation could be better with the primary meaning of Polish *szpilka* [ʃpilka] (*վարսկալ* [varskal] / *վարսակալ* [varsakal] (Ժիրք 1980, 4: 383)). The next is *գամասուտղ* [gamaseʋ]. The use of this noun as ‘hairpin, pin, hair slide’ is not common because the word primarily means ‘a thin screw-rod for connecting two details to each other’ (Աղայան 1976, 1: 218). The word consists of *գամ* ([gam] ‘nail’), which is probably an Iranian borrowing (like Avestan *gāma*, Middle-Iranian *gām* – ‘step’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 147) and *սուտղ* [aseʋ].⁹³ There is also *կցասուտղ* (*գլխարկկնեղ*) ([kts^haseʋ (glχarkneri)] ‘safety-pin’) which is from *կցել* ([kts^hel] ‘to attach’) as the derivative of *կից* [kits^h] and according to Jahukyan could have come from the Proto-Indo-European stem **geit-so-* or **geit-sk-* (from **geit-* – ‘neighbor or to be attached to’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 407). The second element is *սուտղ*.⁹⁴ And finally, *խայթոց, կծու խոսք* [χajt^hots^h, ktsu χosk^h], which means ‘to make biting remarks about somebody, to make caustic remarks about somebody’ (Հայրսուպետյան 2011, 402), and it is possible to translate it this way only as the dictum of the equivalents of Polish expressions such as *wsadzić, wbijać komuś szpile* (lit. ‘stuck/stick pins into someone’) (Zgólkowa 2003, 41: 412). In Armenian, we can also find two frequently used versions of Russian *шпилька* [ʃpilka]: *լվացքի ճարմանկներ* [lvats^hk^{hi} tʃarmandner] – ‘laundry clip’ and *բարձր և բարակ կրունկով կոշիկներ* [bardzr (j)ev barak krunknerov kofikner] – ‘high-heeled shoes’/ ‘stilettos’.

PM: *szpila* [ʃpila] (from Latin *spinula* (Brückner 1027, 2: 55)), the basic form of *szpilka* [ʃpilka], has been known in Polish since the 15th century with the meaning of a ‘needle with a head’. The noun came from German *Spill(e)* (Boryś 2008, 606). Vasmer specifies that the Russian noun *шпилька* [ʃpilka] came from Polish, where it came from Late Middle High German and before that Early New High German *spille* (‘pin, needle’) or Middle Low German *spile* (‘spear, stick with a sharp end’) (Фасмер 1987, 4: 473), which is also confirmed by Brückner (1927, 2: 553–554) and several other sources. Сря disagrees with this, deriving *шпилька* [ʃpilka] directly from German *Spill* (Евгеньева 1984, 4: 728). In Old Polish *szpila* [ʃpila] meant ‘the subject of mockery’ (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 578). Now it has several meanings:

- ‘a small, narrow, sharp piece of metal used to attach, e.g., fabric’;
- ‘a thin and high heel in the shoe or a women’s high-heeled shoe’;

⁹³ As in the case of *նահավիցա* [nahavitsa] – entry no. 61.

⁹⁴ As in the case of *նահավիցա* [nahavitsa].

- ‘a rod with an eye or bend at one end for attaching a tent to the ground’;
- ‘a narrow, sharp leaf on a coniferous tree’;
- ‘a screw with thread on both sides’ (Zgółkova 2003, 41: 412–413; Brückner 1927, 2: 553–554).

R: Obviously, it is not a direct Polish borrowing in Armenian. շպիկա [ʃpɪlka] has its equivalents in Armenian, which have been in active usage by native speakers; however, the Russian influences are sometimes visible (especially in the case of ‘hairpin’ and ‘laundry clip’).

63. **L:** չուխ⁹⁵ (Hanusz 1886, 391) [tʰuxɑ] (Pol. *czucha(j)*, Eng. *broadcloth as (coarse) heavy cloth*) (cf. Ալգերեան 1868, 96; Ալգերեան and Պրէմսեան 1821, 1: 106).

AT: չխ⁹⁵ [tʰoxɑ] (Rivola 1633, 309) or չուխ⁹⁵ [tʰuxɑ] as ‘fine woven woolen fabric’ and ‘cloth’ (Սարգսյան 2007, 4: 446; Աղայան 1976, 2: 1166) passed into Armenian from Persian *čuxā* [tʰuxɑ] (Աճառեան 1977, 3: 633; Ջահուկյան 2010, 613). Sevan Nişanyan also emphasizes that ‘this type of wool fabric’ in Turkish is from Persian *čōxa* [tʰoxɑ] or *čūka* [tʰuxɑ] (Nişanyan). The Turkish path for the borrowing is especially interesting for the Armenian language because the noun չուխ⁹⁵ [tʰuxɑ] was obviously in usage in the Armenian (as a Persian loanword) when it passed into Turkish. In Turkish *çuha* [tʰuxɑ] appears for the first time in the medieval manuscript *Codex Cumanicus* (the beginning of 14th century) (Nişanyan), the vocabulary of which contains Kipchak (cf. Salan 2016). Though, chronologically (the period of Kipchak’s “extinction” among Polish Armenians), in the case of the Kutuy dialect, the Polish clue seems to be justified. The other option is that the noun simply stayed in Kutuy dialect from basic Armenian vocabulary. Evidence of this may be, among others, Acharyan’s statement, which is in agreement with Hanusz and A. Brückner, that Persian *čuxā* [tʰuxɑ] (or Turkish *çuha* [tʰuxɑ]) was widespread in vast areas from the East to the Balkans (Kurdish *čuka*, Arabic *jūxa*, Russian *чуга* [tʰuga], Polish *czucha* [tʰuxɑ] etc.) (Աճառեան 1977, 3: 633; Фасмер 1987, 4: 377). Acharyan mentions that, as a new borrowing, the word occurs almost everywhere in Armenian dialects.

⁹⁵ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *čhuxà* [tʰuxɑ].

In the Armenian historiographer Leo's literary work, we can even find a fragment where he describes the richness and diversity of goods sold by Armenian merchants in the 16th–17th centuries, mentioning, among others, *շմխս* [tʰuχa] as something like 'heavy cloth' (Լևո 1904, 443).

PM: Hanusz describes it as 'cloth' (Hanusz 1886, 391) but Linde, who refrains from etymological explanations, describes it in more detail as 'a long fur-lined (Turkish) dress' (Linde 1807, 1, 1: 382). In Polish, this noun occurs in several versions – *czuha* [tʰuha], *czucha* [tʰuχa], *czuja* [tʰuja], *czuhaj* [tʰuhaj], *czuhań* [tʰuhan], *czuszka* [tʰuʃka] – which, according to Brückner, are somewhat vague – "a vague figure, as a strange stray" (Brückner 1927, 1: 81). The researcher is also convinced that the word came from Hungarian (*csoha* [tʰoha], *csuha* [tʰuha]) to Polish but passed into Hungarian from Turkish, which, as I have already noted, borrowed it (with the meaning of 'woolen cloth') from Persian (Brückner 1927, 1: 81). Cf. Modern Polish slang *ciuchy* ([tʰuχy] 'clothes').

R: for Polish Armenians (especially from the town Kutý), the noun must have been a Polish loanword. However, for Eastern or Western Armenian languages, it is Persian (possibly somewhere Turkish) loanword.

64. **L:** **պանչոխ**⁹⁶ (Hanusz 1886, 449) [pantʰoχa / bantʰoχa] (Pol. *pończocha*, Eng. *stocking*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 932; Ալգերեան 1868: 685; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 824).

AT: *գուլպա* [gulpa] is an Assyrian borrowing – *gurbā* (cf. Persian *gūrūb*) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 171; Անանեան 1971, 1: 599) and seems to be the best equivalent of the Polish *pończocha* [pontʰoχa]. The next possible noun is *զանկապան/զանկապան* [zankapan] (Մեղրեցի 1698, 97) with the same meaning and an Avestan origin – *zangōpāna* (cf. Middle Iranian *zangpān* etc.) (Անանեան 1973, 2: 80; Olsen 1999, 323, 880). Less complicated is the neologism *զուգազուլպա* ([zugagulpa] 'pair of socks') (Էրոյան 2002, 160), where *զուգ* [zug] is a derivative of *զոյգ* ([zojg] 'pair') and comes from Assyrian *zaugā* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 242; Անանեան 1973, 2: 105).

⁹⁶ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *pončocha* [pontʰoχa].

PM: according to Boryś, the noun has been in use in Polish since the 16th century (a piece of clothing covering the leg, a type of long sock reaching the knees or above and also as a part of the armor like shin-guard) as *pończocha* [pontʃ^hoχa], *puńczocha* [puntʃ^hoχa], *pańczocha* [pantʃ^hoχa], *pańczocho* [pańtʃ^hoχa], which is a borrowing from Middle German *buntschuoeh* (shoe with straps to tie to the leg) (Boryś 2008, 463; Гаркавец 2010, 1156).

R: the noun *pončox* [pontʃ^hoχ] also exists in Kipchak as ‘narrow pants sewn from the fabric’, etc. (Armenian intermediation cannot be ruled out) (Гаркавец 2010, 1156). Harkavets proposes *շախշուր* [tʃ^haxʃur] (Гаркавец 2010, 1156) as the Armenian equivalent of *pončoxa*, which could also be in use as *շախճիյր* ([tʃ^haxʃtʃijr] ‘pants’) – a loanword from Persian either directly or through Turkish borrowing (Պալաւանգի 1826, 381), whereas the noun *շախշուր* [tʃ^haxʃur] as ‘sock, socks, stocking, stockings’ also exists in the Tat language (Huseynova 2014, 617) (a Southwestern Iranian language related to Persian (Windfuhr and Perry 2009, 417; cf. Clifton 2009)). Probably, as implied by Harkavets, we can suppose that it comes from Turkish *çakşir* [tʃ^hakʃir] (‘narrow pants made of a delicate fabric’ or just ‘a kind of baggy, wide pants’ (Nişanyan)) or Russian *чачхуры* [tʃ^haxʃ^hury] as ‘female shoes’ (Гаркавец 2010, 1156; cf. Slovoedia.com). Nevertheless, *շախշուր* as used in Armenian never means *pończocha* [pontʃ^hoχa] and could be the equivalent of Kipchak *pončox* [pontʃ^hoχ] but not the Polish *pończocha* [pontʃ^hoχa]. Vasmer claims that the above-mentioned *панчоха* [pańtʃ^hoχa] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 600, 701) passed into Russian, Ruthenian/Ukrainian and to a number of languages from Polish (Фасмер 1987, 3: 200; Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 600, 701). Therefore, it is very likely that, at least into the Kutuy dialect, the noun also came from Polish. The Polish *pańczocha* in Armenian could easily have been transformed into *panczocho* because of the lack of palatalized *ń* [ny] in Armenian. Moreover, I think it is very important to add a remark about the Armenian borrowing’s source: the noun *pańczocha* [pańtʃ^hoχa] as *socks*, was also known in the region as a part of the Polish highlanders’ dialect (Greń and Krasowska 2008, 159).

65. **L:** **ռենկավիչկա**⁹⁷ (Hanusz 1886, 457) [renkavitʃka] (Pol. *rękawiczka*, Eng. *glove*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 397; Ալգերեան, 1868: 335; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 392).

AT: the Armenian equivalent is *ձեռնոց* [dzernots^h] (Rivola 1633, 228), which consists of *ձեռն* ([dzern] ‘hand’) from Proto-Indo-European **ǵheǵ(o)r-* (‘hand’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 475) and *-ոց* [ots^h] from the Indo-European suffix **-sko-/a-* with the basic vowel **-o-* (Ջահուկյան 1995, 139). The next possible translation could be *թայթայսն* [tʰatʰpan]. *Թայթ* [tʰatʰ], probably from the Proto-Indo-European stem **ta(n)g-* (**te(n)g-* (‘to touch, catch, tiff’), **tang-t* > (paw), **teng-t* > (‘membrane’)). However, it could also be a child’s word (**tata-*, **teta-*) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 253). *-սն* [pan] is probably the Middle-Persian suffix *-pan* with the meaning of ‘holding, having’ (Մալխասեանց 1945, 4: 46; cf. Olsen 1999, 323, 627).

PM: *rękawica* [renkavitsʰa] (since 1495) means (still in use) a “covering put on the fingers, hand and part of the forearm” (Urbańczyk 1973–1977, 7: 460–461). The noun is a derivative from Proto-Slav *ръканъ* (sleeve) (Borys 2008, 514) from *ръка* (‘hand, arm’) (Derksen 2008, 439–440).

R: there is no doubt that it is a Polish loanword in Kutuy dialect of Armenian.

66. **L:** **տ/թորբա**⁹⁸ (Hanusz 1886, 466) [torba] (Pol. *torba*, Eng. *bag*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 73; Ալգերեան 1868, 59; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 64).

AT: an apt equivalent could be *պարկ* ([park] ‘bag’) (Rivola 1633, 318), with an uncertain etymology (Ջահուկյան 2010, 632; Olsen 1999, 956) or *մախախ/մախսախ* ([maxax/maxax] with the same meaning of ‘bag’) but again with an inexact etymology (Աճառեան 1977, 3: 228; Olsen 1999, 957). There is also the Armenian noun *տորբակ* ([toprak] ‘sack, bag, wallet, receptacle’) (Ղազարյան

⁹⁷ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *rękawiczka* [renkavitʃka].

⁹⁸ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *torbà* [torba].

and Ավետիսյան 2009, 764; Nişanyan) which rather comes from Tatar *tubrak* or Turkish *torba* (used since the 14th century). Harkavets proposes for Kipchak *torba* as equivalent to Armenian *մաղախ* [макач] and *բայսակ* [բայսак] (Гаркавец 2010, 1484), which is an Iranian loanword – **payusak* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 619)).

PM: *torba*, with slight differences in semantic nuances, occurs in practically all Slavic languages (Brückner 1927, 2: 574; Фасмер 1987, 4: 81; Мельничук 2006, 5: 602; Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 975 etc). It probably came directly from Turkish (*torba*), where it was in use even at the beginning of the 14th century (Nişanyan; Linde 1812, 3: 637–638). In Polish, the word *torba* has been in use since the 18th century – first with the meaning of a ‘bag for feeding horses’ and ‘stomach of a cow’ (Boryś 2008, 638–639).

R: despite being in use in Turkish, in Armenian we rarely find *տորբա* [torba] (as *թորբա* [t^horba]). When it does occur, it is along with an explanation of its meaning as *bag*, for example, *թորբա* [t^horba] is ‘saddlebag’ (Պետրոսյան 1968, 37), somebody left *թորբա* [t^horba] full of bread (as in the Artsakh dialect example) (Սարգսյան, Աբ), the professional term for ‘cylindrical soft bag’ (Skolkoseriy.ru) etc. Thus, the noun *թորբա* [t^horba] was in only use by Polish Armenians and Hanusz proposes Polish and possibly Ruthenian as its source, especially for the Kuty dialect (Hanusz 1886, 466; cf. Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 975).

67. **L:** **քաֆթան** (Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան 2015, 30) [k^haftan], **խաֆտ(թ)ան**⁹⁹ (Hanusz 1886: 417) [χaftan] (Pol. *kaftan*, Eng. *caftan/kaftan*).

AT: the noun *կաֆտան* [kaftan] was known in the Polish Armenian dialect as *քաֆթան* [k^haftan] (Գրիգորյան 1963, (512) 315), but the word is not common for the language. More widespread and more commonly used is a kaftan-like garment – *կապա* [капа] (Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան 2015, 30) / *կապայ* [капай] (Rivola 1633, 191; Մալխասևանց 1944, 2: 389), which is to be worn on the shirt, under the coat. It is a kind of long cloth (Հլրբ 2004, 3: 42). The noun,

⁹⁹ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *χaftan* [χaftan].

կապու [kapa] comes from Arabic *qabā* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 384; Մալխասեանց 1944, 2: 389).

PM: in Old Polish it appeared in the 15th century as *kawtan* (a type of coat) and from the 16th century it was known as *kaftan/koftan* (a general term for various types of men's upper garments, decorative outer garment etc.) (Boryś 2008, 219; Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 219; Brückner 1927, 1: 213).

R: the fact that the noun is borrowed from Turkish is not in doubt (Hanusz 1886, 417; Гаркавец 2010, 648; Фасмер 1986, 2: 212; *Osmanlıca sözlük* pos. 3701 etc). However, it is difficult to say whether it passed into the Polish Armenian dialect from Polish (Boryś 2008, 219) or whether it remained from Kipchak times (Гаркавец 2010, 648). The word passed into Turkish from Arabic or Persian (*kaftān* or *qaftān*) even before 1310 (Nişanyan; Dauzat et al. 1971, 122) and was also widely used in Ottoman Turkish as *haftân* (*Osmanlıca sözlük* pos. 3039). However, the very rare appearance of the noun *kaftan* in Armenian suggests that the word was rather typical of Polish realities: King John III Sobieski “in his wardrobe already had rich clothes brought from Turkey and Persia as gifts, for example, ‘golden-headed Turkish caftan’ or ‘silk-coated satin caftan’ which he received ‘from Mr. Słoniawski, the royal secretary, an Armenian ennobled in 1659’” (Biedrońska-Słota 2015).

68. **L:** **բօլփաք** (Դազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 821) [k^hoɫp^hak^h(g)] (Pol. *kolpak*,¹⁰⁰ Eng. *skullcap, cap, hubcap*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 135, 879; Ալգերեան 1868, 108, 656; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 121, 788).

AT: *թասակ* [t^hasak] (‘skullcap’), *գլխադիր* [glɣadir] (‘cap’). The equivalent of *բօլփաք/կապուսկ* [kalpak] exists in Armenian as a Turkish word borrowed from Russian (Մալխասեանց 1944, 2: 366) (*kalpak* has been known in Turkish since the 15th century (Nişanyan)). *Թասակ* [t^hasak] is possibly from *թաս* [t^has] (Arabic loanword *tass/a* (‘cup’, ‘skull’) from Persian *tašt* (Աճառեան 1973, 2: 157; Ջահուկյան 2010, 259)) and *-ակ* [-ak] (probably from Iranian *-ak* which could have a diminutive value (Ջահուկյան 2010, 794)). *Գլխադիր* [glɣadir]

¹⁰⁰ According to Դազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 821).

is a joining of *գլուխ* ([glux] ‘head’) from the Proto Indo-European stem **ghōlukho-* (‘head’), similar to Lithuanian *galvą*, Old Slavic *glava*, etc. ((Ջահուկյան 2010, 163; cf. Derksen 2008, 176), and *դնել* [dnel] (‘to put’)).¹⁰¹

PM: must be *kolpak* and not *kolpak* as proposed by MAD (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 821) (or it is just a typographic error). One of the Polish meanings is ‘tuft’, ‘tip’, ‘top’ (Krasnowolski and Niedźwiedzki 1920, 1: 129). Brückner believed that *kolpak* (next to the ancient *klobuk* (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 295)), as a relatively new borrowing that had passed to Polish through Russian (from Turkish), was first recorded in Polish in 1578 (Brückner 1927, 1: 248). However, *kolpak* [kolpak] had to be known a little earlier, as in 1574 it was recorded in the Court in Kamianets-Podilskyi (Գրիգորյան 1963, (283) 228–229). There is one more option: the noun in Armenian was borrowed not from Polish but even earlier from Russian (known in the language as *колпак* [kolpak], *колпакъ* [kolpak’] at least since the 15th century (Фасмер 1986, 2: 297)) or Kipchak. Brückner also mentions the Hungarian Hussars’ ‘hubcap’ (*kolpak*) (in Hungarian *kalpag*) as a possible source of borrowing (Brückner 1927, 1: 248), which is also confirmed by Linde (1808, 1, 2: 1053).

R: in the case of the sentence from the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocol “[...] Ա (1) **քոլփաք** [k^holp^hak^h] կապուտ չուխի աղուեսով [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (283) 228–229) (*քոլփաք* [k^holp^hak^h] was also mentioned as misappropriated good’), Bozhko proposes the Ukrainian *ковпак* [kovpak] (Мельничук 1985, 2: 485–486) as the source of the Armenian borrowing (Բոժկո 2010, 112), which is hard to justify. If we assume the 16th century for the date of the final formation of the Ukrainian language (Fałowski 2011, 128), it is unlikely that this noun would have passed to Armenian from Ukrainian in the *քոլփաք* [k^holp^hak^h(g)] version and not *ковпак* [kovpak]. We can rather take into consideration Ruthenian *колпак* [kolpak] as the synonym of *ковпак* [kovpak] with the meaning of ‘mushroom’ or ‘beret’ (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 355, 360). As a piece of trivia I will add that Harkavets did not find *խաքաք* as the equivalent of *kalpak* (Гаркавец 2010, 651) in Kipchak as he had expected. In Armenian, on the contrary, we can also find another (but archaic) form of ‘cap’, ‘lid’ – *ղախաղ* [xap^hak] – which comes from Turkish *kapak* [kapak] (Մալխասյան 1944, 3: 185; Ժիլք 1974, 3: 428; Nişanyan). Therefore, I am

¹⁰¹ As in the case of *վոյթ* [voj^h] – entry no. 141.

more and more inclined to say that *բօլիսար* [k^holp^hak^h] is not a Polish, Ruthenian/Ukrainian or Russian borrowing, but a Turkish one, which later received the appearance of belonging to the Slavic languages under the influence of Slavic surroundings.

69. **L:** **Ֆարտուկ** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 615) [fartuk] (Pol. *fartuch*, Eng. *apron*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 53; Ալզերեան 1868, 40).

AT: a very rare use (often archaic) besides the meaning of an ‘apron’ (for technical uses can also mean ‘case’, ‘sheath’, ‘blanket’) (Հայրապետյան 2011, 615) etc.

PM: *fartuch* [fartuχ] functioned in Old Polish from the 15th century (*fertuch*) as ‘some piece of clothing’. It came from Middle-Upper-German *vortouch* (now in German *Fürtuch*) – *fartuch* (as ‘scarf before something’) (Boryś 2008, 149; Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 357). The word is also noted by Linde (1807, 1, 1: 632).

R: the Polish origin of Russian *фартук* [fartuk] (or Ukrainian *фартух* [fartukh], even Kipchak *fartuχ* [fartukh], *vartuχ* [fartukh] (Гаркавец 2010, 518), etc.) is beyond doubt (Фасмер 1987, 4: 186) as is the Russian origin of *ֆարտուկ* [fartuk] in Armenian. A direct borrowing is rather impossible.

Explanation of garments- and fabrics-related terms

Granat: “Navy blue and half-navy blue were one of the most favorite colors of fabric in Poland. In 1643, Volumina leg[um] enumerates scarlets, granets ([granet] ‘navy blue’) [...] alias all Venetian cloths. [...] The granet (navy blue) and the half-scarlet went for the same price. Navy blue high cloth horns with a gray sheepskin were commonly worn by all strata of the nation” (Gloger 1901, 2: 209, transcriptions – G.M.).

Kanafa: “Kanafas [kanafas], kanawac [kanavats^h], kanawas [kanavas], striped silk or cotton fabric [...]” (Gloger 1901, 2: 321).

Scarlet: “Scarlet, crimson, purple [were – G.M.] the privileged color of the ruling house of Piasts [*panujący dom Piastów*] and of the knighthood, that is, the nobility [...]. In the past it was named: szarłat [ʃarlat], szarłatny [ʃarlatny], szarłatowy [ʃarlatovy], czerwień [tʰervien], but by the 18th century the use of szkarłat [ʃkarlat] and szkarłatny [ʃkarlatny] was common. The color and all fabrics of that color were called szarłat [ʃarlat]. [...] Marcin of Urzędów thinks that the words kermes (chodzi o naturalny barwnik kermes) and scarlet come from the Polish [month name of – G.M.] June. Knapski writes in his dictionary: ‘Purple scarlet, a sea clam, from which they squeeze their purple paint, a fish, a turtle, a magenta sea snail’.” (cf. Gloger 1903, 4: 310, transcriptions and emphases in italics – G.M.).

Tabinet: “A species of kitajka (Chinese) silk called Dutch was in various colors and used for women’s clothes, caps, bed fences, and was mentioned by many Polish writers of the 17th century [...]” (Gloger 1903, 4: 350).

Złotogłów was a silk-warped fabric, used in old Poland for rich costumes, liturgical vestments, interior decoration, etc. (SJP).

Farming, agriculture

70. **L:** **արաղ անելու** (Աճառյան 1953, 189) [arat anelu] (Pol. *orać*, Eng. *plough*) (cf. Magakian 2022, 123; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 708; Ալգերեան 1868, 543; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 648)).

AT: there are at least two proper translations into Armenian. The first translation is *հերկել* [herkel], which consists of the noun *հերկ* and the verbal suffix *-ել* and is probably a Proto-Indo-European noun, but the etymology is not certain (Ջահուկյան 2010, 458). The second translation is *վարել* [varel]: the noun *վար* [var] (with the verbal suffix *-ել* [-el]) is an Iranian loanword (**vaθ-* from Indo-European **uedh-* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 705)).

PM: the verb *orać* [oratʃ^h] is from Proto-Slavic **orati*, *orǫ* (‘plough, plow’), which is a continuation of the Proto-Indo-European agricultural word **ar(ə)-* (‘plow’) created from the stem **arə-* (‘to separate’), so the original meaning of the word is rather ‘to separate the earth (with a tool)’. It has been used since the 14th century (Boryś 2008, 394; Brückner 1927, 1: 381; Derksen 2008, 372–373).

R: the source for the borrowing by Polish Armenians of the typical verb for the Slavic languages *orać* seems to be the Polish (cf. Աճառյան 1953, 189); however, we cannot completely rule out Old Belarusian *араць* ([arats^h] ‘plow’) (Мартынаў 1978, 144).

71. **L:** **բասրա/բասիքա** (Գազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 111) [pask^ha]/ [pasik^ha] (Pol. *pasieka*, Eng. *apiary*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 50; Ալգերեան 1868, 36)).

AT: (*մեղվա*)*փեղթակ* [(mɛvna)p^het^hak]. Consists of *մեղվա* (derivative from *մեղր/մեղու* (‘honey’/‘bee’)) – Proto-Indo-European *mel(it)* – (‘honey’) with existing

parallel *medhu* (Աճառեան 1977, 3: 302; Ջսհուկլյան 2010, 522) (e.g. Sanskrit *medh(u)uos* (cf. Olsen 1999, 106)) and *իկիթաւ* [p^het^hak] – from Middle Persian *petāk*, or Sanskrit *petaka* as ‘box, basket’ (*peta* meant ‘basket’) (Ջսհուկլյան 2010, 762; Աճառեան 1979, 4: 493).

PM: since 14th century *pasiēka* [paʃiēka] (or *pszczelnik* [pʃtʃ^hɛlnik] (Linde 1811, 2, 2: 644)) were: a) ‘abattis, a place in the forest barricaded with felled trees’; b) ‘thinning, clearing’; c) ‘pagan grove, idolatrous’; d) ‘arable field among the woods, fenced, laying woode’; e) ‘juniper fence’; f) ‘pasture, cattle grazing’ (Krasnowolski and Niedźwiedzki 1920, 2: 306; Urbańczyk 1970–1973, 6: 43; Brückner 1927, 2: 416). The noun comes from Proto-Slavic **pasěka* (‘what was cut out, place where the forest was cut down, clearing’) from the Proto-Slavic verb **po-sěkti* (‘cut, cut down’) with the specific archaic derivative change of verbal prefix **po-* into name prefix **pa-* (Borys 2008, 414–415).¹⁰²

R: a bold assumption can be made here. Since the noun *բասթաւ* / *բասիթաւ* [pask^ha] / [pasik^ha], in addition to the meaning ‘the beehive’ in the 16th century, had also a different meaning – ‘a forest area where livestock graze’ (Borys 2008, 414). So, it is therefore not excluded that the word in the Armenian had also the last meaning. This possibility is very real, because in the 16th century the noun was often used in the sense of the clearing in the forest (where the cattle graze) or glade, meadow, a piece of field overgrown with bushes, just a pasture (Borys 2008, 414). This is what the following illustration from the Kamianets-Podilskiy Court protocol the MAD states: “[...] այնպէս էլ զբարբաւս. նոյնպէս էլ զբասիթաւներս [zpasik^haners] այլ [...] (both my farms and my բասիթաւներ [pasik^haner] – Armenian plural of *բասիթաւ* ([pasik^ha] ‘apiaries’) [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (228) 202). The words *pasiēki* [paʃiēki] suggest that the subject of the analysis – *բասիթաւ* ([pasik^ha] ‘apiary’), could also be used with the meaning of ‘glade, meadow, pasture’ etc. It is also possible that the word passed to Kipchak (*pasika*, *pasēka* (Гаркавец 2010, 1121)) by the intermediary of Armenian.

¹⁰² Details of **sěkti* see also in Derksen (2008, 446).

72. **L:** **Եալովիցա(մըլ)** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 177¹⁰³) [(j)ɛalovits^ha(məj)] (Pol. *jałowizna*, Eng. *heifer* (cf. Magakian 2022, 124; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 439; Ալգերեան 1868, 358; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 420)).

AT: *ստերը կով* or *երիհը* ([sterdʒ kov] or [(j)ɛrindʒ] ‘sterile/infertile cow’ or ‘heifer’). *Ստերը* ([sterdʒ] ‘infertile’) is from Indo-European *sterdhio-* (or *sterdh-*) which comes from *ster-* (ստերը [sterdʒ]) – cf. Sanskrit *stari-* as ‘infertile cow’ (Ջահուկյան 2010, 694). *կով* [kov] is from the Indo-European stem **guou-/gwov* (‘cattle’) (cf. Sanskrit *gāus/gáva* – ‘bull’, *gavī* – ‘cow’, Persian *gāv* – ‘bull’, Greek *βους* – ‘bull, cow’, old Swedish *kō* – ‘cow’ etc.) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 421; Աճառեան 1973, 2: 639). *Երիհը* probably comes from Indo-European **kʷrentio-* or **kʷer-* (‘head, horn, cattle’) – cf. Ancient Upper German (*h*)*rind* (‘cattle, oxen’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 226). Acharyan does not accept this explanation but instead mentions the New Upper German *rind* (‘oxen’) (Աճառեան 1973, 2: 56).

PM: *jałowizna/jalówka* [jalovizna]/[jaluvka] has been in use in Polish since the 15th century – ‘still barren, not giving milk’ / ‘prepubescent cow/heifer’ (Arct 1916, 1: 464; Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 114. *Jalówka* comes from Proto-Slavic *jalovъ* (‘sterile, miserable’) (Boryś 2008, 203–204).

R: in Kipchak, the noun is also the Polish loanword – *yalovica* (Гаркавец 2010, 1634). Ukrainian (rather Ruthenian *яловець* [jalovets^h] / *яловиця* [jalovyts^hja]) (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 1113; Мельничук 2012, 6: 545; Гаркавец 2010, 1634) is also a possible origin for Kipchak but rather by the intermediary of Armenian. In modern Armenian, the noun functions only as a term for the production of things from cow hides (cf. redfeatherfarm.org; neurologystatus.ru etc.). The meaning of *Եալովիցա(մըլ)* [(j)ɛalovits^ha(məj)] (with, as Professor Andrzej Stanislaw Pisowicz emphasizes, *մըլ* [məj] as Western Armenian indefinite article) was obviously familiar for Polish Armenians (Գրիգորյան 1963, (565) 336).

¹⁰³ The authors’ transcription proposal is *Եալովիցամըլ* [(j)ɛalovits^haməj].

73. **L:** լոպատա¹⁰⁴ (Hanusz 1886, 435) [lopata] (or [lobata] for some Western Armenians), (Pol. *lopata*, Eng. *shovel*, *spade* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 866, 902; Ալգերեան 1868, 649, 669; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 779, 805)).

AT: uniquely apt translation of *բահ* [bah] as a ‘tool for digging’ (Մեղրեցի 1698, 45), which comes from Proto-Indo-European **bhr-ti-* or **bher-ti* from the stem **bher-* (‘prick with a sharp tool, cut, tear’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 113). There is also the possibility of *բահ* [bah] as an Iranian borrowing (Աճառեան 1971, 1: 392–393).

PM: *lopata* [lopata], known as ‘spade, shovel to burrow or to flip the loose materials, tool for putting bread into the oven’, etc. (Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 120; Boryś 2008, 301; Linde 1808, 1, 2: 1289) has been in use in Armenian since the 15th century and is rather from Proto-Slavic **lopata* (‘something flat, a tool consisting of a flat piece of wood and a long handle’) (Boryś 2008, 301; Derksen 2008, 285). The word is probably the nominalized form of the feminine of the adjective *lopatъ* (characterized by or distinguished by a large flat part, flat component) with the suffix **-atъ* coming from the Proto-Slavic noun **lorъ* (‘something flat, (large) leaf’), which is from Proto-Indo-European **l̥ep-/l̥op-/l̥ap* (‘be flat, something wide, flat’) (Boryś 2008, 301; Мельничук 1989, 3: 287).

R: it can be assumed that this is a Polish loanword; however, the general Slavic character of that noun (Фасмер 1986, 2: 518–519) suggests that a Ruthenian source (*лоната* [lopata] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 413)) cannot be completely rejected.

74. **L:** կոսիտ անելու¹⁰⁵ (Hanusz 1886, 429) [kosit anelu] (Pol. *kosić*, Eng. *mow* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 606; Ալգերեան 1868, 475; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 565)).

¹⁰⁴ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *lopata* [lopata].

¹⁰⁵ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *kosit anelù* [kosit anelu].

AT: the correct translation *hūāḏḏḏ* ([hndzel] ‘to reap, mow’) consists of *hmlūā* ([hundz] ‘harvest’), which is rather from Proto-Indo-European **onkos* from the stem **enek-* (‘to ripen’) as the Armenian *huunū* ([hasun] ‘mature, ripe’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 468) with the verbal suffix *-ḏḏ* [-ɛ]. However, the Sanskrit root *puñja/puñga* (‘a rick’) is also possible (Անանյան 1977, 3: 123).

PM: *kosić* ([koʃitʃʰ] ‘to cut with a scythe’) is from Proto-Slavic **kosa* ([kosa] ‘scythe’) and has been used in Polish since the 15th century. The verb comes from Proto-Slavic **kositi*, **kośo* (‘to cut with a scythe’) (Boryś 2008, 251; Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 35; Derksen 2008, 238).

R: here (but not only), namely in Kutý dialect, we have the wide-spread phenomenon of a “double” verb: *ḏnuḏun* ([kosit] ‘to mow’) and *uñḏḏnu* ([anelu] ‘to do’). It could be either a Polish or Ruthenian (Желехівський 1886, 1: 370) borrowing.

75. **L:** **ḏap** (Անանյան 1953, 189) [dzap/dzapʰ] (Pol. *cap*, Eng. (*castrated or old*) *goat* or *sheep*: cf. Magakian 2022, 126).

AT: the most appropriate translations are *ḏun* [χoj] or *pmḏ* [buts] (Անանյան 1953, 189). In Armenian, *pmḏ* [buts] is interpreted as ‘lambkin’ (Սուրբասյան 1967, 131; Բարսեղյան 1973, 200; cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 528; Ալգեղեան 1868, 422) and comes from the Proto-Indo-European *bhug’o* (Անանյան 1971, 1: 482). *ḏun* [χoj] we can also find in modern Armenian as ‘male sheep’ (Ժիրք 1972, 2: 546; Մալխասյան 1944, 2: 281) and is noted by F. Rivola simply as ‘sheep’ (Rivola 1633, 175) and Yeremia Meghretsi as the synonym of *ḏn* [ʋotʃʰ]¹⁰⁶ (Մեղրեցի 1698, 144). *ḏun* is obviously a loanword in Armenian, but the original source has not been verified (Ջահուկյան 2010, 339).

PM: *cap* [tsʰap] is rather an acquisition from Romanian shepherds (‘cap’). The Polish was probably borrowed from Romanian *țap* (‘goat’) through itinerant

¹⁰⁶ *ḏn* [ʋotʃʰ] is a synonym of sheep, borrowed rather from Old Turkish (*koç* [kotʃʰ]) and it was recorded in the year 1073 in the Oğuz dialect (the original is *koçyar/koçnar* [kotʃʰɣar]). The noun evolved from the word ‘male sheep’. This in turn is synonymous with the Mongolian noun *quça* [kutʃʰa] with the same meaning (Nişanyan; cf. Korkmaz).

Carpathian shepherds. It is considered to be a pre-Romanesque shepherd's term (similar to Persian *čapiš/čapuš* – ‘a one-year-old goat’, Old Turkish *čabiš* or *čebiš* ‘goat’ (cf. Ekşi sözlük) etc.) and probably comes from a shepherd's cry summoning goats (Brückner 1927, 1: 56; SJP; Boryś 2008, 51; Фасмер 1987, 4: 288–289).

R: the word existed only in Polish Armenian dialects as a Polish loanword (Աճառյան 1953, 189).

76. **L:** **միրոջնիք** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 521) [mirodznik^h] (Pol. *młynarczyk*, Eng. *miller*¹⁰⁷) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 589; Ալգերեան 1868, 462; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 548).

AT: *ջրադատարան*¹⁰⁸ [dʒrɑvɑtsʰɑn] consists of *ջուր* ([dʒur] ‘water’): the Indo-European word *auer-* from the stem *ur-* – ‘water, river, rain’ (cf. Lithuanian *jūra/ yūres* (sea)) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 654) and *սիւղ* ([ɑvɑtsʰ] ‘mill’) the next Indo-European form from the stem *al-* – ‘shred grind’ (cf. Greek *άλυρον* – ‘flour’ (Ջահուկյան 2010, 33; Աճառեան 1971, 1: 118), *αλέθω* ‘grind’ etc.) with the suffix *յան* ([pan] ‘holder, keeper’) from Middle Iranian *-pān* (*-keeper*), which later passed into *-ban* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 59; Olsen 1999, 321–323). The nouns *սիրի(ե)լյան* [ɑvɔrɛɑn] (Ալգերեան 1868, 462; Գայալեան 1938, 11) and *սիւղատարան* [ɑvɑtsɑpɑn] (Աղայան 1976, 1: 22) as ‘miller’ also can be taken into account as rare but possible (archaic) equivalents in Armenian. In both cases, we have *սիրիք* ([ɑvɔrikʰ] ‘mill’) or *սիւղ* ([ɑvɑtsʰ] ‘mill’) with *յան* [pan], as above.

PM: according to MAD, *միրոջնիք* [mirodznik^h] is *młynarczyk* [mɫinartʰik],¹⁰⁹ which would mean ‘miller’. In fact, *młynarczyk* was a ‘journeyman, miller's helper’ (SPXVI). *Młynarz* is the ‘miller’ and *-czyk* is the suffix that creates the diminutive masculine noun (Szober 1923, 130; Gaertner 1934, 309).

¹⁰⁷ Both translations are according to Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 521).

¹⁰⁸ Translation according to Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 521).

¹⁰⁹ Ibidem.

R: the Armenian word for miller (ջրաղացական [dʒɾɑvɑtsʰɑn]) was known to Armenians from Poland as the dialectal form ջաղջիպան [dʒɑtʰʲɑn] (Գրիգորյան 1963, (46) 118) or ջաղջիպան [tʰɑtʰʲɑn] (Գրիգորյան 1963, (287) 229). It could also be ջաղջրպան [dʒɑtsʰəpɑn] (Rivola 1633, 325). In fact, միրոջնիք [mirodʒnikʰ] was the ‘miller’s assistant/helper (as the journeyman)’. The Kamianets-Podilskyi Court text’s¹¹⁰ simple analysis clearly indicates ջրաղացական [dʒɾɑvɑtsʰɑn] (Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան 2015, 30; Գրիգորյան 2017, 60) as ‘miller’. In Linde’s explanations the միրոջնիք [mirodʒnikʰ] (Polish *miroc-znik*) concept is more detailed. At the beginning of the 19th century, Linde stresses *miroc-znik* as a Russian word (because of the lack of that notion in Ukrainian) and explains it as the ‘one who used to measure various things (in business) at Jewish leaseholder/tenant’ (used with a negative attitude toward Jewish boys) (Linde 1809, 2, 1: 110). Here we must take into account the fact that it is Ukrainian where we can find *мірошник/мирочник* (although the Russian version was mentioned by Linde, this noun is a Ukrainian loanword (Фасмер 1986, 2: 627)) as ‘mill’s assistant, sub-master who takes flour for grinding’ (Мельничук 1989, 3: 481). The same meaning of ‘miller’s journeyman’ we can also find in the *Малоруско-німецький* dictionary for Ruthenian (Желехівський 1886, 1: 443). Linde’s interpretation is very relevant here because the ‘mill assistant’ was probably also responsible for weighing wheat and flour. The above interpretation casts doubt on the noun’s Polish origin, confirming the Ukrainian one (Բոժկո 2010, 112). In addition, the complainant party that appears in the presented Court protocol, as suggested by their name – Հրիցրո (Ukrainian Грицко/Грыцко [Hrytsʰkʰo]), could have been Ukrainian (Բոժկո 2010, 113).

¹¹⁰ For example: “Հայոց թվ, ՌԻԳ (1575). օրն չորեքշաբթի. օգոստոսի ԺԷ (17): Ի Սարգիս Ջախնոյ վոյթին առջեւն. որ էր Տեմուշին տեղն. եւ իւր դատաւորացն հաւասար: / Ի յայս դատաստանին առջեւն եկաւ Հրիցրո Կրին եւ գանկատ առաւ **միրոջնիքին [mirodʒnikʰin]** վերայ. եթէ ի ջրաղացքին [dʒɾɑvɑtsʰkʰin] մէջ հալաւս մոռցաւ եւ Դ (4) – ում օրն գնացի. զի առնէի զհալաւս. նա չգտաւ: Եւ ես այժմ **միրոջնիքէն [mirodʒnikʰen]** զիտեմ. զերս ուրիշ մարդ չկայր: / Եւ **միրոջնիքն [mirodʒnikʰn]** ասաց. թէ հաշա իլնա. ոչ տեսել եմ զայն հալաւս եւ ոչ առել եմ: / Եւ դատաստանն. լսելով Բ (2) կողմն զիօսքն եւ վճիռ եհատ. զի **միրոջնիքի [mirodʒnikʰi]** երդվնայ այս աւուր Բ (2) շաբաթ. որպէս չէ տեսել զայն հալաւս եւ կամ չէ առնուլ եւ իւր պիտոյից չէ անցուցել: / Ուստի Բ (2) կողմն այլ ընդունեցին եւ **միրոջնիքն [mirodʒnikʰn]** զերդումն ի յանձն էաւ եւ դատաստանին քամեղնիյ ետուր:” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (599) 349).

77. **L:** մորգ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 376) [morg] (Pol. *morg*, Eng. *morgen*).

AT: I could not find any use of *մորգ* [morg] in Armenian and can only base my analysis on DFW, which correctly interprets the noun as ‘an old land size (about 0.5 ha) in Poland and Lithuania’ (which can be plowed for one day). The best equivalent in Armenian would be *օրսւլսր* [oravar], was used in Armenia very often which in the 13th–18th centuries with the same Polish meaning of *morga* (with the ending *a*) – an area of land that one man can mow or plow during the day (Վարդանյան 1968, 191; Sulimierski and Chlebowski 1883, 4: 677). Unfortunately, the Armenian sources do not give the exact dimensions and components of *օրսւլսր* [oravar]. This noun comes from *օր* ([or] ‘day’), which is probably from the Proto-Indo-European stem *āmōr* – ‘strong’ (Անանեան 1979, 4: 616), conjunction *ս* [a], and *լսր* ([var] ‘plough’) from Iranian **vaθ-*, which is from Proto-Indo-European stem *v(u)edh-* (Չահնկյան 2010, 705; Անանեան 1979, 4: 313).

PM: *morg(a)* is from German *Morgen* (morning) and was known also as *mórg* [murg] or *jutrzyrna* ([jutʃina] ‘tomorrow’) in Polish (Sulimierski and Chlebowski 1883, 4: 677) as a ‘unit of measure of area – about 5600 m²’ (slightly different in diverse regions and times) or ‘a field of this size’ (SPXVI; Sulimierski and Chlebowski 1883, 4: 677). Linde uses the word with the same meaning, also derived from German (Linde 1809, 2, 1: 140).

R: according to Vasmer, the Russian *морга* [morga] (proposed by some sources *морг* [morg] (Հայրապետյան 2011, 376; Мельничук 1989, 3: 512 etc.)) is either a Polish loanword or a German one with the same meaning – ‘measure of area’ (Фасмер 1986, 2: 652). Due to the infrequent use of this noun in Armenian (apart from that dictionary), it is presumed that *մորգ* [morg] could have been borrowed from Russian as a word of Polish (or possibly even German) origin.

78. **L:** **մուժիք** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 530) [muzik^h] (Pol. *macznik*, Eng. *miller*¹¹¹).¹¹²

AT: according to MAD's explanation, the noun likely means *ջրադարձան* [dzrakats^hpan]¹¹³ 'miller').

PM: according to MAD, the probable Polish translation of *մուժիք* is *macznik* [muzik^h] (possibly instead of *mącznik*¹¹⁴ [montʃ^hnik] – 'mealworm'). None of the protocols from the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court (Գրիգորյան 1963, (418) 277, (493) 307, (603) 351 etc.), nor any other document that I examined, used *մուժիք* [muzik^h] with the meaning of *mącznik* – 'mealworm' (as 'miller') or 'miller'¹¹⁵. In fact, the noun *mużyk* [muzyk] is the Polish archaic form for a 'simple peasant', 'boor' (Karłowicz et al. 1900, 2: 1080), similar to *muzhik/moujik/mujik/muzjik* (Dictionary.com). Linde also mentions *mużyk* [muzyk] as a simple (tough and rough) peasant from Russia (*мужук*) (Linde 1809, 2, 1: 168).

R: *մուժիք* is a Russian loanword in Polish (now used very rarely) with the meaning of *mężczyzna* (SPXVI) ([menʒtʃ^hyzna] 'man, male'). The Russian form is *мужук* ([muzyk] 'man' etc.), which was initially a diminutive form of *муж* ([muz] 'husband'). In the past in Russia, the people who legally stood below others were designated as minors – from here we have the diminutive form of the noun (Фасмер 1986, 2: 671; cf. Шанский, Иванов, Шанская 1971, 275). Russian *муж* comes from Old Church Slavic *mōžь* ('man, husband'), which is from Proto-Indo-European **mon-g(w)io-* (cf. Sanskrit *mānu* – 'man, mankind', Old High German *mann* – 'man, husband' etc.) (Derksen 2008, 330). Of course, the noun *մուժիք* [muzik^h] could have been borrowed by the Armenians in Poland from Polish or Ruthenian/Ukrainian (with the meaning of 'tough and rough peasant'), but there is no doubt that it is a Russian loanword.

¹¹¹ Both translations according to Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 530).

¹¹² There is clear confusion here.

¹¹³ See details for **միրոճնիք** [mirodʒnik^h].

¹¹⁴ The letter ą is pronounced as a nasal sound o [õ].

¹¹⁵ In turn, *mącznik* ('mealworm') beetles and larvae eat decaying leaves, sticks, grasses, and occasionally new plant growth. As general decomposers, they also eat dead insects, feces, and stored grains. The common name of *mącznik* in Poland was *drewniak* ([drevniak] 'wooden') (Linde 1809, 2, 1: 7; Skorupka et al. 1969, 378).

79. **L:** պաստուխ¹¹⁶ (Hanusz 1886, 451) [pastux] (Pol. *pastuch*, Eng. *shepherd*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 860; Ալգերեան 1868, 647; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 776).

AT: *hni/hu* [hoviv] is an apt translation which comes from Proto-Indo-European stem **owi-pā-* (**owi-* – ‘sheep’ and **pā-* – ‘to feed, graze’) (Անտեան 1977, 3: 117).

PM: *pastuch* [pastux] has been in use at least since 1370 with the meaning of the ‘one who watches over cattle, sheep, pigs, etc.’ (Urbańczyk 1970–1973, 6: 47). The noun comes from Proto-Slavic *pasti* (‘pasture, herd’) from the stem *pažitь* (‘pasture, meadow’) (Derksen 2008, 392, 393) from **pasq* (‘watch over, look after the cattle on the pasture, graze’) (Boryś 2008, 416).

R: in the case of the noun *պաստուխ* [pastux], as a Slavic word (Фасмер 1987, 3: 214–215), the source of borrowing could be the language of the nearest neighbors (geographically speaking), which Hanusz also suggests (Hanusz 1886, 451), namely Ruthenian (*пастух* [pastux]) (Желехівський and Недільский 1886, 2: 605) and Polish *pastuch* [pastux].

80. **L:** սդրդայ (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 693) [sterta(j)] (Pol. *sterta*, Eng. *stack/rick*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 801, 918; Ալգերեան 1868, 612, 678; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 732, 815).

AT: there are two Armenian equivalents: *դեզ* ([dez] ‘rick’), from Indo-European *dheigh* (‘clay’, ‘knead dough’, ‘puddle’, ‘shape’, ‘apply’), a noun cognate with Sanskrit *dēhī* (‘bomb’, ‘dam’), Avestan *duēzayeiti* (‘hoard, accumulate, amass’) (Անտեան 1971, 1: 421; Ջահուկյան 2010, 196), etc.; and the noun *բարդ* [bard] / *բարդոց* [bardots] (‘hay’), from Persian *pard* (‘time’) but also possibly Latin *pars/partis* (‘part’), Indo-European or Sanskrit *bhrti* (‘brings’), Sumerian *bar* (‘hoard, collect’), etc. (Անտեան 1971, 1: 421).

¹¹⁶ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *pastux* [pastux].

PM: *sterta* [sterta] or *styrta* [stirta] (e.g., ‘straw, hay’ etc. stored in a stack for winter fodder) has been in use in Polish since the 15th century (Brückner 1927, 2: 515; Borys 2008, 577).

R: the Ruthenian/Ukrainian source (*стурта* [styrta] (Мельничук 2006, 5: 417; Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 920)) is as likely (Borys 2008, 577) as the Polish one. By the way, in Polish, Linde does not see the difference between *sterta* [sterta] and *styrta* [styrta] (Linde 1812, 3: 456). Translating *sīirta* [sitirta] / *stīirta* [stirta] from Kipchak into Polish, Ukrainian and Armenian, Harkavets proposes the Armenian equivalent for *sterta* – *մարակ* [marak], which is a somewhat vague translation. According to Acharyan *մարակ* [marak] (Աճառեան 1977, 3: 275) is noted in Armenian only in the dictionary *Բանգիրք Հայոց* of Yeremia Meghretsi (Մեղրեցի 1698, 252) (as Latin *fœnile*, ‘a hayloft’ (Atkinson 1822, 52; Adam 1805, 174; Numen online dictionary [latinlexicon.org]; DMLCS)), which Jahukyan interprets as Hebrew *māraq*’s with the translation of ‘refined, purged’ (Ջահուկյան 2010, 515). Harkavets could mean *մարաք* [marak^h] (Rivola 1633, 252) (which is the alternative form of *մարագ* [marag]) – as a kind of stock and not *մարակ* [marak]. If *սիրիայ* [stērta(j)] could mean ‘rick’, it could have also been translated into Armenian as *մարագ/մարաք* ([marak^h] as ‘a place to store hay’). *Մարաք/մարագ* [marak^h] is a word of rather unknown origin, although V. Urishean derives it from Arabic as something like a ‘veiled place of rest’ (Ուրիշեան 1998, 2: 49). However, Kraelitz-Greifenhorst does not rule out a Turkish borrowing – *merék* (Kraelitz-Greifenhorst 1911, 259).

81. **L:** **սնոպ**¹¹⁷ (Hanusz 1886, 460) [snop] (Pol. *snop*, Eng. *sheaf*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 858; Ալգերեան 1868, 646; Ալգերեան and Պրեմսեան 1821, 1: 775).

AT: *junīṅā* [χurdz] is the best translation and is probably a Proto-Indo-European word: **khōrtio-no-* from the stem **kert-* (‘to rotate, twist, squeeze, gather’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 350).

¹¹⁷ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *snop* [snop].

PM: according to existing scientific literature, *snop* [snop] has been in use in Polish since the 14th century with the meaning of ‘the bunch of harvested grain cereals (exceptionally other plants), often as a benefit in kind to a feudal lord’ (cf. Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 327). The noun comes from Proto-Slavic **snopъ* (‘large bunch of grain, straw, bunch’) from Proto-Indo-European **snep/*snōp/*snap* (‘to bind’ with the primary meaning ‘what is bound’) and is related to the Old High German *snuaba* (‘ribbon, tape’) (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 328; Borys 2008, 565; Brückner 1927, 2: 504).

R: besides Polish *snop* (Hanusz 1886, 460) other sources seem uncertain.

82. L: popu/pophgu (Գլազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 820) [k^hopa / k^hopits^ha] (Pol. *kopa*, *kopica*, Eng. *a heap*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 36).

AT: *խոտի դեզ* [χoti dez] (‘hayrick’) or *բարդ* [bard] (‘hayrick’) (Գրիգորյան 2017, 55–62). The first – *խոտի դեզ* (as ‘heap of grass’) – is a compound noun from *խոտ* [χot] ‘grass’ with *ի* (genitive *of* or *’s* possessive form) and *դեզ* ([dez] ‘heap’). In the case of *խոտ* [χot], there are Sanskrit parallels, but they do not lead to Indo-European forms united together with Armenian: cf. *k(h)ata*, *khetam* (‘grass’) which may be considered *gaddi* (‘grass, dry grass’) in the Dravidian Telugu language. Caucasian parallels (Udian *χod* – ‘tree’) could hardly be the source of the Armenian; on the contrary, they could have been borrowed from Armenian (Ջահուկյան 2010, 343). *դեզ* [dez] is rather a form of Proto-Indo-European *dheigh* (cf. Sanskrit *dēhī* – ‘dam, Avestan’, *diz*, *daēzayeiti* – ‘hoard, raise’, *uzdaēza* – ‘heap’ etc.) (Անտոնյան 1971, 1: 659). Olsen does not completely deny the Iranian origin of the word but supposes that *դեզ* [dez] may come from (Proto)-Indo-European **bhóros* – derivative **dhóighos* or s-stem **dhéighos* (Olsen 1999, 204). The second noun – *բարդ* [bard] – is probably Proto-Indo-European **bhrti-* from the root **bher-* (‘bring, take’), as in Sanskrit *bhrti-* (‘brings’), etc. (Ջահուկյան 2010, 121; Անտոնյան 1971, 1: 421; Olsen 1999, 81, 850).

PM: *kopa* is a Proto-Slavic form (‘heap, stack’) (Borys 2008, 248) and has existed in Polish since the 14th century with the meanings ‘quantity measure containing 60 pieces, a pile of grain or hay, also 60 sheaves, monetary unit containing

60 silver groszy, fine, financial court penalty or money in general’ (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 335–336; cf. Arct 1920, 1: 132; Brückner 1927, 1: 254).

R: Bozhko proposes Ukrainian *порігву* [k^hopits^ha] (Բոժկո 2010, 112) rather than Ruthenian *котиця* [kopyts^hja] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 364) as the source, which is possible, albeit not as likely as Polish (in Ukrainian *кона* [kopa] is considered a Belarusian loanword (Мельничук 1985, 2: 564)). In Kipchak, the noun *kopa* is very close in meaning to Polish or Ruthenian/Ukrainian – ‘heap, stack, flock, pile’ (Гаркавец 2010, 714), etc. In Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocols, we see it once in the following fragment: “[...] ի դաշտն առել է Դ (4) քորիցա [k^hopits^ha] իստսմ. առանց իմ իստսց [...]

” (‘[...] took 4 heaps of hay without my permission [...]’) (Գրիգորյան 1963, (173) 176–177).

Household items

83. **L:** **բանկա** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 84) [banka] (Pol. *bańka*, Eng. *jar* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 508; Ալզերեան 1868, 413; Ալզերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 488)).¹¹⁸

AT: *բանկա* (according to DFW) means ‘mostly cylindrical, wide-mouthed glass, clay or mortar vessel or, for cupping therapy, a vessel to put on the backs of patients’ (Աղայան 1976, 1: 168; Ժիրբ 1969, 1: 282). For medical use, there is also the noun ապիկ [apik] from *ապակի* [apaki]), an Iranian loanword (cf. Sogdian *apakēnak*, Persian *ābgīna*, etc., from Avestan *āp-*, Old Persian *āpi-*, Persian *āb* (‘water’)) (Անտեան 1971, 1: 226; Ջահուկյան 2010, 66; Olsen 1999, 450).

PM: the noun is the diminutive of *bania* [banja] (since the 15th century) – ‘a bulky dish, something convex, spherical’ etc. The word probably comes from Proto-Slavic **baŋa* (‘bathhouse’, ‘dome’, ‘domed vessel’) and is a Latin Vulgaris loanword – **bānea* (Latin *balnea/bal(i)neum* – ‘bath, baths’) (Boryś 2008, 21; Фасмер 1986, 1: 121). In Polish, for *bańka* [banjka] we can find at least 10 meanings: ‘a spherical dish with a neck, sometimes in the shape of a bowl or barber’s vessel for phlebotomy’ (Nitsch 1953–1955, 1: 60); ‘a tin dish used to store liquids, a small, spherical glass vessel attached to the body to cause local hyperemia or to draw blood as tool of cupping therapy’, (figurative) ‘illusions’ (Skorupka et al. 1969, 31; SPXVI) etc.

R: in the DFW of A. Hayrapetyan, we find the explanation that *բանկա* is a Russian loanword (*банка* [banka]) where it came from Polish *bańka*. Brückner obviously tries to explain the Polish origin of *bańka* (Brückner 1927, 1: 14), but he is not convincing (cf. Фасмер 1986, 1: 121). For the Armenian, St. Malkhasyants’

¹¹⁸ Probably with a medical meaning.

dictionary points only to the Russian borrowing of *բանկա(յ)* [banka(j)] in Armenian (Մալխասյան 1944, 1: 329), which is still in daily use.

84. **L:** **բրիստավայ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 128) [pristavkhaj] (Pol. *miska do salaty*, Eng. *lettuce bowl*; cf. Magakian 2022, 124).¹¹⁹

AT: the most appropriate translation is *սոցանի աման* [aʔtshani aman], which means ‘the bowel of սոցան’ ([aʔtshan], ‘the food from the plants sprinkled with salt’ (Rivola 1633, 10)). This is comprised of *սո* (from Proto-Indo-European stem *sal- or *Sali- (salt) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 32)) and *ցան* (‘to sow, to sprinkle’, which is of an unknown origin) with the third stem *աման* (from Proto-Indo-European *am-* (‘pour’) (Աճառեան 1971, 1: 143)).

PM: *przystawka/przystawka* ([pʃestavka/pʃystavka] ‘small bowl’) (Urbańczyk 1973–1977, 7: 183, 363) or *przystawka* ([pʃystavka] ‘snack, appetizer, entrée, hors d’oeuvre’) (Urbańczyk 1973–1977, 7: 248) has been used in Polish since at least the 15th century (Boryś 2008, 577).

R: *սոցան* also means an ‘appetizer’ or ‘starter’; however, according to the protocol of the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court, *բրիստավայ* [pristavkhaj] meant only ‘a (small) bowl’ (cf. Գրիգորյան 1963, 286–288) and not a kind of food as it does in Polish. Linde also stressed the meaning of the *dish* in Polish but not the food – ‘platter, medium bowl, salad bowl’ and also ‘to put sth against / to sth’ or ‘to add, to bring’ (Linde 1811, 2, 2: 1244). With almost the same meaning as *բրիստավայ* [pristavkhaj], we also have in Kipchak *pristavka* [pristavka] / *pr̥stavka* [pr̥stavka] – ‘something from the dishes’ or ‘small plate for snacks’ (Гаркавец 2010, 1175, 1179), which could have also been borrowed through Armenian.

¹¹⁹ Both translations are according to Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 128).

85. **L:** **բէշքայ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 119) [betʃ^hkhaj], now very rare petʃ^hkaj (Pol. *beczka*, Eng. *barrel* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 79; Ալգերեան 1868, 63; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 69)).

AT: *usulhun* ([takar] ‘barrel’) – this is a unique translation and is obviously a loanword from Middle Persian *takār* or Persian *tayār* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 718)

PM: *beczka* [betʃ^hka] has been used in Polish since the 14th century, primarily from *běci* which is rather an Old Bavarian loanword from **butša/*butše* (Boryś 2008, 24; cf. Фасмер 1986, 1: 202).

R: the existence of this word in this sense in the given historical period is doubtful, all the more so since the *Słownik staropolski* proposes use of the word *beczka* (or *baczka* [batʃ^hka]) at the beginning of the 15th century at the earliest (Nitsch 1953–1955, 1: 72–73). However, the example cited in MAD creates a problem – “[...] եղին բարսն եւ զամենայն ի փուլ ածին եւ զամենայն դրուսն. եւ **զբէշքայ [zpetʃ^hkhaj]** քաղաքին բերեալ կամուրջ կապեցին ընդ ծովն ի ներս [...]” (Պալիենցի 1956, 189). The text describes the siege of the city and the destruction of the defensive walls, hence, *զբէշքայ* [zpetʃ^hkhaj] does not seem to refer to the Polish noun *beczka*. The text is a fragment from *Մանր ժամանակագրութիւններ* (Small chronicles), and it is not quite clear what the meaning of the noun *զբէշքայ* (also *զպէշք նիւթսն* [zpetʃ^hk^h njut^hsn] or *զպէշքայթսն* [zpetʃ^hk^hajət^hsn], etc.) is (Պալիենցի 1956, 194). Even if we assume that this noun is of Polish origin with Polish pronunciation, and if we take Western Armenian into account because of the borrowing period, the spelling of *պէշքայ* [betʃ^hkhaj] is more likely than *բէշքայ* [petʃ^hkhaj] (Պալիենցի 1956, 189, 194). In colloquial Armenian, the word appeared later than the Russian version – *бочка* ([botʃ^hka] barrel) – and was also used in the dialectal forms *բոշկա* [boʃka] and *բոշկա* [botʃ^hka] with the same meaning (Սարգսյան 2001, 1: 210).

86. **L:** բոլպոչոկ (Պողոսյան 2014, 48) [polbotʃʰok] (Pol. *bolpoček*¹²⁰/*polboček*, Eng. *barrel, cask, keg, wood* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 79, 140, 519, 1099; Ալգերեան 1868, 63, 418; Ալգերեան and Պրէնստեան 1821, 1: 69, 113, 493)).

AT: NWEA translates բոլպոչոկ [polbotʃʰok] as *տակար* ([takar] ‘barrel, cask, keg, wood’) and explains չափի միավոր ([tʃʰapʰi miavor] ‘unit of measure’) similar to կոտ ([kot] ‘pound’).

PM: I could not find such a word in either Old or present-day Polish.

R: from the perspective of history and Western Armenian, which is close to Polish Armenian, even the Polish transcription of *bolpoček* proposed by the NWEA is not adequate because if the Armenian pronunciation is բոլպոչոկ, then the Polish transcript should read *polboczok* instead of *bolpoček* (as proposed by NWEA) which could be pronounced in Armenian, as I have already mentioned, *polboxok*. However, within this noun it is possible to perceive Polish *pol/pól* (‘half’) (with Western Armenian pronunciation = բոլ [pol]) and *beczka* [b/petʃʰka] as ‘barrel’. Then we could have *pólbeczka* [pulbetʃʰka] as a unit of measurement of ‘half of the barrel’ – for liquids and loose materials, of different sizes at different times (Doroszewski; Gloger 1900, 1: 137). In Polish, we also have *pólbeczulek* [pulbetʃʰulek], *pólbeczulka* [pulbetʃʰulka] with the same meaning (Arct 1916, 1: 283). The example of NWEA confirms this hypothesis – Բազում զանձք խոստացաւ նոցա... զոր ոմանք ատին երկու բոլպոչօք [polbotʃʰokʰ] (տակարիկ) կարմիր ֆլորի (Ալիշան 1896, 61). Here the author Gh. Alishan is talking about two half-barrels (Polish *pólbeczka*) of money – կարմիր ֆլորի ([karmir florin] ‘red florin’¹²¹) and, as we can see in Armenian, explains in parentheses the meaning of the incomprehensible word – բոլպոչօք [polbotʃʰokʰ] – as Armenian *տակարիկ* ([takarik] ‘barrel’). The original transliteration of բոլպոչոկ(ո)կ [polbotʃʰok/kʰ] in Western-Armenian sounds very close to Polish *pólbeczka* [pulbetʃʰka].

¹²⁰ Translation according to Պողոսյան (2014, 48).

¹²¹ It could be from *červonij*, probably *červonij zloty* – ‘florin’ or ‘ducat’ (Tryjarski 1982, 324).

87. **L:** **դաբչուն**¹²² (Hanusz 1886, 392) [taptʃun] (Pol. *tapczan*, Eng. *couch,avenport* (cf. Ասմանգույլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 202, 225; Ալգերեան 1868, 180; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 204)).

AT: in modern Armenian, the equivalent is *տույզսուն* [taptʃan] which means ‘a coastal deckchair’, ‘hard sofa’. This noun in Middle Armenian was known as the Polish loanword *tapczan* [taptʃan] or *տույզսուն* [toptʃan]) with the meaning of ‘couch, sofa, bed’ (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 748).

PM: Hanusz proposes ‘bed’, possibly ‘couch, carpet’ (Hanusz 1886, 392). Brückner points out that at the beginning of the 20th century, *tapczan* [taptʃan] or *tarczán* [tartʃan] still referred to ‘bench, bunk’ (Brückner 1927, 2: 565) in Polish as it had in the 16th century. Moreover, in Customs Instruction from 1643 (Instruktarz¹²³ celny 1643, 82/42), we see that the original meaning of the noun was slightly different. In the part of “Instruction” that “deals with Turkish Goods, which Armenians, Persians, Greeks and Turks introduced to the Crown,” *tapczany* ([t/daptʃany] ‘couches’ (Instruktarz celny 1643, 82/42) are mentioned. The transliteration/transcription in Armenian could be [dabtʃany], which, as Zygmunt Gloger emphasizes and Linde also mentions, are “a kind of Turkish rug, which were imported to Poland, hung on the walls” (Instruktarz celny 1643, 82/42; Gloger 1903, 4: 358; Linde 1812, 3: 602).

R: the word exists in different languages close to Polish Armenians such as Ruthenian *танчан* [taptʃan] or *тончан* [toptʃan] (Желехівський and Недільский 1886, 2: 948, 975) / Ukrainian *танчан* [taptʃan] (Мельничук 2006, 5: 516), Kipchak (rather through the Armenian language) *tapčan* [taptʃan] (Гаркавец 2010, 1385), etc. However, if *դաբչուն* [taptʃun] with the meaning of the Kutuy dialect is not present in the basic Armenian vocabulary, the Polish borrowing becomes the primary source (apart from the fact that Turkish etymology of the noun seems an obvious (Karakurt 2017, 215; cf. Kurtbilal 2019, 195–227, etc.) source of Armenian borrowing). On the other hand, it is difficult to unequivocally rule out that the noun could have been introduced into Polish from Turkish via Armenian.

¹²² The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *dapčhùn* [taptʃun].

¹²³ The modern Polish spelling is *instruktaż* [instruktaz].

88. **L:** լանցուխ (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 283; Hanusz 1886, 435¹²⁴) [lants^hux] (Pol. *łańcuch*, *kajdany*, Eng. *chain*, *manacle* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 146, 570; Ալգերեան 1868, 120, 448; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 134, 530)).

AT: շղթա(j) [ʃɛt^ha(j)] is a unique equivalent in Armenian and is an Aramaic loanword from *šīšitā* → *šīšilt’ə*, with the fall of the *-i-* (Assyrian *šēšaltā* or *šīšilt’ə*, Arabic *silsila* etc.) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 590; Աճառեան 1977, 3: 524; Ուրիշեան 1998, 2: 100).

PM: the Polish noun *łańcuch* [lańts^hux] (or *łańcuch* [lants^hux], *lejcuch* [lejts^hux], *leńcuch* [leńts^hux], *lajcuch* [lajts^hux] etc.) has been in use since the 14th century with the meaning of ‘type of cord made of metal links, chain for tying the prisoner, bonds, shackles’ (Linde 1808, 1, 1: 1223¹²⁵; Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 96; Boryś 2008, 295; Brückner 1927, 1: 306). The noun is an Upper-Middle-German loanword: *Lannzug* consists of *lanne* (chain) and *zuc*, *zuges* (‘pulling, train, something dragging on’, etc.) (Boryś 2008, 295; Гаркавец 2010, 913).

R: Bozhko believes that it is a Ukrainian loanword (Բոժկո 2010, 112), but Harkavets’s dictionary, among others, shows that at least phonetically it is a Polish loanword: Kipchak *lançux* [lants^hux] is *лaнцyг* [lants^hjuh] in Ukrainian but *łańcuch* in Polish [lańts^hux] (Гаркавец 2010, 913) (which in my opinion could have come to Kipchak through the Armenian). Bozhko’s approach is rather unlikely because, according to Ukrainian sources, the Ukrainian noun *лaнцyг* [lants^hjuh] has been borrowed from Polish or at least through Polish (Мельничук 1989, 3: 192). In Polish Armenian, it appears earlier. We can note it in 1574 in the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court Protocols (Գրիգորյան 1963, (445) 286–288). From Armenian sources we can conclude that *լանցուխ* [lants^hux] was used as ‘iron chain’ in farming as well as a ‘jewelry product’ etc.: “Մէկ լանցուխ [lants^hux] ոսկու կարմրէ, որ նոր կու քաշէ էրսուն օսգի կարմիր” (‘the sentence is about an expensive chain (լանցուխ [lants^hux]) made of high quality gold’) (Գրիգորյան

¹²⁴ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *lançux* [lançux].

¹²⁵ Samuel Linde refers also to the verb *łączyć* ([lontʃitʃ] ‘to connect/join’ etc.) which however does not seem to be justified.

1974, 41) or “Ա (1) կտոր լանցուխի [lants^hux] էրկաթի” (‘a piece of iron chain (լանցուխի [lants^hux])’) (Գրիգորյան 1963, (445) 286–288) etc. It is an obvious Polish loanword. The Polish *ł* could have easily been changed into *l* and *ń* to *n* due to the lack of Armenian equivalents. Hanusz suggests Polish or even, in my opinion less likely, Ruthenian (Hanusz 1886, 435) *ланиц* [lants^h], *ланицух* [lants^hux], *ланицюг* [lants^hjuh] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 397) as the origin of the loanword.

89. **L:** **լավիցա**¹²⁶ (Hanusz 1886, 435) [lavits^ha] (Pol. *lawica*, *lawa*, *lawka*, Eng. *bench* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 89; Ալգերեան 1868, 72–73; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 80)).

AT: the equivalent is *նստարան* [nstaran], which consists of *նիստ* [nist] from the Proto-Indo-European stem **ni-zdo* (**ni* (bottom), **sed/*zd* (to sit)) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 569; cf. Olsen 1999, 17) and *արան* [aran] from Iranian *-a-dan(a)-*, from the stem element *-a-* with *dana-* (place) (Ջահուկյան 1994, 60; cf. Olsen 1999, 339–342).

PM: *lawica* [lavits^ha] is the derivative of *lawa* [lava], a word known in Polish since the 14th century (with different meanings) from Proto-Slavic **lava* (‘seating equipment, bench’), which likely comes from Proto-Indo-European **lēu-/lāu-* (‘stone’) (Boryś 2008, 297). *Lawica* meant ‘court bench on which jurors sat in German law courts, also a jury sitting on the bench, the court itself, a bench for sitting or footbridge over the stream, market stall, stand’ (Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 103–104).

R: as a source of borrowing, Hanusz suggests the Ruthenian (Hanusz 1886, 435) – *лава* [lava], *лавина* [lavyna], *лавиця* [lavytshja] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 394; Мельничук 1989, 3: 175–176). The probability that the word was borrowed from Polish, however, is very high. It is also very likely that *լավիցա* [lavits^ha]/*lawica* passed into Kipchak (*lavica* [lavits^ha] – ‘city council, town hall, magistrate, community jury council’ (Гаркавец 2010, 916)) through Polish Armenians (even at the beginning of their stay in Poland).

¹²⁶ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *lavica* [lavits^ha].

90. **L:** կիյ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 282) [kij] (Pol. *kij*, Eng. *cue*, *stick*). (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 216, 928–929; Ալզերեան 1868, 684; Ալզերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 822).

AT: կիյ in Armenian is in use only as *stick* with the meaning of a ‘long rod for playing billiards’ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 282), a *cue* (Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 216).

PM: *kij* [kij] in Old Polish (since the 13th century) was a ‘wooden pole, walking stick’, later ‘a stick (sometimes shod), a staff, a cudgel or even stick fight as a form of evidence in the trial’ (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 276–277; Borys 2008, 230). The noun came from Proto-Slavic *kyjъ* (‘stick, club’), which is from the Proto-Slavic verb *kuti* (‘beat, hit’) with the suffix **-jъ* and archaic change of native vowel **u* into **y* (from earlier alternation of **ou* into **ū*) (Borys 2008, 230; Derksen 2008, 265).

R: borrowing from Polish through Russian *куй* [kij] is not entirely impossible, but Vasmer believes that a Polish intermediary with a borrowing from Russian is rather unlikely (Фасмер 1986, 2: 231). The common Slavic root of *kij* confirm this hypothesis: Brückner gives the meaning and origin of the noun *kij* as the same for all Slavs (Brückner 1927, 1: 229) (as **kyjъ* by Derksen (2008, 265)). In Armenian, կիյ is probably a direct Russian loanword, however, without any Polish traces.

91. **L:** կովադլա¹²⁷ (Hanusz 1886, 429) [kovadla] (Pol. *kowadlo*, Eng. *anvil*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 49; Ալզերեան 1868, 35).

AT: սալ [sal] is an apt translation. The noun comes from Proto-Indo-European **kəlā-* of the stem **kei-* with the meaning of ‘sharpen’ (cf. Sanskrit *çilā* – ‘stone, rock’ etc.) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 662). In the first half of the 17th century, սալ was already interpreted as ‘plate’ (Rivola 1633, 332). The next possible translation is *զնդան* [zndan] with the meaning of ‘anvil’ (explanations similar to գազնայ [kaznaj]).

¹²⁷ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *kovadlā* [kovadla].

PM: *kowadlo* [kowadlo] originally meant ‘what can be forged: ore, metal’ (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 365). Since the 16th century, it has meant ‘what is used for forging metal, an anvil, a hammer’ (Boryś 2008, 254). The noun comes from Proto-Slavic **kovadlo* (Boryś 2008, 254) and is the name of the tool coming from **kovati* ([kovati] ‘to forge’) with the suffixe *-dlo*, which creates the names of tools and means related to the performance of specific activities (Szober 1923, 134; cf. Derksen 2008, 241–242; Boryś 2008, 254).

R: according to J. Hanusz, the noun is a Polish loanword for Polish Armenians (or only for the Armenians from Kutý) (Hanusz 1886, 429). This noun has never appeared in any of the other Armenian dialects.

92. **L:** **մօզձիր** (Աճառեան 1953, 189) [mozdzir] (Pol. *moździerz*, Eng. *mortar (and pestle)*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 602, 691; Ալզերեան 1868, 473, 532; Ալզերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 635).

AT: the Polish word *moździerz* also has the meaning of ‘mortar’ as weapon; however, it was not used by Polish Armenians. In this context, the correct Armenian word is *սսւնի* ([sand] ‘anvil’) (Աճառեան 1953, 189), which is an Iranian loanword (e.g. Middle Persian *sandān* – ‘dungeon’, ‘slab’). Less likely is the Semitic (like Accadian *samādu(m)* – ‘grind’) origin or Assyrian *aseṣṣā* – ‘anvil’, which is rather a random similarity (Ջսիհուկյան 2010, 667; cf. Աճառեան 1979, 4: 171–172; Olsen 1999, 673, 682).

PM: *moździerz* (or *modżerz*, *moźgierz*, *moźderz*) has been in use in Polish since the 15th century. It was first used to refer to a kitchen or pharmacy bowl with a pestle, used for grinding kitchen spices and medicinal substances into a fine powder and borrowed from Old Bohemian *možieř/moždieř/mozdieř/možďrieř* (*moździerz*) which is a Middle-Upper-German word – *Mörser* (from Latin *mortārium*) (cf. Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 334–335; Boryś 2008, 338; Brückner 1927, 1: 346).

R: *մօզձիր* [mozdzir] is obviously a Polish loanword in the Polish Armenian dialect (Աճառեան 1953, 189).

93. **L:** շաֆա¹²⁸ (Hanusz 1886, 462) [ʃafa] (Pol. *szafa*, Eng. *cupboard*, *locker wardrobe*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 217, 1075; Ալգերեան 1868, 193, 790; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 220).

AT: the Armenian equivalent could be *պահարան* ([paharan] – ‘cupboard, locker’) or *զգեստապահարան* ([zgestapaharan] – ‘wardrobe’). *պահարան* is a derivative of *պահ* [pah], which is from Iranian *pahr* (*<*pavra* – *pavra*) as ‘protection’ or ‘guard’ (Ջահուկյան 2010, 617; Olsen 1999, 711) with the suffix *-արան*.¹²⁹ *զգեստ* ([zgest] ‘garment’, ‘clothing’) (Olsen 1999, 108) is a derivative of *զգեստու* [zgenul], composed with the prefix *զ* [z] from the Proto-Indo-European stem **ues-* of the form **ues* (‘to wear’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 235–236; Անտոնյան 1973, 2: 88) and is linked with *պահարան* [paharan] with the conjunction *ա* [a].

PM: this noun appears around the 16th century as *szafa* [ʃafa] in Polish and, a little later, as a *шафа* [ʃafa] for ‘place for storing clothes’ in Russian, Ruthenian/Ukrainian, Belarusian (Мельничук 2006, 5: 1084; Фасмер 1987, 4: 414; Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 1084). Brückner writes that it was during this period that the noun replaced the older nouns *almarje* [almarjen], *cebratka* [ts^hebratka] or *faska* [faska] and probably penetrated the Polish language from the German *Schaff* or *Schafel* in the 16th century (Brückner 1927, 2: 539).

R: it is somewhat difficult to determine the exact source of borrowing, although Polish (especially in the case of the Kutya dialect) is most likely (Hanusz 1886, 462).

94. **L:** ուպրոս (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 620) [ubrus] or օբրոս¹³⁰ (Hanusz 1886, 446) [obrus] (Pol. *obrus*, Eng. *tablecloth*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 966; Ալգերեան 1868, 708; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 853).

¹²⁸ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *šafä* [ʃafa].

¹²⁹ Like *-արան* [-aran] in the case of **րարթու** [rat^hu] – entry no. 195.

¹³⁰ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *obrus* [oprus/oprus].

AT: *ւիռնց* [sp^hrots^h] (or old forms *իռնց* [p^hrots^h] (Մալխաստեանց 1945, 4: 528) and *իռնվացք* [p^hrvats^hk^h] (Rivola 1633, 380)) is the translation of ‘tablecloth’ in Armenian, which also meant ‘carpet’ (Մալխաստեանց 1945, 4: 283; Ժիլլը 1980, 4: 684; Աղալյան 1976, 2: 1539). *ւիռնց* [sp^hrots^h] comes from Indo-European **phēr-s-*, **pher-* (‘to shed’, ‘to sow’), which we can compare with Middle Upper German *sproewen* (‘to shake’, ‘to throw out’), Latin *spargo* (‘to sprinkle’), etc. (Զահուկյան 2010, 770; Անանյան 1979, 4: 531).

PM: *obrus* [obrus] or *ubrus* [ubrus] in Kipchak (Гаркавец 2010, 1031–1032), as Harkavets emphasizes, has been in use in Polish since the 14th century and comes from Proto-Slavic **o(b)brusъ* – ‘a piece of wiping cloth, a hand cloth’ (Boryś 2008, 376; cf. Brückner 1927, 1: 372) – also known as ‘sheet, tablecloth, towel’ (Urbańczyk 1965–1969, 5: 380; Linde 1809, 2, 1: 388). The item originally served for rubbing hands and sweat (Brückner 1927, 1: 372).

R: The Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocol informs us that “[...] դրել էր Ասվասուրիին մօտն Մարուխնային փետին ամանաթ ապրանքներ. [...] ԻԳ (23) յօթօղ **ուպրուս** [uprus/ubrus]. [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (92) 139–140) which we can interpret as information that somebody left (probably as collateral) items with someone and among them there were 23 cubits long *ուպրուս* ([ubrus] ‘tablecloth’). We can suppose that, at least in this context, *ուպրուս* [ubrus] could even just mean ‘fabric’. To be precise, it is worth highlighting that Bozhko explains the source of Armenian *ուպրուս* [ubrus] in the Ukrainian (Բոժկո 2010, 112), which is hard to prove (but impossible to rule out). According to Есум, the dialectal version of the noun has been available in Ukrainian since the 11th century (Мельничук 2003, 4: 144), but it is uncertain whether we can speak of Ukrainian as an independent language during that period (Fałowski 2011, 130). If the Armenians adopted the Polish form of *ուպրուս* [ubrus] as a household item, then obviously they had not had an equivalent of that word in Armenian, otherwise they would have used that instead. According to J. Hanusz, for at least Kutay Armenians, *օրրուս* [ob(p)rus] meant ‘towel, or table covering’ (Hanusz 1886, 446). So, both *ուպրուս* [ubrus] and *օրրուս* [ob(p)rus] could have passed into Armenian from Ruthenian (Желехівський 1886, 1: 548), as well as Ukrainian (Мельничук 2003, 4: 143–144) or (with greater similarity) from Polish. Only Polish Armenians used both forms of the noun.

95. **L:** **չարս** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 625) [tʰara] or **ճառայ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 470) [tʰaraj] (Pol. *czara*, Eng. *pot, pitcher*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 701, 719; Ալգերեան 1868, 538, 550; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 643, 657).

AT: *չարս* [tʰara], *ճառայ* [tʰaraj] / *ճարայ* [tʰaraj] comes from Arab *ʃara* or Persian *ʃarre* ('pot, pitcher'). French *jarre* and Italian *giarra*, etc. also have the same Arab source (Աճառեան 1977, 3: 189; cf. *gara* (Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 201)). According to Acharyan (Աճառեան 1977, 3: 189), Russian (Фасмер 1987, 4: 316) and Ukrainian (Мельничук 2012, 6: 280–281) *чара* [tʰara] (or Ruthenian *чаракa* [tʰaraka] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 1060)) forms were probably borrowed from Turk *čara* [tʰara].

PM: in spite of the different forms – *czara* [tʰara] as *bowl* (or *czasza* [tʰaʃa]) and *kielich* [kieliχ] as 'cup', they can also be used interchangeably (Nitsch 1953–1955, 1: 356). *Czara* [tʰara] is a 'low, wide, semicircular, cylindrical vessel, usually without handles, often richly decorated, formerly used for drinking wine, honey', etc. (Sobol 1995, 200; cf. Doroszewski). The noun has been in use in Poland since the 17th century (Boryś 2008, 90) and is a Russian loanword (*чара* [tʰara] (Фасмер 1987, 4: 316; Boryś 2008, 90)), where it has been in use since the 12th century and was borrowed from the Orient (cf. Turk¹³¹ and Mongol¹³² *čara* etc.) (Boryś 2008, 90; Brückner 1927, 1: 72).

R: *չարս* [tʰara] may also be a Russian (or Ruthenian/Ukrainian) loanword in the Polish Armenian dialect. However, in Russian it functioned earlier than in Polish, and even in the inventory prepared by the Court in Kamianets-Podilskyi from the 16th century we can find it in the penultimate position of this list: "[...] մնորովի **չարս [tʰara]** փայտէ [...]" (Գրիգորյան 1963, (445) 286–288) (wooden *չարս* ([tʰara] 'pot, pitcher') from Moscow).

¹³¹ In Kipchak it is rendered as *čarka*, where we can see Slavic influence in the diminutive ending *-ka*, which seems to be from Proto-Slavic **-ьka*. (Гаркавец 2010, 369–370, Derksen 2008, 26; Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 1060).

¹³² Hrachya Acharyan doubts *čara*'s Arabic borrowing in Mongolian (Աճառեան 1977, 3: 189).

96. **L:** պիլա¹³³ (Hanusz 1886, 452) [pila] (Pol. *pila*, Eng. *saw*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 827; Ալգերեան 1868, 628; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան h. 1 1821, 751).

AT: *uṣṣ* ([sʷots^h] ‘saw’) of an unknown etymology (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 233; Rivola 1633, 341).

PM: *pila* [pila] – since the 15th century, ‘a tool with a toothed blade for cutting’ (Urbańczyk 1970–1973, 6: 135–136) – is probably a German borrowing **fīlō* (‘a file’) (Borys 2008, 436), also noted by J. Hanusz (1886, 452).

R: Hanusz sees the possible sources of borrowing in Polish *pila* [pila] and Romanian *pilă* [pila] (Hanusz 1886, 452; Oczko 2010, 204). However, it seems to me that we also have to take into consideration the Ruthenian *пила* ([pyla] ‘saw’) (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 631). The noun also exists in Kipchak (*pila*) (Гаркавец 2010, 137) but with Armenian equivalent *uṣṣ* [sʷots^h].

97. **L:** պյալա¹³⁴ (Hanusz 1886, 452) [pjala] (Pol. *szkło*, *szklanka*, Eng. *piyāla*, *piyal’e*, *phial*) (cf. Ալգերեան 1868, 533; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 637).

AT: the correct form is *փիալայ* [p^hialaj], which is from Persian *piyāla* by the intermediary of Turkish *piyale* – drinking glass or glass full of wine, known in Turkish from the time of Codex Cumanicus at the beginning of the 14th century (Մալխասեանց 1944, 4: 498; Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 786; Nişanyan).

PM: I could not find a Polish equivalent.

R: although the Greek form dates back to the 2nd millennium BC, its ultimate origin is still unclear (Nişanyan); however, its meaning is a ‘glass’ or a ‘cup’

¹³³ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *pilà* [pila].

¹³⁴ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *pjala* [pjala].

(Villotte 1714, 95; cf. Гаркавец 2010, 1188). Even though the noun was used in the Armenian dialect of Kutuy, it does not seem to be a Polish borrowing. The noun could have been in the language directly from Persian or Turkish, or, as Hanusz proposes, from Romanian *fială*, Latin *phiala*, or even Greek φιάλη (Hanusz 1886, 452).

98. **L:** **պոսնեա** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 659) [bodnea] (Pol. *waliza*, Eng. *suitcase*, *case*, *valise*¹³⁵) (cf. Ասմանզուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 140, 951, 1055; Ալգերեան 1868, 113; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 126).

AT: *ճամպրուկ*¹³⁶ ([tʃampruk] ‘suitcase’) is probably an Iranian loanword and means ‘bag made by hair’ or ‘bag, suitcase’ (Անանեան, 1977, 3: 180; Ջահուկյան 2010, 487). The translation of *պոսնեա* [bodnea] as *ճամպրուկ* ([tʃampruk] ‘suitcase’ – ‘a large boxed travel case, leather, cardboard, etc., with clothes and various hand items’) is rather the less used form in Armenian. *ճամպրուկ* [tʃampruk] is the equivalent of *waliza* [valiza], which passed into Polish only in 19th century from French with the meaning of ‘a type of carriage trunk’ (Linde 1814, 4: 131; cf. TLFi; Dauzat et al. 1971, 781) (In French the etymology is not certain (Dauzat et al. 1971, 781)). The Armenian *ճամպրուկ* [tʃampruk] was in use in the language much earlier, probably since the beginning of 1706 (cf. Յայսմաւուրք, 1706, Feb. 24). As *ճամբրայ* [tʃampraj] (as ‘a travel or shepherd’s bag’) we can see it even since the beginning of the 17th century (Rivola 1633, 239). However, both *waliza* [valiza] and *ճամպրուկ* [tʃampruk] are nouns that came into use later and in the 16th century were not used in the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocol. The protocol only informs: “Եկաւ Զալինեայէն Իւրեաշ եւ զանկատ առաւ Ռինան՝ Խաչքոյին կնոջն վերայ. զոր տվել էր նմա պահելու Բ (2) **պոսնեա [bodnea]**. զոր Ա (1) **պոսնեան [bodnean]** առի ի նմանէ եւ միւսի մէջն կայր օծիրիլէ” which is about ‘a lady who gave to the other lady to store two **պոսնեա [bodnea]** and there were valuables in one’ (Գրիգորյան 1963, (283) 228).

PM: Polish *bodnia* [bodnia], *bednia* [bednia] or *dzieża* [dziejza] is a ‘large wooden bowl, kneading-trough’ or ‘barrel with a lockable lid’ (Doroszewski;

¹³⁵ Both translations are according to Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 659).

¹³⁶ According to Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 659).

Krasnowolski and Niedźwiedzki 1920, 23) and could be a Ruthenian/Ukrainian borrowing (Фасмер 1986, 1: 184).

R: in Polish Armenian it could also be a Ruthenian/Ukrainian (*бодня* [bodnja]) or Polish loanword. The noun has been in Ruthenian/Ukrainian since at least the 16th century, so the Proto-Slavic *bъdъnъ* could come from German and having taken root in Polish (*bodnia*, *będnia*) either independently or through Ruthenian/Ukrainian (Doroszewski; Krasnowolski and Niedźwiedzki 1920, 1: 23; Мельничук 1982, 1: 221–222). The *Малоруско-німецький словарь* (in Ruthenian) also adds the meaning ‘vat’ (‘large barrel, large tun with clasp’) (Желехівський 1886, 1: 37). Anna Czapła acknowledges the Ukrainian origin of *bodnia/bednia* and adds that it also means a ‘very fat, indecent person’ (Czapła 2016, 21). The detailed analyze of Polish *bodnia/bednia* (see more: Pospiszyl 2004, 121) brings one more possible explanation – the Armenian equivalent (also known to Polish Armenians) could be *սնդուկ* ([sɛnduk] ‘chest’), from Arabic *sandūq*, *sundūq* (Մալխասեանց 1945, 4: 23; Աղայան 1976, 2: 1314). The Kipchak word *bodnâ* also comes from Ukrainian (or Ruthenian?) *бодня* or Polish *bednia*, *będnia*, *bodnia* and means ‘tub with a lid’ (Гаркавец 2010, 302), but we cannot exclude that it went to Kipchak through Armenian. Thus, we can suppose that the Polish Armenian equivalent of *bodnia* [bodnia], *bednia* [bednia], *będnia* [bendnia] or *dzieża* [dʒieʒa] is ‘a small, usually leather or wooden bag/box containing valuables or even food’.

99. **L:** սոլ (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 693) [sol] (Pol. *stół*, Eng. *table*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 966; Ալգերեան 1868, 708; Ալգերեան and Պրէստեան 1821, 1: 852; Młynarczyk 2010, 88–89).

AT: *սեղան* [sevan], the origin of which is not certain, probably comes from Persian *šēlān* (‘royal table’) from which also comes Turkish *şilan* (‘sultans and emirs table’, ‘social dinner’), Kurdish *şilan* (‘feast’), etc. (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 198–199).

PM: *stół* has been in the language since 14th century Proto-Slavic **stolъ*/**stòlъ* (also *stolek* as ‘place to sit’) and is a noun based on the verb **stьlati* and the

Proto-Slavic **stolъ* as ‘primary something on the ground for eating and sitting on that’ (Boryś 2008, 579; Derksen 2008, 468).

R: Armenians borrowed the noun with the meaning of ‘table’, but Harkavets also gives another Armenian sense of *stol* – *բագին* [bagin] (Гаркавец 2010, 1320), which means ‘altar, church altar’ (Ջահուկյան 2010, 110). It is a Middle Persian (*bag*) or Old Persian (*baga*) loanword – ‘god’ (Անտոնյան 1971, 1: 373), which could also have been in use with the same meaning. In Bozhko’s opinion, *սոլ* [stol] is a Ukrainian loanword in Polish Armenian (Բոժկո 2010, 112). The Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocol, where this noun was noted, comes from 1574 (Գրիգորյան 1963, (445) 286). So, even if we consider Bozhko’s argument to be justified, the chronology may point to Ruthenian (rather than Ukrainian) pronunciation of *cmil* [stil] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 921; Мельничук 2006, 5: 419). In fact, before the 14th century, the noun in Ruthenian/Ukrainian was also *смол* [stol],¹³⁷ but borrowing the word by Armenians occurred around the 16th century (according to the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocols of at least 100 years later), so Polish still remains the most likely source of borrowing for *սոլ* [stol].

100. **L:** **սնոր** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 707) [snor] (Pol. *sznur*, Eng. *cord, rope*) (cf. Ասմանզուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 197, 810; Ալգերեան 1868, 176, 617; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 200, 737).

AT: from three proposals of the translation of *սնոր* [snor] into Armenian (*քուր* [k^hux], *ժապավեն* [zapaven] and *երիզ* [eriz] (Մեդրեցի 1698, 92), only the last one has a more or less clear origin. *քուր* [k^hux] has an unknown origin (Ջահուկյան 2010, 787; Անտոնյան 1979, 4: 591), *ժապավեն* [zapaven] is rather Iranian loanword but the origin is also unclear (Ջահուկյան 2010, 280; Անտոնյան, 1973, 2: 228). However, according to Olsen, the word “looks unmistakably Iranian” (Olsen 1999, 947). *երիզ* [eriz] may come from Proto-Indo-European **reigh-* which is probably a derivative of the parallel form **rei-g(-)* (‘to tie, to link’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 225).

¹³⁷ Private correspondence with Professor Oleg Leszczak.

PM: the noun *sznur* [ʃnur] has existed in Polish since the 14th century, but in the past, *snor* [snor], is a Middle-Upper-German loanword (Boryś 2008, 605), was also in use.

R: *sznur* [ʃnur] as *snor* [snor] only occurred in Polish, so it appears to have been a Polish borrowing as in this example: “[...] եւ կէս ֆլորին այլ սպիտակ սովի. Որ սնորներ [snorner] բանեցին” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (136) 160–161) (somebody ‘gave half of florin for the cords’).

101. **L:** սոֆա¹³⁸ (Hanusz 1886, 460) [sofa] (Pol. *sofa*, *kanapa*, Eng. *sofa*, *couch*) (cf. Ասմանգույան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 202, 895; Ալզերեան 1868, 180, 664; Ալզերեան and Պրէստեան 1821, 1: 204, 798).

AT: *puqúng* [bazmots^h] is the derivative of *puqúh* ([bazmil] ‘to sit’) and is an Iranian loanword – Persian *bazm* (‘feast, regale’) and *bazmgāh* (‘place of feasts’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 110) with the Indo-European suffix **-sko-/a-* with previous basic vowel **-o-* (which indicates the location) (Ջահուկյան 1995, 139).

PM: Linde, with a little bit of uncertainty, explains *sofa* as a kind of ‘settee’ (Linde 1812, 3: 330). The noun occurs both in Ottoman Turkish (from Arabic *suffe* [sufe]) as well as in modern Turkish (*sofa*) (*Osmanlıca sözlük* pos. 8659). It was first recorded in the 14th century (Nişanyan). Through the Turkish, the Arabic *şuffa(t)*¹³⁹ (or *şúffa/şúffah*) (Мельничук 2006, 5: 361) appeared in the 16th century in French as a *sofa* (Dauzat et al. 1971, 697) and from there it came to Russian as *софа* [sofa] (Фасмер 1987, 3: 729). This noun began to be widely used in the 18th century in Poland and in Europe (*Encyklopedia PWN*).

R: it is difficult to clearly determine from which language the word was borrowed by the Polish Armenians (especially those in Kutuy). In the classical Armenian vocabulary, *sofa* does not appear, so it is hard to suppose that it remained in Kutuy

¹³⁸ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *sofà* [sofa].

¹³⁹ Could mean ‘a stone base, a bench, a row, rows of the amphitheater, a cushion saddle on a camel’ (Nişanyan; Фасмер 1987, 3: 729; Мельничук 2006, 5: 360–361).

dialect from the Armenian language (or even from Turkish). We have intermediary languages, among which Polish could be selected first (*sofa*), then Ruthenian (*софа, софка* [sofa, sofka], as a ‘rug, settee’ etc. (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 898; Рымашевская 1990, 363; Мельничук 2006, 5: 360–361)) or Russian (*софа* [sofa]) (Фасмер 1987, 3: 729).

102. **L:** **տրուշլաք** (Գազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 768) [druʃlak^h(g)] (Pol. *cedzak*, Eng. *strainer, colander*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 168, 937; Ալզերեան 1868, 143, 687; Ալզերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 161, 827).

AT: MAD proposes *քամիչ* ([khamitʃ^h] ‘strainer’) which is the most appropriate translation. The noun is the derivative of *քամ* [kham], which comes from Proto Indo-European **qm-* from the stem **qem-* (‘to compress, crumple’) – cf. Lithuanian *kamioti* (‘compress, crumple, tuck’), Latvian *kēmsu* (‘crumple, tuck’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 775; Աճառեան 1979, 4: 547). At the beginning of the 17th century in Armenian the noun *քամոնք* ([k^hamots^hk^h] ‘what remains after straining’) was in use (Rivola 1633, 383), and by the end of the same century the verb *քամել* ([khamel] ‘to squeeze’) (Մեղրեցի 1698, 327) was common.

PM: we see the noun *druszlak* [druʃlag] in Polish in the 15th century (Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 220) as a ‘special scoop with holes (for draining water)’ (Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 220), a ‘kitchen colander’ from the German *Durschlag* (Sobol 1995, 252). Brückner stresses that in Modern Polish, *druszlak* is more common than the old form *durszłak* (Brückner 1927, 1: 99). Moreover, as regards Kipchak *drušlak*, Harkavets proposes both Polish forms *druszlak* and *durszłak* [durʃlag] (Гаркавец 2010, 443). It is also worth adding that the *Słownik języka polskiego* (Dictionary of the Polish language) by Mieczysław Szymczak gives only the version *durszłak* [durʃlak] (*Słownik języka polskiego* 1978, 1: 468).

R: MAD proposes Russian *друслаз* [druʃlag] as the source of the noun’s borrowing (Գազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 768), where it is also a loanword. As for Russian, there is a bit of confusion: there is no unanimity as to the source of the loanword. According to Vasmer, Russian *друслаз* [druʃlag] or *дуршлаз*

[durʃlag] (existing in the language since the 17th century) is a German loanword (directly from German) (Фасмер 1986, 1: 544, 555). But according to N. Shanski, *ծրսլազ* [durʃlag] is a 20th century borrowing as a German noun, but it is in Russian through the intermediary of Polish (Словарь Шанского). Vozhko also proposes Ukrainian as the source of the loanword in Armenian (Բոճկո 2010, 112), but Ukrainian *друсляг* [druʃljah] (since 16th century) itself is also a German form, which came into the language through Polish (Мельничук 1985, 2: 136). In this case, instead of Ukrainian, we have again (rather) Ruthenian (Желехівський 1886, 1: 207). The source of the loanword could be Polish, Russian and Ruthenian/Ukrainian, but the first one (geographically and chronologically) is much more likely. Armenian sources also sometimes propose Ukrainian as a loanword (Աբաղյան et al. 2017, 218–219), but these suggestions seem to be misguided (without any etymological explanations).

103. **L:** **Ֆոլգա** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 627) [folga] (Pol. *folga*,¹⁴⁰ Eng. *foil*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 359–360; Ալզերեան 1868, 307; Ալզերեան and Պրեմսեան 1821, 1: 358).

AT: *ֆոլգա* [folga] (a Polish loanword according to DFW) is in use as ‘a thin flexible metal sheet, used mainly for covering or wrapping food’ (Աղայան 1976, 2: 160; Ժիրբ 1980, 4: 822; Հայրապետյան 2011, 627). There is also the modern derivative *նրբաթիթեղ* [nrbaʰitʰeʁ] (‘foil’): *նրբ* [nrba] is from *նուրբ* ([nurba] ‘subtle, delicate’), which is from Proto-Indo-European *snōbri* coming from the stem *snēbhri-* (‘subtle, narrow’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 574), with the conjunction *u* [a] and *թիթեղ/թիթեղն* ([tʰitʰeʁ] ‘tin plate’) (Մեղրեցի 1698, 119), probably Proto-Indo-European compound of **ptei-ptelon-* from the stem **pet-* (‘to spread’) (Անատեան 1973, 2: 183; Ջահուկյան 2010, 266).

PM: *folga* [folga], and more precisely *foil* (from German *Folie* (Brückner 1927, 1: 124)) as ‘an underlay/setting of all kinds precious stones’, we can meet in Linde’s, Antoni Albertrandy’s and Brückner’s dictionaries (as a jewelry term) (Linde 1807, 1, 1: 648; Albertrandy 1790, 78; Brückner 1927, 1: 124 etc.).

¹⁴⁰ According to Հայրապետյան (2011, 627).

R: the Polish origin of the *folga* with the meaning of *պրբաթիղթիղ* [nrbat^hit^hɛk] is doubtful with the meaning of ‘food wrapping’. In that sense Linde also gives the currently used version – *folia* (Linde 1807, 1, 1: 648; cf. Sobol 1995, 351). It is possible that the word penetrated into Russian from Polish (Фасмер 1987, 4: 201; Евгенъева 1984, 4: 573 etc.). However, in Polish the meaning that has gone to Russian (‘very thin metal sheet’ (Фасмер 1987, 4: 201; Евгенъева 1984, 4: 573) ‘especially for wrapping food’) stopped being used. Contemporary semantic similarity of that noun in Armenian and Russian clearly indicates that it did not pass to Armenian directly from Polish, but rather from Russian.

Accommodation, elements of architecture, buildings, and decorations

104. **L:** **բիվնիցա** (Պողոսյան 2014, 46) [pivnits^ha] (Pol. *piwnica*, Eng. *cellar* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 144; Ալգերեան 1868, 118; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 131)).

AT: the explanation given by NWEA is not entirely clear: *բիվնիցա* is interpreted as having two meanings: *գարեջրատուն* [garedzratun] (‘beerhouse’), which in Armenian is from *գարի* ([*gari*] ‘barley’) probably coming from Indo-European *gher* (‘to go out’, ‘to grow’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 151) with *ջուր* [dʒur]¹⁴¹ and *գինետուն* [ginetun] (‘dive bar, pub, gin shop’ etc.) (Պողոսյան 2014, 46), which is from *գինի* (‘vine’) and comes from Proto-Indo-European *voinio* (Անանեան 1971, 1: 558). In both cases, we have the second stem *-տուն* [tun] (‘house’) which is from Indo-European **dem-* (from the stem **dem(o)-* (‘to build’, ‘adjust one another’) as in Sanskrit *dāma-* or Greek *δῶμα* (‘house’) etc.) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 735).

PM: here *piwnica*¹⁴² (from *piwo* ‘beer’) comes from Proto-Slavic **pivo* (‘beverage, drink’) which also is from Proto-Slavic **piti* (‘to drink’) (Boryś 2008, 438; Derksen 2008, 401, 402) and formerly had a meaning in Polish of ‘a supply of alcohol, especially wines, beer etc. stored in an underground room’ (PWN; Linde 1811, 2, 2: 718).

R: the illustration of the use of this word in NWEA is “Եւ գետնափոր մաղարանի, **բիվնիցանի [pivnits^hani]** քարէ, որ ամառն ըմպելին ցուրտ եւ պաղ լինի (Սիւ. Լեհ., 337)” (Պողոսյան 2014, 46; cf. Ակիմեան 1936, 337), which, in this case, does not mean a place to drink beer or wine but rather the stone cellar that could be used to keep drinks cool (especially in summer) (cf. Ալգերեան 1868, 118). The reason for the ambiguous interpretation of *բիվնիցա* [pivnits^ha] may be the influence of the noun *մաղարան* [masaran] which

¹⁴¹ Similar to the case of **բիւէ** [pive] – entry no. 146.

¹⁴² *Piwo* > *piw-nica* (Szober 1923, 128).

was used in the same sentence, means ‘cave’ and comes from Arabic *mağara* (passed to Armenian from Turkish) (Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 243; Աղայան 1976, 2: 960; Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 488; Nişanyan).

105. **L:** բլլախա (Հայրապետյան 2011, 100) [bljaχa] (Pol. *plyta/plytka (odznaka)* as *wyróżnik* or *dekoracja – blacha*,¹⁴³ Eng. *plate, badge* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 704; Ալգերեան 1868, 540; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 64, 645)).

AT: an apt translation is թիթեղ [tʰitʰeβ] (Гаркавец 2010, 299). It is obviously a compound noun: **ptei-ptelon-* from the stem **pet-* (‘spread, extend, disseminate’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 266).

PM: in 15th and 16th centuries *blacha* [blaχa] as *blach* [blaχ] or *plach* [plaχ] meant ‘sheet metal, armor’. The noun came from Upper-Middle-German *blēch* (Boryś 2008, 29). Now it means, among others, ‘a thin, flat piece of metal, sheet of metal or metal alloys, obtained by rolling or hammering’ etc. (Skorupka et al. 1969, 47).

R: DFW suggests Polish origin (known in the language since 15th century (Nitsch 1953–1955, 1: 97–98)) of the noun բլլախա [blaχa], although it indicates Russian (бляха [bljaχa]) as the source of borrowing for Armenian – ‘panel as a distinctive sign or decoration (stamped with picture, letter, number)’ (Фасмер 1986, 1: 180). To Russian (Фасмер 1986, 1: 180) and Ukrainian (Мельничук 1982, 1: 216) (or Ruthenian (Желехівський 1886, 1: 34)) *blacha* passed from Polish. Phonetically, both languages could have been the source of borrowing, but it is difficult to say clearly which language was the source of the loanword. The noun was in use also in Kipchak as *blâχ*, *bliâχ* as ‘metal plate, plaque’ etc. (Гаркавец 2010, 299–300), however, in this case it could be an Armenian loanword.

¹⁴³ According to the interpretation of Հայրապետյան (2011, 100).

106. **L:** **գանոկ**¹⁴⁴ (Hanusz 1886, 405) [ganok] or rather [kanog]¹⁴⁵) (Pol. *ganek*, Eng. *porch* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 716; Ալգերեան 1868, 584; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 654))

AT: *գանոկ* [ganok/kanog] has never been in use in Eastern or Western Armenian. The correct translation is *նախամուտ* [naχamutk^h], which consists of *նախ* ([naχ] ‘before, at first’) – **naχ* is an Iranian loanword (cf. Pazend **naχust*, Middle Persian *naχvin* – ‘first, beginning’ etc.) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 560; Անանեան 1977, 3: 419; cf. Olsen 1999, 896), with the conjunction *ու* [a] and the noun *մուտ*(*p*) ([mut(k^h)] ‘access, entrance’), which comes from the Proto-Indo-European stem **mōd-* (‘to meet, to approach’) (Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 427). The next possible synonym of *նախամուտ* is *նախադուր* ([naχadur] – ‘first door’) (Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 427) where *դուր* [dur] is from Proto-Indo-European **dhur-* from the stem **dhuer-* (door) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 204).

PM: *ganek* [ganɛk] in Polish means ‘porch, walking into the house, gallery, corridor, flat roof, terrace on the house or in front of the house or covered entrance, podcienie’ ([podtʃ^hienie] – a semi-open space with a colonnade on one side, running along the building face), ‘vestibule’ etc. (Linde 1808, 1, 2: 678; Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 382). It is a German loanword from Upper-Middle-German *Ganc* and Modern German *Gang* (Boryś 2008, 154; Brückner 1927, 1: 134).

R: *ganek* – *гано́к* [ganok] (ТГД) – appears in many Slavic languages, and there is a high probability that the word passed to the dialect of Kutuy from Ruthenian, as Hanusz states (1886, 405), or directly from Polish, which I think is also likely (in Poland in the 17th and 18th centuries it was already a very common architectural solution (Gloger 1901, 2: 177; Brückner 1927, 1: 134)).

¹⁴⁴ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *gànok* ([ganok] – Eastern Armenian or [kanog] – Western Armenian).

¹⁴⁵ Western Armenian pronunciation.

107. **L:** **գունա**¹⁴⁶ (Hanusz 1886, 408) [guna] (Pol. *gunia*, Eng. *quilt*, *blanket*, *sheepskin coat*¹⁴⁷ (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 97, 753, 859; Ալգերեան 1868, 81, 581; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 89)).

AT: there is no exact translation in Armenian. It is something like ‘sheep/goat fur coat’ as in Armenian these are *յափմունջի* [jap^hundzi] or *սյծենակաւ* [ajtsenkatʃ]. The first is a Turkish loanword (Անտեան 1902, 248; Nişanyan) and the second consists of *սյծ* [ajts] – the base of *սյծեն* ([ajtsen] ‘from goat’) and the Proto-Indo-European noun *aigʷi-* from the stem **aigʷ-* (‘goat’) (Չահուկյան 2010, 49) with *կաւ* (a thick piece of woolen fabric or hair (see: Մալխասեանց 1944, 2: 371)), which is of uncertain etymology. Possible equivalents in Armenian may also be *ծածկոց* ([tsatskots^h] ‘blanket’) – again of an uncertain etymology – and *ծածկոցաւ* [tsatskots^haʃal], which is the same as above with the conjunction *ա* [a] and noun *շաւ* ([ʃal] ‘shawl’). *շաւ* has its origin in Persian, but it is not clear whether it became Armenian through Persian or Turkish (Nişanyan; TLFİ; Անտեան 1902, 257). The next (but not the last) possible Polish synonym *gunia* is also *շուխա* ([tʃ^huxa] ‘broadcloth’).¹⁴⁸

PM: *gunia* [gunia] has been in use since 1437 and means ‘rug, blanket, cover’ or ‘simple blanket on both sides hairy or shaggy’ (Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 522; Linde 1808, 1, 2: 802). It probably passed into Polish from Latin *gunna* (‘sheepskin coat’) (Brückner 1927, 1: 163–164). The noun also existed in Old-Irish – *gaunyā-* (‘colored’) from Avestan *gaōna-* (‘hair’, ‘sort’, ‘color’), etc. (Фасмер 1986, 1: 475) – like *գոյն* ([gujn] ‘color’) or *գոյն* ([gojn] ‘color’) in Armenian, where the noun is an Iranian loanword (e.g. Middle Persian *gūn* or above-mentioned Avestan *gaona* etc.) (Չահուկյան 2010, 167; Անտեան 1971, 1: 578; cf. Olsen 1999, 371).

R: *gunia* in Polish and *гуня* [hunja] in Ruthenian/Ukrainian have the same meaning (Желехівський 1886, 1: 164; Мельничук 1982, 1: 620–621; Фасмер 1986, 1: 475) and the version *գունա* [guna] could have been borrowed from either of them. The case is a bit more complicated because of Turkish and even Romanian,

¹⁴⁶ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *guna* [guna].

¹⁴⁷ Men’s outer garment worn in Poland by highlanders.

¹⁴⁸ For details see: **շուխա** [tʃ^huxa] – entry no. 63.

which could have also been the source of Polish Armenian's borrowing (Hanusz 1886, 408).

108. **L:** **դախ**¹⁴⁹ (Hanusz 1886, 391) [daχ] (Pol. *dach*, Eng. *roof* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 809; Ալզերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 737).

AT: Eastern or Western Armenian *դախ* ([daχ] 'fleshless', 'maturing to dry', 'spoiled, old' (Աղայան h. 1 1976, 271; Ժիրք, h. 1, 1969: 463) has nothing in common with Polish Armenian *դախ* ([daχ] 'roof'). The first is from an unknown source, but the second is of Polish origin and was known only among Polish Armenians.

PM: *dach* [daχ] is a German loanword (Linde 1807, 1, 1: 397). The noun has also penetrated into other languages; for example, Ruthenian/Ukrainian *дах* [daχ] (Мельничук 1985, 2: 15; Желехівський 1886, 1: 173), etc. It has functioned in the language since the 14th or 15th century (Brückner 1927, 1: 83; Boryś 2008, 108).

R: for chronological reasons, German can be excluded, but Polish remains the main source of borrowing among Armenians in Poland, especially in the Kutý dialect. It has never been present in Easter or Western Armenian.

109. **L:** **կուխնյա** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 317–318) [kuχnja] (Pol. *kuchnia*, Eng. *kitchen, cuisine*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 522, 216; Ալզերեան 1868, 419; Ալզերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 495).

AT: *կուխնյա* in Armenian is a typical Russian loanword (*кухня* [kuχnja]), which has its equivalent *խոհանոց* (details in **քուխնայ** [kuχnaj] – entry no. 115) and means 'kitchen' or 'cuisine'. In a pejorative sense, the word can also mean 'intrigues' or 'dark things' etc. However, it is a very rare and archaic form which still exists in slang or jargon. Sometimes we even see a distorted form *կուխնի* [kuχni] declined according to the principles of Armenian grammar.

¹⁴⁹ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *daχ* [daχ].

PM: *kuchnia* [kuχnia] is ‘a room adapted to prepare dishes’ or ‘a cuisine’ (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 1: 459). The noun comes from the German old form *kuchīna*, later *kuchīn*, *küche(n)*, from Latin *coquīna*, *cocīna* (Brückner 1927, 1: 297).

R: see details given for **քուխնայ** [khuχnaj]. It is worth adding that in Polish Armenian, the *քուխնայ* [khuχnaj] is a Polish loanword, but in Eastern Armenian, it is the result of Russian influence. However, it is a very unusual and archaic form which still exists in slang or jargon.

110. **L:** **մաղազին** (Գրագրարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 488; Գրիգորյան 2017, 60) [maχazin] (Pol. *magazyn*, Eng. *shop*, *warehouse*) (cf. Ասմանգույան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 863, 1075; Ալգերեան 1868, 648, 790; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 778, 952; Մկնարczyk 2010, 85).

AT: according to MAD, it is only ‘a shop’. For this noun, the most appropriate translation into Armenian is, of course, *խանութ* [χanuth], which is an Assyrian loanword – *χānutā* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 316) (like Arabic *hānūt* (Անտոնյան 1973, 2: 331)) – ‘store/shop’. But in Polish, the noun also has the meaning *ujuhłtun* ([pahest] ‘warehouse’), which in Armenian is a derivative of *պահ* [pah] from Persian **pahr* (**pavra* – *pavra*), similar to Parthian *pahr* as ‘protection/safeguard’ (Ջահուկյան 2010, 617).

PM: the word *magazyn* in Polish came from French – *magasin* (Sobol 1995, 674). Originally it was Arabic *maχāzin/maḥāzin* (plural of *maχzan/maḥazan* – ‘warehouse, store’), which entered into French either by the intermediary of Provençal (*magazenum* in the 13th century) or Italian (*magazzino* in the 15th century) (TLFI; cf. Turek 2002a, 98). In Polish it initially referred to various types of rooms used for ‘storing goods, inventory, equipment’, etc. Currently, *magazyn* [magazyn] is, among others, a large, well-stocked ‘shop’, as well as ‘a studio’ and a ‘place to sell clothes’ (also a ‘fashion salon’ and also ‘an illustrated trade journal’) (Machnicka 1999, 57; Sobol 1995, 674; Brückner 1927, 1: 317).

R: the text from the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocol, which is the illustration of *մառազին* [maʁazin] given in MAD, describes some people drinking and quarrelling in the *մառազին* [maʁazin] (Գրիգորյան 1963, (118) 153–154). From that protocol, it is hard to deduce with certainty that *մառազին* [maʁazin] is only a ‘shop’. However, we cannot exclude the possibility that one could drink and quarrel in the ‘store/shop’. The next possible source of borrowing *մառազին* [maʁazin] is Russian. For example, Linde, after interpreting the *magazyn* (*magaz*, *magazen*) in Polish as ‘warehouse for storing grain and various things’ (Linde 1809, 2, 1: 8), explains that the noun in Russian means a ‘storage, place of spare, barn, pantry, auxiliary house’ etc. (Linde 1809, 2, 1: 9). Vasmer explains the *магазея* [magazeja] (*магазей* [magazej], *магазейн* [magazejn]) as a Western loanword in Russian (from Arabic *ḫāzana* – ‘collect, accumulate, hoard’ (cf. Мельничук 1989, 3: 351)) and, like Linde, underlines the meaning of ‘bread barn, stock’ (Фасмер 1986, 2: 554–555). *Магазея* [magazeja] can also be interpreted as ‘building or premises for laying and storing any stocks’, etc. (Словарь Даля). However, Malkhaseants uses *մառազայ* [maʁazaj] (also derived from Arabic *maḫāzin/magaza*) as ‘cave/cellar or place for storing goods’ (Մալխասյան 1944, 3: 243). Bozhko goes further and proposes Ukrainian as the source of borrowing into Armenian *մառազին* [maʁazin], where the word means ‘storage, warehouse’ (Բոժկո 2010, 112), which is less likely. However, as we can see, the notion of warehouse dominates. We must pay special attention to the difference between the word as used by Polish Armenians *մառազին* [maʁazin] and that existing till the 20th century in Eastern Armenian *մառազին* [magazin]. *մառազին* ([magazin] ‘shop, selling place’) in Armenia from Russian influence was known in Eastern Armenian and *մառազին* [magazin] passed into the language through Russian alone (Մալխասյան 1944, 3: 230). In contrast to *մառազին* [magazin], the word *մառազայ* [maʁaza] / *մառազի* [maʁazi] / *մառազին* [maʁazin] has existed in (especially Western) Armenian for long time and means ‘store, great shop or cave/cellar’ from Turk *mağaza* (probably from Italian *magazzino* or French *magasin*) (Անանյան 1902, 226; Nişanyan). Moreover, in *մառազին* [maʁazin] we can phonetically observe Turkish influence (as in Kipchak – *mayazi* (Гаркавец 2010, 937)) and this is seen in Armenian sources even till the 20th century. Under these circumstances, it is difficult to deduce which language is the source of the loanword:

- *մառազի(ն)* [maʁazin] (Turkish loanword – *mağaza* (Nişanyan));
- *մառազին* [magazin] (Russian loanword – *магазин* (Ожегов 2012, 514));

- *մաղազին* [maʒazin] / *մագազին* [magazin] (Polish loanword – *magazyn* (Skorupka et al. 1969, 364));
- *մահազին* [mahazin] (Ruthenian loanword – *магазин* (Желехівський 1886, 1: 422) or Ukrainian *магазин* (Мельничук 1989, 3: 351).

The fact that the word *մաղազին* [maʒazin] (pronounced even as [magazin]) was still in use in the 20th century, especially with the meaning of ‘store, warehouse’ suggests that it could have taken root in the essential vocabulary of Armenian (alongside *մաղազին* [maʒazin] (cf. Մշակ 1873; Կոմիտաս and Աբեղեան 1905, 65–67; Ծիրվանզադեա; Օվյան; Ծիրվանզադե 1959, 496)).

111. **L:** **շքիթալ** (Պողոսյան 2014, 156) [ʃpit^h(d)al] or **սքիտալ** (Պողոսյան 2014, 180; Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 349) [spital] (Pol. *szpital*, Eng. *hospital*) (cf. Ասմանզուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 454; Ալգերեան 1868, 368; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 172, 434).

AT: *հիվանդանոց/հիվանդանոց* [hivandanots^h] is possibly from Middle Persian *χῖvand*, *χῖvandakan*, *χῖvandakanih* (Անանեան 1977, 3: 98). In this composed noun, we also have the conjunction *u* [a] and the suffix *-անոց* [anots^h], which form a noun with the meaning of place (Ջահուկյան 1994, 58). The next possible equivalent is *բուշարան* [buzaran] from Middle Persian *bōž* (cf. Avestan *buǰ*) (Անանեան 1971, 1: 467; Ջահուկյան 2010, 135) and from the Iranian suffixal form *-a-δan(a)-* (Ջահուկյան 1994, 60).

PM: in Old Polish (15th century) it had the meaning of ‘shelter for poor, sick, homeless people’ and is a loanword from German *Spital* (with the same meaning) (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 578; Boryś 2008, 606; cf. TLF1) with the Latin etymology (*hospitalis* (‘friendly’)).

R: The Kipchak Dictionary also proposes the meanings ‘shelter, almshouse’ (Гаркавец 2010, 1359), which is the same as in Polish and German languages. From this point of view, the Armenian translation of *շքիթալ* / *սքիտալ* [ʃpit^h(d)al] / [spit(d)al] to ‘hospital’ (exclusively) seems possible but incomplete.

112. **L:** սուֆիտ¹⁵⁰ (Hanusz 1886, 461) [sufit] (Pol. *sufit*, Eng. *ceiling*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 143; Ալգերեան 1868, 118; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 131).

AT: *արաստաղ* [arastak] is composed of the prefix *ար-* [ar-] with the Proto-Indo-European form (*u*)*arastak* [(a)rastak] of <*stl-no-* coming from the stem *stel* ('to spread, strew, put, erect') as Sanskrit *sthāla-* ('land, elevation'), Old-High-German *stal* ('town, room') or Armenian *ստեղծանել* ([stɛʁtsanel] 'to create'), etc. (Ջահուկյան 2010, 73; Անտեան 1971, 1: 254; cf. Olsen 1999, 478, 703). There are also two other archaic forms: *արաստաք* [arastak^h] and *արիք* [arik^h] (Rivola 1633, 32; Մեղրեցի 1698, 30; Անտեան 1971, 1: 260), where *արիք* [arik^h] is probably from the Proto-Indo-European stem **rei-* ('to lean') (Ջահուկյան 2010, 74).

PM: *sufit* ([sufit] 'ceiling, roof') is a later borrowing from Italian *soffitto* (Brückner 1927, 2: 525; Sobol 1995, 1051; Linde 1812, 3: 461).

R: this noun is certainly a borrowing from Polish and could also be used in other regions of Poland by Polish Armenians.

113. **L:** սրկեք (Պողոսյան 2014, 188) [skhlep(p^h)] (Pol. *sklep*, Eng. *store, shop*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 863, 934; Ալգերեան 1868, 648, 686; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 778, 826; Młynarczyk 2010, 86).

AT: NWEA rightly proposes *խանութ* [xanut^h] (from Assyrian loanword *χānutā* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 316)) or *ստղախար* [takavar] (which Jahukyan interprets as *tālavar* ('hut, tent' etc.) from Parthian *t'l'w'r* or Persian *tālār/tālar* ('hall, salon, assembly room' etc.) (Ջահուկյան 1987, 547)).

PM: the word *sklep* ([sklep] 'store, shop') or *sklepienie* ([sklepienie] 'vault, crypt, tomb, vault, cenotaph, repository, sepulcher', etc.) has been known in Polish since 15th century (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 233). In contemporary Polish, *sklep* is

¹⁵⁰ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *sufit* [sufit].

‘a place intended for the sale of goods’, but formerly – from the 15th century – ‘a vault, casemates, dungeon’, or ‘basement’. The noun meant also a ‘basement under the floor of the room’. Relatively newer Polish meaning included the ‘place of sale with a vaulted cellar where goods were formerly sold’ (Boryś 2008, 551), in other words – ‘a store for placing the goods’ (Linde 1812, 3: 265). Brückner mentions that German *Gewölbe* means ‘vault, chamber, basement’, and figuratively ‘stall’ or ‘trade’. Following that example, Polish *sklep* (‘store vault’) has acquired a similar meaning since the end of the 17th century ‘stall’ (Brückner 1927, 2: 493). Vasmer even thinks that the word *sklep* came from Polish through Ukrainian (*склеп* [sklep] (Мельничук 2006, 5: 274)), or, in my opinion through Ruthenian (*склеп* [sklep] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 874)), and has gone to other languages (including Russian) (Фасмер 1987, 3: 642).

R: from the example in the NWEA, we know about one use of *sklep*: “[...] և էլթ սրէրներ [sk^hlepner] (կրպակ, խանութ) [...]” (Պողոսյան 2014, 188; Ալիշան 1896, 63). Gh. Alishan writes *սրէրներ* [sk^hlepner] (plural of *սրէր* [skhlep]) is part of a description of a fire in the Polish town of Kamianets-Podilskiy, where a huge number of Armenians were living, and explains the meaning of the word in parentheses as *kiosk* ‘booth, shop’, which means that *սրէր* [skhlep] was not in common use in Armenian but was familiar to Polish Armenians. I cannot completely rule out that Armenians could have also known other meanings of that noun. Interestingly, the contemporary meaning of *sklep* in modern Armenian is ‘a tomb, a building intended for laying inside a coffin or grave or as a separate burial site’. To modern Armenian, in the above sense, it passed from Russian as a Russian term for a ‘crypt, chapel, grave, tomb’ (Efremova.info), which is not far from the past meaning of the word in Polish: Linde also mentions many a time *sklep* under churches (in the ground), where there were *chapels* and many people were buried (Linde 1812, 3: 265). With the same meaning, the noun *sklep* or *iskilep* (with prosthetic ‘i’?) was used in Kipchak where it probably also came from Armenian. Harkavets also adds the equivalent of the Armenian *գմբեթ* ([gmbet^h] ‘dome’) and *կոզակ* ([kozak] ‘thrown (fixed) beam along the wall to strengthen it and place other beams on it and the middle of the large arch of the altar of the church’) as additional meanings (Гаркавец 2010, 1283).

114. **L:** **բօրչմա** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 821) [k^hortʃ^hma], **բօրչման** (Գրիգորյան 1963, (421) 278) [k^hortʃ^hmman], **բ(բ)ռչմա**¹⁵¹ (Hanusz 1886, 430) [k(k^h)rtʃ^hma] (Pol. *karczma*, Eng. *inn*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 490; Ալգերեան 1868, 398; Ալգերեան and Ղրբնեան 1821, 1: 470).

AT: MAD's proposals include *սլանդոկ* [pandok] and *օղետուն* [oʒetun], but we can also add *գինետուն* [ginetun]. *սլանդոկ* ([pandok] 'inn, tavern' (Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 490, 974)) – a Greek loanword from πανδοκείον (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 20; Ջահուկյան 2010, 62) ('guesthouse', 'hotel', 'tavern'). From Greek comes Arabic *funtuq* or *funduq* ('inn') (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 20). *Օղետուն* [oʒetun] ('vodka house') which consists of *օղի* [oʒi] ('vodka') and *տուն* ([tun] 'house'). *օղի* [oʒi] is probably from Sanskrit *ali* ('alcoholic beverage') (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 613). Next is *գինետուն* [ginetun], where *գինի* [gini], a Proto-Indo-European word (**uoinio-*, **uoino-*), is probably from the stem **uei-* ('rotate, scroll') (Ջահուկյան 2010, 161). *տուն* ([tun] common for *օղի* and *գինի*) is without doubt from Proto-Indo-European **dem-* (from the stem **dem(o)-* ('build', 'adapt to each other') and can be compared to Sanskrit *dāma-* ('house'), Greek δώμα ('house, roof') (Ջահուկյան 2010, 735) etc.

PM: the noun *karczma* ([kartʃ^hma] 'inn, tavern, roadhouse') has been used in Polish since the 14th century (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 244; Linde 1808, 1, 2: 962). In Old Polish, *kaczma* [katʃ^hma] and in the 16th century sporadically even *karzczma* (Boryś 2008, 223) were used. The noun comes from Proto-Slavic **krčьma* ('inn, tavern') but further etymology is uncertain (Boryś 2008, 223). One of the suggestions also associates this word with the Proto-Slavic verb **krčiti* with the suffix **-ьma* ('to remove bushes and trees', 'grub up'), so in the original sense it could mean 'a building' (a tavern) on the grubbing ground (cf. Boryś 2008, 223). From the Slavs, the word was borrowed by Germans, Hungarians, Romanians, etc. (Brückner 1927, 1: 220).

R: the fragment of the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocol where *բօրչման* [k^hortʃ^hmman] was found ("գի այլ ասելի ի **բօրչման** [k^hortʃ^hmman] չնտնել ու ոչ մեղրի. եւ ոչ ցրի. եւ ոչ բիւէ միւնչեւ ի գաստիկին տօսին" (Գրիգորյան

¹⁵¹ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *krčmà* [krtʃ^hma].

1963, (421) 278)) has already been analyzed in the case of **բիււ** [pivɛ] – entry no. 146. The equivalent in Kipchak is *korčma*, *karčma* [kʰortʃʱma, kʰartʃʱma] with the same Polish meanings (Гаркавец 2010, 715) and could have also been borrowed through Armenian. Besides the Polish source of borrowing, Hanusz also suspects Ruthenian (*корчма* [kortʃʱma] / *коршма* [korʃma] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 369)). The Ruthenian/Ukrainian origin of *քորչմա* [kʰortʃʱma] / *քորչման* [kʰortʃʱmman] / *քորչմ(ւ)ա* [kʰortʃʱm(m)a] / *կռչմա* [krtʃʱma] seems obvious.

115. **L:** **քուխնայ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 815) [kʰuxnaj] (Pol. *kuchnia*, Eng. *kitchen*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 522; Ալգերեան 1868, 419; Ալգերեան and Պրէստեան 1821, 1: 495).

AT: *խոհանոց* [χohanotsʰ] consists of *խոհ* ([χoh] ‘eating, food’) from Iranian **χva(r)h*, which we can compare with Avestan *χvarəða*, Persian *χvār*, *χvāl*, etc. (Ջահուկյան 2010, 338), and *-անոց* ([-anotsʰ] of uncertain etymology with the meaning of a place (Ջահուկյան 1994, 58)). In the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocol we read: “[...] Ա (1) լանցուխ **քուխնայի** [kʰuxnaj]. Բ (2) էրկաթ **քուխնայի** [kʰuxnaj]. Չոր վերայ կրակ դնեն [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (445) 286–287) (an inventory list where *քուխնայի* [kʰuxnaj] is mentioned twice). Its pronunciation is typical for Western Armenian natives; personally, I remember hearing this pronunciation.

PM: *kuchnia* [kuxnia] has been known in Polish since the 15th century (from Old Upper German’s later form *kuchīna/chuhkina* (‘kitchen’) (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 459; Boryś 2008, 271) and means ‘a room, a place adapted to prepare dishes’ (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 459).

R: according to Bozhko, *քուխնայ* [kʰuxnaj] in Armenian is a Ukrainian loanword (Բոժկո 2010, 114) – *кухня* [kuxnja], but this statement is unconfirmed. Even if we are talking about Ukrainian roots, we must talk first about Ruthenian ones (Желехівський 1886, 1: 393). In Ruthenian/Ukrainian *кухня* [kuxnja] is a Polish loanword (Мельничук 1989, 3: 164–165), as it is in Russian (Фасмер 1986, 2: 436). The words *խոհանոց* ([χohanotsʰ] ‘kitchen’) and *խոհարար* ([χoharar] ‘cook’) in Armenian appear quite late (around the 19th century). Even the *Նոր*

բառգիրք հայկազեան լեզուի dictionary from the early 19th century notes the word *խոհարար* [χoharar] (Աւետիքեան et al. 1836, 1: 959) and directs us to the old form of the noun – *խոհակեր* [χohaker] (Աւետիքեան et al. 1836, 1: 958) with the meaning ‘cook’. *խոհակեր* [χohaker] can be seen with the same meaning in the Malkhasyants dictionary as Iranian loanword from *χvālgar* (Մալխասեանց 1944, 2: 280). *խոհ(ա)կեր* [χoh(a)ker] is from Iranian *χva(r)h(a)kar* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 339; Olsen 1999, 885), which is a derivative of *խոհ* [χoh], coming from Iranian *χvarh* (Անանեան 1973, 2: 388). The borrowing of *kuchnia* (*քուխնայ* [k^huxnaj]) by (especially Polish) Armenians from Polish is obvious because the original Armenian form *խոհակեր* [χohaker] has been known since the translation of the Bible into Armenian (cf. Armenian E-Bible). The word also existed in Kipchak, where Harkavets proposes the Armenian equivalent *խոհակերոց* ([χohakerots^h] ‘canteen, lunchroom, mess-hall’ (Гаркавец 2010, 762, cf. Ալգերեան 1868, 419; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 495).

116. **L:** **Ֆրամուգա** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 634) [framuga] (Pol. *framuga*, Eng. *jambeau*, *jamb*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 508; Ալգերեան 1868, 413; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 487).

AT: **Ֆրամուգա** [framuga] (a Polish loanword according DFW) is rarely used and only as technical word for ‘jamb, jambeau’ (Kouyoumdjian 1970, 77).

PM: *framuga* [framuga] (old *frambuga* [frambuga] or *framboga* [framboga]) rather comes from German Verramung (Brückner 1927, 1: 145; Гаркавец 2010, 529; Фасмер 1987, 4: 205; Sobol 1995, 363).

R: *фрамуга* [framuga] is a possible Polish loanword in Russian, but certainly a Russian loanword in Armenian.

People

117. **L:** **բաննա** (Գլազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 110) [panna] (Pol. *panna*, Eng. *miss* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 594; Ալգերեան 1868, 467; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 554)).

AT: *դերահաս սղջիկ* ([*derahas aʁdzik*] ‘teenage girl’) or *օրիորդ* ([*oriord*] ‘damsel’) may be the most appropriate translations. The first one, a compound noun from *դերահաս* [*derahas*] and *սղջիկ* [*aʁdzik*]: *դերահաս* [*derahas*], consists of *դեր-* [*der*] from the Indo-European form *-dher* (‘still, yet’) (Անանեան 1971, 1: 654), the conjunction *ս* [*a*] and *հաս* [*has*], which is a derivative from Indo-European *enek* (‘ripen, maturity’) (Չառուկյան 2010, 448); *սղջիկ* [*aʁdzik*] is probably a derivative from Indo-European *al-* (‘grind, mill’ (Համբարձումյան 1997, 149) or ‘a person involved in subsistence farming, a housewife’ (Համբարձումյան 1997, 152)). The second one is *օրիորդ* [*oriord*] (main meaning ‘virgin or female without a husband’), almost a synonym of *սղջիկ* [*aʁdzik*] (again the main meaning is ‘virgin or female without a husband’). Some sources suggest Sumerian *aru* (‘female’) / Khaldean *awri/auri* (‘master’) with *urudani* (‘generation’), etc. as the root; however, this is uncertain (Անանեան 1979, 4: 619; Olsen 1999, 531).

PM: *panna* [panna] has existed in Polish since the 14th century and likely comes from Proto-Slavic **գերանна* (‘daughter of a master’) as a female form of Proto-Slavic **գերанъ* (‘belonging to the master, lord’) which is from the same Proto-Slavic **гѣранъ* (‘master, lord’) with the suffix *-анъ* (Boryś 2008, 411). The main meaning was ‘unmarried girl of the master or noble family, young woman before marriage, virgin’ (Urbańczyk 1970–1973, 6: 29).

R: *բաննա* [panna] is obviously the female form of *բան* [pan], that is, Polish *pan*, English ‘master, mister’, functioning in Polish since the 13th century (Boryś 2008, 410) as ‘honorary title, Mister’ (Գլազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 108).

Vasmer emphasizes that the noun *pan* as ‘mister, landowner’ is in relation to the Poles (Фасмер 1987, 3: 195–196). Both *բաննաւ* [panna] and *բան* [pan] are apparently Polish loanwords in Armenian as well as in Kipchak (Гаркавец 2010, 1117, 1116), where it is possible that they came through Armenian.

118. **L:** **գալիքաւ**¹⁵² (Hanusz 1886, 404) [kalika/kalik^ha] (Pol. *kaleka*, Eng. *cripple* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 211; Ալգերեան 1868, 118; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 214)).

AT: *հաշմանդամ* [haʃmandam] is the correct translation of Polish *kaleka* [kaleka], which consists of *հաշմ* [haʃm] (‘a mutilated, crippled person’), which could have an accidental similarity to the Arabic loanwords *h(a)šm* (‘to crush, to break’) and *inhišām* (‘to lose weight, to become unfit for functioning’ (Ջահուկյան 2010, 447; Աճառեան 1977, 3: 43), and *ամդամ* ([andam] ‘member of the body, pecker’), an Iranian loanword (in Parthian language is *handām*, in Middle Persian or Persian – *andām*) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 54; Olsen 1999, 864). The next apt translation is *խեղանդամ* [χekandam] from the Proto-Indo-European stem **(s)k(h)el-* (‘wretched, tilt, bend, crooked, inverted, distorted’) like Latin *scelus* (‘evil, rascality, misfortune’) or Old High German *scēlah* (‘crooked’) etc. (Ջահուկյան 2010, 326).

PM: Linde defines *kaleka* [kaleka] as ‘infirm, lame, blind’ (Linde 1808, 1, 2: 939). However, the appearance of the word in Polish is not entirely clear. According to Brückner *kaleka* came to Polish from the East through Ruthenia (*каліка* [kalika] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 331)) and has Turkish origins (from Persian *kalak* – ‘mishapen, lame’) (Brückner 1927, 1: 213). In Ruthenia (or Ukrainian (Мельничук 1985, 2: 352) – G.M.) Brückner adds, ‘the wandering beggars, singers of religious legends and other stichs’ (probably meant *смух* [stix] as ‘poems’ or ‘(religious) songs’ were also formerly called *kaleka* (Мельничук 2006, 5: 417; Фасмер 1987, 3: 761)) (Brückner 1927, 1: 213; cf. Мельничук 1985, 2: 352). Ananiasz Zajączkowski also mentions that Slavic *kaleka* is borrowed from Turkish *kalyk* (actually with the back *k*: *qaḷyg*), which means ‘insufficient, missing, defective, lame’. According to him, both the formal (phonetic) and semantic features of

¹⁵² The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *gatickhà* [kalikha].

these noun (Turkish *kalyk*, Russian *kalik*, Polish *kaleka*) confirm the Turkish etymology (Zajączkowski 1937/1938, 2, 4: 38). The transition of Persian > Turkish > Slavic languages is also accepted by Vasmer (Фасмер 1986, 2: 166).

R: It is difficult to clearly determine which language is in the root of the loanword: Turkish, Ruthenian/Ukrainian, Russian or Polish. Hanusz and Brückner propose either Ruthenian *kalika* or Romanian *kalik* (Hanusz 1886, 404), which in my opinion does not exhaust all the possibilities of borrowings because we cannot exclude Polish as the form *kalika* is still in use in some Polish dialects (Czarnecka 2014, 151): I have heard the noun *kalika* many times, for example, in the Świętokrzyskie region of Poland.

119. **L:** **զօճօնձ/զօճենց** (Պողոսյան 2014, 53–54) [kzonts/kzents^h] (Pol. *ksiądz*, Eng. *priest, clergyman* (Պետրոսյան 1875, 738)). (cf. Magakian 2021, 228–229; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 160, 730; Ալգերեան 1868, 136, 560; Ալգերեան and Պրէսնեան 1821, 1: 152, 670; Bartoszewicz 1923, 414)).

AT: *puhhuṣu(j)* [k^hahana(j)] or *տերտեր / տէրտէր* [terter]. Armenian *puhhuṣu(j)* [k^hahana(j)] comes from Assyrian *kāhnā* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 773) or rather Aramean plural *kahanayā* (‘fortune teller, supplier’ but also ‘redeem, atone for sins’) (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 540). *տերտեր / տէրտէր* [terter] is the double form of *տէր* ([ter] ‘master’)¹⁵³ consists of *տի* ([ti] ‘big’) of unknown origin (Ջահուկյան 2010, 728; cf. Olsen 1999, 673 etc.) and *այր* ([ajr] ‘man, adult male’) which is a Proto-Indo-European word with a confusing explanation: there is, for instance, in Avestan *arša* (‘male, virile’), in Sanskrit *rśabhá* (‘bull’), but we also have Greek *άνήρ*, *άν(δ)ρός* (‘man’) (Աճառեան 1971, 1: 173; cf. Olsen 1999, 171).

PM: *ksiądz* [kʃondz], known in Old Polish since the 13th century, comes from *kniądz* (with the change of **kn* into *kś*) and primarily Proto-Slavic **kъnędzъ* (‘reigning ruler, prince’), which was borrowed from Germanic **kuningaz* (‘king’) (Boryś 2008, 269). Gothic **kuniggs*, Old High German *kuning* (from *kuni* – ‘kind, genus’) also are possible (cf. Фасмер 1986, 2: 266; Трубачёва 1987, 200–201).

¹⁵³ See details in **բրինգիբալ** – entry no. 9.

R: Armenians in Poland (who were mostly Catholics) could not under any circumstances replace the Polish *kściądz* [kʃondz] with the Armenian *տերտեր/քահանայ* because, at least, *kściądz* [kʃondz] is a Catholic priest in Poland (and practices celibacy) but the Armenian *տերտեր* [terter] / *քահանայ* [kʰahana(j)] appears only in the Armenian Apostolic church (and does not practice celibacy (Ժիրք 1980, 4: 495)). For instance, the sentence “Կամենից քաղաքիս **Ֆրանգի** [frangi] եպիսկոպոսն **Քժօնծ** [kʃontz] ՏԵԼՈՂ ՍԵԳԵՆՈՎԱՐԻՅ” (Ալիշան 1896, 47) is about a (Armenian) Catholic priest-bishop (Աղայան 1976, 2: 1608). Polish *kściądz* [kʃondz] also probably passed from Armenian to Kipchak as *kšondz* (Гаркавец 2010, 759).

120. **L:** **քրիժազ** (Պողոսյան 2014, 58) [kriʒak] (Pol. *krzyżak*, Eng. *crusader* (cf. Magakian 2021, 229–230; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 214; close to: Ալգերեան 1868, 189, 191; Bartoszewicz 1923, 412)).

AT: the most appropriate translations are as follows. *խաչակիր* [χatʰakir] consists of *խաչ* ([χatʰ] ‘cross’ (Olsen 1999, 955)), which probably comes from Proto-Indo-European **khotiō-* from the stem **khet-* (‘wood’) but is connected with Persian *χada* (‘straight and long branch, rod, hanging gibbet’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 317; Աճառեան 1973, 2: 334). The words for *cross* (with the Christian meaning) in neighboring languages are rather borrowed from Christian Armenians (sometimes even via Persian *χāč* [χatʰ]) (cf. Dankoff 1995, 162; Ասատրյան 1990, 139–144 etc.). In the case of *խաչակիր*, we have additionally *ու* – conjunction, and *կիր* ([kir] ‘to carry’), which is rather from Proto-Indo-European **guēr-* from the stem **guer-* (‘heavy’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 407). The second, *ասպետ* [aspɛt], is an Iranian loanword (cf. with Sanskrit *açvapati*, Old-Persian **aspa-pati* (= *aspa* (‘horse’) and *pati* (‘owner, senior’) – ‘the owner of the horse’) etc.) (Աճառեան 1971, 1: 274).

PM: *krzyżak* [kzyʒak] (also known as *krzyżownik* [kzyʒovnik] or *krzyżownik* [kzyʒɛvnik]) (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 421; Brückner 1927, 1: 276) probably exists in Polish (at least with the meaning of ‘member of the Teutonic Order, crusader’) since the 14th century (cf. Czaja and Nowak 2013, 14). Linde even emphasizes ‘order of hospital Brothers’ as a meaning (Linde 1808, 1, 2: 1163).

R: coming from *krzyż* (a loanword of Romance *krō(d)že* from the 7th or 8th centuries (Boryś 2008, 268)), the noun *գրիժաւ* [*krizak*] is obviously a Polish loanword, which was in use among Polish Armenians. The example illustrating the word *գրիժաւ* in NWEA (“[...] երբեմն ընդ Գրիժաւաց [...]” (‘sometime against the Crusaders’) (Կամենացի 1964) comes from Polish Armenian historian Hovanes Kamienietzy’s *Պատմութիւն պատերազմին Խոթինու* (History of the war of Khotyn), a book about the victorious battle of Polish troops against Turkish invaders near the town Khotyn in 1621, the ceasefire, and other events.

121. **L: գօլէնցքի/գօլէնցքի** (Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան 2015, 30) [kolents^hk^hij]/[kolents^hk^hij] (Pol. *kolekcja*, Eng. *collection*).¹⁵⁴

AT: there is no such word in the Armenian language.

PM: there is no such word in the Polish language.

R: the noun *գօլէնցքի* [kolents^hk^hij] / *գօլննցքի* [kolents^hk^hij] appears in the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court Protocol: “Այնոր հետեւ եղաւ Եւրքոն եւ երես Ա (1) **գօլէնցքի** [kolents^hk^hij] տամդանուն.¹⁵⁵ օր պարոնին բարեխօս լինաւ եւ Ա (1) **գօլէնցքի** [kolents^hk^hij] տարաւ պարոնին եւ խնդրեց զպարոնն” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (552) 331) (*գօլէնցքի* [kolents^hk^hij] is an intermediary in the amicable solution of the problem). According to Harkavets’s translations (Гаркавец 2010, 710), we can interpret the noun as ‘somebody/who comes from Cologne (Köln)’. The noun is an obvious Polish loanword, where it was known as *koleński* or *koloński* (‘from Cologne’ or even ‘the type of cloth produced in Cologne on the Rhine’) since 1498 (Гаркавец 2010, 710; Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 316). There is a (perhaps very weak but possible) trace also. In the northeast of Poland, in the Kolono Hügelland, there is the city of Kolno which has existed since 1422 (Kowalczyk-Heyman 2009, 262). It is impossible to rule out that the intermediary was from Kolno. Nevertheless, the *kolekcja* (‘collection’) interpretation must be discarded as erroneous.

¹⁵⁴ Translations according to Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան (2015, 30).

¹⁵⁵ *ղամդանի* [tambatʃi] / *տամդանի* [dambatʃi] is a Turkish loanword with the meaning of *stamp-man* (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 364, 367; Çelebi 2015, 190).

122. **L:** լուբկա¹⁵⁶ (Hanusz 1886, 434) [lupka/lubga] (Pol. *lubka*, Eng. *beloved, dear* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 58, 227; Ալգերեան 1868, 72, 200; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 229)).

AT: սիրելի ([sireli] beloved) is a derivative of սեր/սէր ([ser] / [sɛr] ‘love’) (Rivola 1633, 339) from Proto-Indo-European **k’ēi-ro-* of the stem **k’ēi-* (‘to lie’) (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 208) or, in this context, at least *gus̄luyih* ([tsʰankali] ‘desirable’) of an unknown origin. I would remind that, as Pisowicz explains, Polish *ł* [~w] in *lubka* as a rule, passed into Armenian as *l* [l] – *lubka*. According to him only old Polish *ł* pronounced as Russian л [l] could be rendered in Armenian by *l*. Modern Polish *ł* pronounced as English *w* cannot be rendered by *l*.

PM: *lubka* in Polish was a ‘nice person, loved, dear or (female) lover’ (cf. Doroszewski). The noun is a derivative of *luby* (‘sweet, dear, beloved, pleasant, desired’ (Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 72)) which has been used in Polish since the 14th century (Borys 2008, 291) and comes from Proto-Slavic **lubъ* (‘sweet, pleasant’) (Derksen 2008, 281; Borys 2008, 291).

R: Hanusz interprets լուբկա as ‘beloved, dear’ (Hanusz 1886, 434) and as the origin of borrowing proposes Polish or Ruthenian. The source of the borrowing is more likely Polish because neither in Ruthenian nor in modern Ukrainian could I find equivalents of лубка [lubka] / лупка [lupka] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 414, 416; Мельничук 1989, 3: 309) with a meaning similar to that given by Hanusz. But in both languages, in the period corresponding to the works of Hanusz, любка [ljubka] occurs as ‘beloved, dear’ (Желехівський 1886, 1: 418; Мельничук 1989, 3: 319). It seems much simpler to assume that the word was borrowed from Polish *lubka* [lubka] rather than from Ruthenian/Ukrainian любка [ljubka]. Even if we accept that it was acquainted from Ruthenian, later, as Leszczak emphasizes, the noun could be changed to *lubka* under Polish influence.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁶ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *lubkà* [lubka].

¹⁵⁷ Private correspondence with Professor Oleg Leszczak (18.04.2020).

123. **L:** **խարունժիյ** (Յարութիւնեանց 1912, 148) [χaronzɨj] (Pol. *chorąży*, Eng. *ensign*). (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 308; Աւգերեան 1868, 265; Աւգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 307)).

AT: is from Russian with the meaning of first officer rank in Cossack troops (Յարութիւնեանց 1912, 148). As a Russian loanword, the meaning is correct; however, the most appropriate Armenian equivalent could be *դրօժակակիր* ‘flag bearer, banner bearer’. The word is a compound noun: *դրոժ(ակ)* [droʃ(ak)] with the conjunction *ու* [a] and *կիր* [kir]. *դրոժ* is an Iranian loanword (Middle-Iranian – *drafš*, Avestan – *drafša*, Persian – *dirafš* (flag) etc. (Աճառեան 1971, 1: 697; Olsen 1999, 878)). *ակ* [ak] is of an unknown origin and the verb *կիր* [kir]¹⁵⁸ probably Proto-Indo-European **guēr* from the stem **guer* (‘heavy’) (Չահուկյան 2010, 407).

PM: the Polish source – *chorąży* [χoronzy] or *chorąże* [χoronze] appeared in the language in the late 12th century as ‘bearer’ of ‘flag’/‘banner’/‘streamer’/‘ensign’ (Nitsch 1953–1955, 1: 246). At that time, *chorąże* was a military degree which comes from Proto-Slav **chorogъ*, **chorogъve* (‘banner, flag, pennant’) (Boryś 2008, 66). Brückner derives the word from the Mongolian term for the war sign *orongō*, *horongō* (with possible Turkish mediation), but Boryś claims Germanic roots are more likely (Brückner 1927, 1: 182–183; Соловьев 1936, 345; Boryś 2008, 66; cf. Словарь Шанского; Словарь Крылова).

R: the noun was for sure borrowed from Russian *хорунжий* [χoronzɨj]; however, it at least passed into Russian, and Ruthenian/Ukrainian from Polish (Фасмер 1987, 4: 269; Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 1044; Мельничук 2012, 6: 204).

124. **L:** **կաբզան**¹⁵⁹ (Hanusz 1886, 425) [kabzan] (Pol. *kabzan*, Eng. *kabzan*¹⁶⁰). (cf. Martirosyan 2019, 207)).

¹⁵⁸ Etymology as in the case of **գրիժազ** [kriʒak] – entry no. 120.

¹⁵⁹ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *kabzàn* [kabzan].

¹⁶⁰ Sobriquet of Polish Armenians.

AT: there is no equivalent in the Armenian for *kabzan* (cf. Մկրտչյան 2015, 57).

PM: according to Hanusz it means ‘wallet’ (Hanusz 1886, 425) which he compares with Turkish *kabza* (‘handle’) of Arabic roots (cf. Nişanyan). In fact, it was the mocking name of Polish Armenians – may be from ‘to tamp the purse / fill the purse’ (as the characteristic of rich Armenians?) (Brückner 1927, 1: 211). Polish *kabza* comes from Latin *capsa* (Brückner 1927, 1: 211; Pisowicz 2000b, 92) and the attempt to derive the source of the noun from Turkish seems problematic (Brückner 1927, 1: 211; Pisowicz 2000b, 92). The word meant ‘pouch container, case, box’ (Гаркавец 2010, 353), ‘purse, case, lid, storage’ (Brückner 1927, 1: 211), etc. In Russian and Ruthenian (also in modern Ukrainian) *кабза* ([kabza] ‘wallet’ / ‘money’) has the same meaning and was rather passed there from Polish (Фасмер 1986, 2: 151; Желехівський 1886, 1: 329; Мельничук 1985, 2: 332).

R: Stopka explains that in the mid-19th century, Armenians were nicknamed *kobzans* [kobzan] or *kabzans* [kabzan] which Polish provincialisms’ dictionaries derived from *kabza* ([kabza] ‘a pouch for money’), in reference to Armenians’ supposed greed (Stopka 2017b, 335; cf. Król-Mazur 2016a, 188; Pełczyński 2018, 94). Pisowicz proposes *қавазан* ([kawazan] ‘crook, stick’), a very well known in the language (long before his theory), as another origin for this noun (cf. Rivola 1633, 70). The scholar assumes that *қавазан* [kawazan] was an Armenian attribute with what the elders attended the compatriots during the caroling period. So, the Carol with *қавазан* (pronounced *kavazan*) initiated jokingly called by Poles *kabzan* [kabzan] (Pisowicz 2000b, 91–95). A religious background is possible, but not as the final explanation. Caroling with *gawazan/kawazan* was not a custom of the 19th century. The word *kawazan* (as a permanent term) was so common that also appears in Kipchak (Гаркавец 2010, 661). Moreover, Acharyan emphasizes the old and lasting religious significance of *қавазан* in Armenian and its dialects (Անտոնյան 1971, 1: 526). Therefore, it is unclear why it was only in the mid-19th century (Stopka 2017b, 335; Pisowicz 2000b, 92) when *kabza* suddenly arose from *қавазан* (an Iranian loanword in Armenian as Avestan *gavza*, Persian *gāvzan*, etc. (Ջահնկյան 2010, 152). Regarding Pisowicz’s theory, one more point could be added. Acharyan notes that in the Artial dialect, *gawazan* [kawazan] could be interpreted as *չորմիս*

([tʰubuχ] ‘stick, wand’) as a Tatar (Turkish/Kipchak) loanword (Անանյան 1953, 146, 191) similar to *čubuχ* in Kipchak (Гаркавец 2010, 406–407). Thus, there is a completely different possible meaning of this noun among Armenians from Poland. However, even accepting the theory of Pisowicz regarding *կարգաւի*’s origin in *қавуқули* [kavazan] (with the elimination of [a] in *kaw(a)zan* – *kavzan* (Pisowicz 2000b, 94), we have the problem of the process of beta-cism (cf. Lot 1931, 116; Rouquier 2019, 41): how [v] in *kavzan* changed into [b] in *kabzan*. This is hard to explain as folk association (Pisowicz 2000b, 94). It seems to be a random similarity to *kabzan* (‘handle, stick’) in Osman Turkish (Kantar n. d., 241); otherwise, one would have to agree with the etymology proposed by Hanusz: Turkish *kabza* (‘handful’) from an Arabic stem (Nişanyan) in a strange symbiosis with Polish ironic *kabza* (‘wallet’) (Hanusz 1886, 425). It seems, as Grzegorz Pełczyński concludes, that an unambiguous translation of this noun is almost impossible (Pełczyński 2018, 94).

125. **L:** **հեթման** (Պողոսյան 2014, 120) [het^hman] (Pol. *hetman*, Eng. *hetman*).

AT: *հեթման* [hetman] / *հեթման* [het^hman] means general commander of Cossack armies (Ժիրք 1974, 3: 344; Աղսյան 1976, 1: 864).

PM: from Czech *hejtman* and German *Hauptman* (Sobol 1995, 430; Kopaliński 1990, 209) / *Hauptmann* (captain) (Pearsall 1999, 667) (‘military unit commander, commander, commander-in-chief’ (Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 542; Kopaliński 1990, 209)).

R: in Armenian sources, we have *հեթման* [het^hman] (or *հեթման* [hetman]) with the meaning of ‘commander in chief of the Cossack troops’ (Աղսյան 1976, 1: 864; Պողոսյան 2014, 120). It seems to be a great narrowing of the meaning of *hetman* [hetman] in Polish. In fact, the position of *hetman* was known in Polish as early as in 1410 (Brückner 1927, 1: 171) – *etman* [etman], *hejtman* [hejtman], *hetman* [hetman] (‘military unit commander, commander, commander-in-chief’) (Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 542; Kopaliński 1990, 209). In 1590, during the reign of Sigismund the Third, by the *Konstytucje Seymu Warszawskiego Roku Bożego 1590* (Constitutions [‘Acts’] of the Warsaw Sejm in AD 1590) in *Assekuracya Hetmańska* and *Disciplina Militaris*, the rights, obligations and privileges of

Hetman were legally established (Volumen Secundum: 1325–1327). Moreover, the *English Oxford Dictionary* gives not only ‘Cossack’, but also, and primarily, ‘Polish military commander’ as its definition of *hetman* (Pearsall 1999, 667). In French, *Trésor de la langue Française informatisé*, one can find the same interpretation of that military title (TLFI), and in both languages, *hetman* is treated as a Polish loanword. As *yetman*’s or *hetman*’s (which were in use also in Kipchak) Armenian equivalent Harkavets proposes *զորագլուխ* [zoraglux] (Гаркавец 2010, 585) (or *զորագլուխ* [zoraglux]), which has exactly the same meaning as *hetman* (Մալխասյան 1944, 2: 42). *զորագլուխ* consists of *զոր* [za(v)ur] (an Iranian loanword similar to Avestan *zāvarə*, Middle Persian *zōr* – ‘strength, power’, Persian *zōr* – ‘strength, power’ etc.) (Անանյան 1973, 2: 114), conjunction *ու* [a] and *գլուխ* [glux] (from Proto Indo-European stem **ghōlu-kho-* – ‘head’) (Չահուկյան 2010, 163). The conclusion appears unambiguous. For Armenians from Poland, it was a word known in a completely different dimension than for Armenians outside of Poland. For the latter, it was an element of rather Ukrainian (or Ruthenian (Желехівський 1886, 1: 139)) reality from later times: even travelling to Poland, the Armenian historian and ethnographer M. Bzhshkeanc in the 19th century wrote about Cossacks’ (but not Polish) *hetman* (Բժշկեանց 1830, 236).

126. **L:** **հուձուլ** (Անանյան 1953, 189) [hudzul] (Pol. *hucul*, Eng. *hutsul*).

AT: in modern Eastern Armenian, the noun is not well known in the language and is used sporadically as a form obviously borrowed from Russian – *զուձուլ* [guts^hul] as Ukrainian living in the Carpathians (Bararanonline.com/гущул).

PM: the first mention of *hucul* in Polish appears at the end of the 18th century (Sulimierski et al. 1882, 3: 203). The origin of this name, which probably dates back to the 16th century, is not precisely established. There are different, sometimes even contradictory versions. It could even be a nickname – Romanian *hoț/hoțul* (‘thief, highwayman’) (Мельничук 1982, 1: 630; Vincenz 2013; Ghilea et al.; Фасмер 1986, 1: 479).

R: the form *հուձուլ* [hudzul] is a Polish loanword in Polish Armenians’ dialect (Աճառյան 1953, 189), which was later forgotten in Armenian as a “useless” word.

127. **L:** **ձէխմիստր** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 446) [dzeχemistr] (Pol. *cechmistrz*, Eng. *the master craftsman / senior of guild*).

AT: *ձէխմիստր* [dzeχemistr] in Armenian is *համքարույթյան ավագ* ([hamk^harut^hyan avag] ‘senior of guild’) (Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 417), which consists of the noun *համքար* ([hamk^har] ‘union of craftsmen’) with the suffix *-ույթյան* [ut^hjun] and noun *ավագ* [avag] with the meaning ‘honorable, older in age and position’. *համքար* [hamk^har] Malkhaseants explains it as a Persian loanword from *hemkār/hamkār* (‘colleague, coworker’) (Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 35; Ճերէնեան et al. 1992, 1: 1136) – cf. Persian *ham-*, *han-* (‘whole, complete, the same’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 440). The suffix *-ույթյան* [ut^hjun] comes from either the Indo-European suffix **-tion* or is the contamination (combination?) of Armenian suffixes *-ոյթ* [ujt^h] and *-յան* [~jun] (Ջահուկյան 2010, 811). The etymology of *ավագ* [avag] is not certain; however, it is likely an Iranian loanword (Olsen 1999, 309).

PM: *cechmistrz* ([ts^hɛχmistʃ] ‘senior of the guild’ (Linde 1807, 1, 1: 219–220)) since the 15th century (Nitsch 1953–1955, 1: 216; Doroszewski) is a derivative of Middle Upper German *zēch(e)* (‘association of people, craftsmen with common aims’) (Boryś 2008, 53) and *mistrz* ([mistʃ] ‘master’) – ‘an educated person, a scientist, a teacher, a man with a master’s degree’ (Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 287) or ‘a craftsman with the highest qualifications, authorized to practice his profession on his own’ (Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 288; cf. Jasińska and Piwowarczyk 2019, 45–57).

R: the form *ձէխմիստր* [dzeχemistr], especially *mistrz* [mistʃ], suggests that this noun was borrowed from Polish and mentioned for example in the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocol as a labor term (Գրիգորյան 1963, (374) 258 etc.). Ukrainian *цехмістр* [ts^hɛχmistʃ] (even from the Ruthenian *цехмустр* [ts^hɛχmistʃ] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 1053)) could even be a source of the loanword which could have passed into Kipchak (*ceχmistir*, *ceχmistr* (Гаркавец

2010, 354)) through Armenian. However, both (with the Russian (Фасмер 1987, 4: 301)) borrowed the noun from Polish.

128. **L:** մագնատ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 340) [magnat] (Pol. *magnat*, Eng. *magnate*) (cf. Magakian 2021, 230–231; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 565; Bartoszewicz 1923, 449)).

AT: it can be presumed that in Armenian there is an equivalent of Polish *magnat* – մեծամեծ [metsametss] as ‘outstanding, prominent’ (Աւետիքեան et al. 1837, 2: 238; Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 292) (from Proto Indo-European *mégʷ/mégʷa* ‘(big) forms’) (Անսոնեան 1977, 3: 295). In F. Rivola’s *Dictionarium armeno-latinum*, we can also find *magnalia* as a Latin equivalent of *մեծամեծ* (‘the great people’) in Armenian (Rivola 1633, 256). In Armenian, *մագնատ* is noted as a French loanword (passed into the language rather through Russian) with the meaning of ‘rich person with political huge influences or large feudal in European countries (especially in Poland and Hungary) and the owner, holder of large industrial and financial capital’ (Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 231; Հայրապետյան 2011, 340; Աղայան 1976, 2: 950; Hy.glosbe.com; Ժիրք 1974, 3: 457).

PM: in Old Poland, *magnat* was ‘a nobleman from an aristocratic family with a great fortune or even later the owner of a powerful enterprise controlling a significant part of the market in a given industry’ (SJP PWN). The noun *magnat* originates from German *ein Magnat*; Linde interprets the archaic already noun *magnatyzm* as ‘aristocracy, upper government’. However, he puts the noun *panosza* next to *magnate* (Linde 1809, 2, 1: 10), which in the 14th and 15th centuries in Poland and Czechia (Bohemia) meant a ‘servant knight of non-noble origin’ (SJP PWN).

R: Armenian sources interpret *մագնատ* as a Russian loanword (Հայրապետյան 2011, 340; Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 231). Malkhasyants proposes French as a source of borrowing (through a Russian intermediary) for Armenian but not Polish (Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 231), as proposes DFW. This last approach does not seem to be justified. The TLFi indicates Latin as the origin and the possibility of its entering into Polish through German (as Linde), which came into use

because of administrative Latin (*magnatus* (Гаркавец 2010, 937)) in Poland and Hungary (TLFI; Dauzat et al. 1971, 435). It seems indisputable that *magnat* appeared in Russian through Polish (Фасмер 1986, 2: 556; Мельничук 1989, 3: 354) then (probably) passed into Armenian.

129. **L:** մամա¹⁶¹ (Hanusz 1886, 438) [mama] (Pol. *matka/mamusia*, Eng. *mother/mummy/mom*).

AT: մայր ([majr] ‘mother’) is the right translation. The noun մայր [majr] comes from Proto-Indo-European stem **māter-* (cf. Sanskrit and Avestan *mātar*, Persian *mādar* etc.) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 506; Անանեան 1977, 3: 246). The next is մամա ([mama] ‘mum, mummy’) – the endearing, caressing form of մայր (cf. Persian *mām*, *māmā* etc. (Անանեան 1977, 3: 242)).

PM: *mama* (mum, mummy) has been known since the 15th century as ‘step-mother’, then ‘mother, nurse’ (Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 158). The noun is the endearing, caressing form of *matka* ([matka] ‘mother’). As in Armenian (Մալխասեան 1944, 3: 245), here also exists children’s characteristic use of double syllable (Boryś 2008, 312).

R: Hanusz proposes Polish *mama* or Ruthenian *мама* (Желехівський 1886, 1: 426) as the source of borrowing for (Kuty’s) Armenian (Hanusz 1886, 438). However, the Armenians (also in Poland) have also had the above-mentioned մայր (or մար [mar]), which is also noted by Hanusz (1886, 438).

130. **L:** նեմեց (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 570) [nemets^h] (Pol. *Niemiec*, Eng. *German*).

AT: գերմանացի [germanats^hi] or գերմանակալի [germanakan] means German in both Western and Eastern Armenians.

¹⁶¹ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *mama* [mama].

PM: Proto-Slavic *něтъсь* (since the 15th century ‘one who is not able to speak, one who speaks incomprehensible language’) (Boryś 2008, 362; cf. Urbańczyk 1965–1969, 5: 192; Linde 1809, 2, 1: 305).

R: in Polish Armenian, it was a Polish loanword (from above-mentioned *Niemiec* [niemiets^h]); however, in Eastern Armenian it was a Russian loanword (*немец* [nemets^h]) (Մալխասյան 1944, 3: 450). In the 20th century, especially after World War II, it was widespread because of the service of Armenians in the Russian-speaking soviet army. Because of geographical and administrative features (including the noun *նեմեց* [nemets^h] found, for instance, in the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocol (Գրիգորյան 1963, (3) 93–94)), except for Polish, the other sources (Кірчак *немес* (Гаркавец 2010, 1013) or Ruthenian/Ukrainian *німець* (Желехівський 1886, 1: 530; Мельничук 2003, 4: 99)) do not seem to be justified for the borrowing.

131. **L:** **նեմիչ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 570; АКТКП, 8: 201, 20: 151) [nemitʰ] (Pol. *Nemicz*,¹⁶² Eng. *Nemich* both are the equivalents of *Pole*).

AT: there is no other explanation besides the Polish Armenian *նեմիչ* [nemitʰ]: no other equivalent in Eastern or Western Armenians. The appropriate meaning is *Polish*.

PM: the noun *նեմիչ* [nemitʰ] as Polish *nemicz* or any other equivalent does not exist in Polish.

R: *նեմիչ* [nemitʰ] is perhaps a Kipchak noun, which, in the given historical period, existed only among Polish Armenians: *nemič* [nemitʰ] / *nemic* [nemits^h] (Pole [male], ‘Polish’), *nemič xatun* (Pole [female]), *nemič tili* [nemits^h tili] / *nemiččä* [nemits^hts^{he}] ‘Polish language’ (Гаркавец 2010, 1013; Stopka 2010a, 121–123; Stopka 2010c, 182). It could have existed in Armenian analogically to *նեմեց* [nemets^h] – ‘someone who does not speak an understandable language’. *նեմիչ* [nemitʰ] could be a (nick)name for Poles, whose speech was probably incomprehensible for Armenian newcomers. The Armenian philologist, educator, historian, ethnographer and musicologist Minas Bzhshkean in the 19th century

¹⁶² There is no Polish transliteration or transcription of *նեմիչ* [nemicz]. The proposal is mine.

wrote: “[...] **նեմիչ քալենտանընա** [...]” [nemitʃ^h kʰalendanəna] (Բժշկեանց 1830, 118) which in Kipchak is *nemič kalendarina* (‘Polish calendar’ (Գարկաբեւ 2010, 650)). The word was noted especially in the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocols, for example, “[...] եւ **նեմիչ** [nemitʃ^h] Եանն Մնիխովը [...]” (‘Pole Jan [Mnichov]’) (Գրիգորյան 1963, (390) 264–265), “[...] ի մէջ Ի (20) ֆլորին **նեմիչի** [nemitʃ^h] սայխակ [...]” (‘20 Polish florins’) (Գրիգորյան 1963, (128) 158–159), “[...] իշխանութեան **նեմիչի** [nemitʃ^h] թագաւորին [...]” (‘under the power of Polish king’) (Գրիգորյան 1963, (475) 299–300) etc. An example of the rooting of this noun in the Polish Armenian dialect may be the following fragment of a 17th-century text in Kipchak (in the Armenian alphabet), which is in Matenadaran¹⁶³: “[...] բասրշահիրքնա **Նեմիչ ուլուսունուն** [nemitʃ^h ulusunun] Ուչունչի Չիկմոնսունուն [...]”¹⁶⁴ The piece could be translated as “[...] In the kingdom of Nemich country of King Sigismund the Third [...]”¹⁶⁵ where we have a typical example of *Nemich – Nemič ulusu* (*Kingdom of Poland* in Kipchak) (Գարկաբեւ 2010, 1550). Leszczak presumes that the term *Nemicz* generally referred to the Slavs, and, in our case, to the Western Slavs.¹⁶⁶ It seems to be a coincidental similarity with the Turkish *nem* or Kipchak *näm* as *humidity* (Nişanyan; Գարկաբեւ 2010, 1007). *Nemicz* is also a family name (cf. Łuc 2017) which comes from Poland or neighboring countries (Belarus and Ukraine): historically the surnames were formed from a nickname or name given to a distant ancestor. From this perspective, the etymology of the surname could also be derived from the Turkish *nem* (‘wet’, ‘cry’, ‘mute’) or from *Niemiec* (German) (ΠφΗ). However, in this case, the Turkish trace is very likely, for example:

¹⁶³ Matenadaran is a museum, repository of manuscripts, and a research institute in Yerevan, Armenia.

¹⁶⁴ The translation on Matenadaran’s website (<http://www.matenadaran.am/ftp/VIIIvolume.htm>) is “[...] Russian nation’s (*nemič*) Zigmund the Third [...]” However, in the original we have “[...] բասրշահիրքնա Նեմիչ ուլուսունուն Ուչունչի Չիկմոնսունուն [...]” which rather means, as I translate above, “[...] In the kingdom of Nemich country King Sigismund the Third [...]” In Matenadaran’s version, it seems that the translator did not include *բասրշահիրքնա* [batəʃahləxəna] (Kipchak *padšaxliχina* kingdom) (cf. Գարկաբեւ 2010, 1252). It is also difficult to explain why “Russian nation’s” appeared in the translation.

¹⁶⁵ Developed by: “Գրիչ՝ Միքոն արկ. Մուրատ օղլու: Ստացող՝ բան Վարդան, բաննա Չօֆիեա, 2403.” *Ժողովոյ (հայաստան դիշտերէն)*, <http://www.matenadaran.am/ftp/VIIIvolume.htm>.

¹⁶⁶ Private correspondence from 2.09.2020.

in Arabic we have النمسا ([Nimsā] ‘Austrian’) which was borrowed from Ottoman Turkish نمچه ([nemçe] ‘mute’) (cf. Redhouse 1890; Nişanyan).

132. **L:** շաֆար (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 592) [ʃafar] (Pol. *szafarz*, Eng. *minister/steward*¹⁶⁷ – somebody as ‘court clerk’) (Գրիգորյան 1963, (42) 116; Ասմանզոլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 160, 591, 928; Ալգերեան 1868, 136, 463, 683; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 152, 550, 822).

AT: the first apt translation is *մարանապետ* [maranapet], which consists of *մարան* [maran] (pantry) with the conjunction *ա* [a] and the noun *պետ* [pet] (principal). *մարան* [maran] is from Assyrian *madānā* (‘granary depository’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 511) or Persian *may* (‘wine’) with *dān* (particle showing place) (Անտոնյան 1977, 3: 263), and *պետ* [pet] is an Iranian borrowing – **pet* (cf. Sanskrit *pāti-*, Avestan *paiti-*, Old Persian *pati-*, Parthian *bēd*, Middle Persian ‘pat, pet as head, principal’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 635; Անտոնյան 1979, 4: 74; Ջահուկյան 1987, 542). The second proposal is *մարնետ* [marnet], which has a broad meaning – ‘person who carries about food, clothing, fuel’, etc. (Ալետիսյան et al. 1837, 2: 885; Պետրոսյան 1875, 706). The noun comes from a combination of two words: *մուն* ([tun] ‘house/home’)¹⁶⁸ and *մեսանետ* [tesanem] (‘I see’ or ‘I will see’) probably from the Proto-Indo-European stem **derk-* (cf. Sanskrit *drç*, *darç* – ‘to see’, Avestan *darasa* – ‘view eye’, etc.) (Անտոնյան 1979, 4: 397; Olsen 1999, 452).

PM: Linde characterized *szafarz* [ʃafaʒ] as the ‘steward, chief inspector’ (Linde 1812, 3: 504). The noun comes from German *schaffen* (‘to create, to manage, to arrange’, etc.), which has existed in Polish since the 15th century (*szafarnia* meant ‘pantry’ (Krasnowolski and Niedźwiedzki 1920, 2: 582)). *Szafarz* [ʃafaʒ] (‘the one who arranges things’) became common in the 16th century (Brückner 1927, 2: 539).

R: as the equivalent of *szafarz* [ʃafaʒ] in Armenian (for Kipchak *šafar*) Harkavets suggests *վերակառն* (Гаркавец 2010, 440, 750) [verakatsʰu] (‘overseer,

¹⁶⁷ His task was to provide all necessary food to the royal or magnate court, a so-called food providing manager.

¹⁶⁸ See the case of **բիվնիցա** [pivnitsʰa] – entry no. 104.

trustee' etc.), which could be a synonym of *տնտես* [ntes] and *մատակարար* [matakarak] (cf. Գայլյան 1938, 473; Սուքիասյան 1967, 605 etc.) or a higher position – *տաճարապետ* [tatʃarapet] (Гаркавец 2010, 952) with broad meanings ('head of Temple, senior official of pagan temples, pontiff, feast table manager or toast master' (Մալխասեանց 1945, 4: 369)). According to the same sources, *տնտես* [ntes] or *իկոնոմոս* ([ikonomos] 'steward') (Աճառեան 1973, 2: 240) are also Armenian analogues of *շաֆար* [ʃafar] (Гаркавец 2010, 1102, 1313), which is a fairly accurate description of this position. The Ukrainian borrowing should rather be excluded (but maybe not quite) because Ukrainian (rather Ruthenian) borrowed the word from Polish (Мельничук 2012, 6: 389; Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 1084; Фасмер 1987, 4: 414). It is worth mentioning two other meanings of Polish *szafarz* [ʃafaʒ]: the office of *szafarz* (clerk), which was created in 1503 for the first time in Poland, in order to perform tax collection activities (Bernat and Biegasiewicz 2013, 575), and *szafarz* [ʃafaʒ] as a person authorized to administer the sacrament (see more: Gospodarek 2012).

133. **L:** **շլախեդնիյ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 597) [ʃlaxetnij] (Pol. *szlachcic*, Eng. *nobleman*, *noble*)¹⁶⁹ (cf. Magakian 2021, 231–232; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 624; Ալգերեան 1868, 487; Ալգերեան and Պրեմսեան 1821, 1: 580; Bartoszewicz 1923, 754)).

AT: the proposal of MAD *շլախտիչ* [ʃlaxtitʃʰ] (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 597) has no translation in Armenian. In MAD, we see only its explanation as a 'Polish smallholder nobleman'. The Armenian analogue is *ազնվական* ([aznvakan] 'nobleman, aristocrat'), which is a derivative of *ազն* ([azn] 'generation, tribe, nation, kind') (Olsen 1999, 115, 120, 862 etc.). The noun is an Iranian loanword (cf. Avestan *ā-sna* – 'innate, noble, nobleman' from the stem *zan* (bear), Zend *āznāvaz* – 'noble' etc. (Ջահուկյան 2010, 23)). *ազնվական* [aznvakan], with the meaning of '*genere illustrissimus* (illustrious family)', has been used since at least the beginning of the 17th century (Rivola 1633, 4).

¹⁶⁹ According to Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 597.

PM: *szlachcic*¹⁷⁰ [ʃlaxɕtʰitʂ] (the translation does not seem to be the most appropriate grammatically) is the one ‘who belongs to the noble state, has a noble origin’ (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 567).

R: շլախտնիյ [ʃlaxetnij] MAD explains as Polish *szlachcic* ([ʃlaxɕtʰitʂ] nobleman). The thing is that *szlachetny* [ʃlaxetnij] in Polish means ‘noble’ either as an adjective (e.g. *He is a very honest and righteous man, He is of noble descent*, etc.) or as the noun *noble*, without *man* (e.g. *we went to see the noble(man)*). *Szlachetny* [ʃlaxetnij], *szlachcic* [ʃlaxɕtʰitʂ] are the derivatives of *szlachta* [ʃlaxta/ʃlaxɕta] which is an Upper Middle German loanword – *slahte* (‘family, tribe, strain’) as (*ge*)*sleht(e)*/*geslaht(e)* (‘family, strain, lineage, noble origin’). According to many researchers, the word *szlachta* was not borrowed from German directly, but through the Czech language (Bogucki 2003, 458). Mentioned in MAD, *szlachetny* [ʃlaxetnij] is an Old Polish form from the 14th century (Boryś 2008, 604) and means ‘somebody associated with the nobility (nobleman), concerning nobility, referring to the nobility, coming from the nobility’ (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 570) or ‘title of courtesy applied to people of noble origin’ (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 570). The Protocols of the Armenian Court in Kamianets-Podilskyi show that շլախտնիյ [ʃlaxetnij], could even be interpreted in the two ways mentioned above (including the illustrative example of the MAD): “[...] եկաւ շլախտնիյ [ʃlaxetnij] Բեդր Մոշինսքիյ ծառայն բան Սրոզիսքիյին” (‘came the noble [gentle?] or nobleman Petr Moshinskiy’s servant [...]’) (Գրիգորյան 1963, (626) 359), “Եկաւ շլախտնիյ [ʃlaxetnij] Վոյցէխ Սլուսքիյ եւ իւր բարիկամաւ նիւրեր առաւ” (‘came noble [gentle?] or nobleman Voycekh Slupskiy [...]’) (Գրիգորյան 1963, (152) 168) etc. However, noble origin in this case is much more appropriate. It is also surprising that modern Armenian, pointing to շլախտնիյ [ʃlaxetnij] as a Polish borrowing (*szlakhtich* [ʃlaxɕtʰitʂ]), phonetically transliterates it according to the Russian (or Ukrainian/Ruthenian) sounding – *шляхтич* [ʃlaxɕtʰitʂ] (cf. Фасмер 1987, 4: 457; Мельничук 2012, 6: 441; Желехівський and Недільский 1886, 2: 1094). Phonetically, Kipchak *slaxetnij*, *šlaxetnī*, *šlaxitnī* (with the same Polish meaning – a loanword rather via Armenian) also sound like Polish Armenian շլախտնիյ [ʃlaxetnij] and not *шляхетный* [ʃlaxetnij] (Гаркавец 2010, 1286, 1356). Undoubtedly, it is a Polish borrowing – ‘nobility’, and, through Polish, the noun *szlachta* ([ʃlaxta] (with its derivatives) penetrated into Russian, Ruthenian/Ukrainian and other Slavic languages

¹⁷⁰ Ibidem.

(Brückner 1927, 2: 550; cf. Фасмер 1987, 4: 457, Мельничук 2012, 6: 441). For the Armenian language, the unique explanation is that the same word was borrowed twice: one as it was described above and the next time as a new Russian loanword. Below, in the following case of շլախտա [ʃlaxta] / շլախտիչ [ʃlaxtitʃʰ], I will provide a short analysis of these loanword(s) as coming from Russian.

134. **L:** շլախտա/շլախտիչ (as the derivative) (Հայրապետյան 2011, 400) [ʃlaxta/ʃlaxtitʃʰ] (Pol. *szlachta/szlachcic*, Eng. *aristocracy/nobleman*) (cf. Magakian 2021, 232–233; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 55, 624; Ալզերեան 1868, 43, 487; Ալզերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 580; Bartoszewicz 1923, 754)).

AT: the apt equivalent of Polish *szlachta* [ʃlaxta] in Armenian is *ազնվականություն* [aznvakanutʰjun] (Մալխասեանց 1944, 1: 12; Ժիրբ 1969, 1: 10 etc.) and for *szlachcic* [ʃlaxtʃʰitʃʰ] – *ազնվական* ([aznvakan] nobleman), as mentioned above, an ‘illustrious family’ known since at least the 17th century (Rivola 1633, 4), with *-ություն* [-utʰjun] (for example like in **ձեխմիստր** [dzeχmistr]). In DFW, we can find the explanation that *շլախտա* [ʃlaxta] was the name of most of the ruling feudal classes in a number of Central European countries (particularly in Poland and Lithuania) (Հայրապետյան 2011, 400) which is the correct definition also according Polish sources (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 571–572; Brückner 1927, 2: 550 etc.). However, in most Armenian sources we find an incorrect interpretation of that noun as in the case of *շլախտեղնի* [ʃlaxetnij] – ‘the name of the Polish petty-seignorial nobility’ (Վարդանյան 2003, 54; Աղայան 1976, 2: 1110; Ժիրբ 1980, 4: 75 etc.). The same problem is with *շլախտիչ* [ʃlaxtitʃʰ], interpreted as ‘Polish small-seignorial nobleman’ (Փալանդուզյան; Հայրապետյան 2011, 400 etc.). From the very beginning, the nobility was a stratified class. The superior nobility (e.g. magnate or aristocracy) arose from great feudal lords but the lower nobility often arose from serial knighthood (cf. Sikorska-Kulesza 1995; Polaczówna 1913; Kuczer 2006; Kuczer 2007; Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 56 etc.).

PM: *szlachta* [ʃlaxta] (or *ślachta* [ʃlaxta], *ślechta* [ʃlɛxta]) meant ‘a state, a social group in the feudal system, with a privileged legal position or a person belonging to the nobility, a nobleman and belonging to the nobility, noble origin, nobility’

(Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 571–572). The noun is from the Middle-Upper-German stem *slahte* (‘family, origin, species, type’) (Фасмер 1987, 4: 457; Brückner 1927, 2: 550 etc.), which is close to the above-mentioned Armenian *uqû* [azn] – ‘generation, tribe, nation, kind’ – not to be confused with German *schlachten* (similar to *szlachtuz(a)* – ‘slaughterhouse, abattoir’, from German *Schlachthaus*) (Brückner 1927, 2: 550; Sobol 1995, 1073). The next noun, *szlachcic* [ʃlaxtʃʰitsʰ] (or *ślachcic* [ʃlaxtʃʰitsʰ], *ślehcic* [ʃlɛxtʃʰitsʰ]), has been known since at least 1399 and meant ‘one who belongs to the noble state’ or ‘has a noble origin’ (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 567).

R: as we see, the soft Russian pronunciation of Polish *szlachta* [ʃlaxta] – *шляхта* [ʃljaxta] – (Фасмер 1987, 4: 457) is visible in Armenian *շլախտա* [ʃljaxta] as a typical example of a Russian loanword. Also, the Ukrainian explanation that the *szlachta* [ʃlaxta] is the lower layer of aristocracy is incomplete and even incorrect (Мельничук 2012, 6: 443). The Ruthenian translation of the noun *шляхта* [ʃljaxta] into German is only *Adel* or *Edelleute* (as ‘aristocracy, nobility’) (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 1094). In Poland, the nobility was abolished by the March Constitution of 1921 (Konstytucja RP [Constitution of the Polish Republic] 1921, Art. 96; *Encyklopedia PWN*).

135. **L:** շպակ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 402) [ʃpak] (Pol. *sprytny człowiek, pogardliwa nazwa wojskowego*, Eng. *resourceful man, the contemptuous name of a soldier*¹⁷¹).

AT: *szpak* [ʃpak] in Armenian is a bird – *սարյակ* [sarjak] (from Middle Persian *sārīk* and Persian *sārī* forms) (Աճառնաւն 1979, 4: 187). However, Armenian DFW proposes that it is a Russian loanword (borrowed from Polish into Russian) with metaphoric usages of *szpak* [ʃpak] as ‘resourceful man’ and, additionally, unknown to me and at least eight dictionaries, as ‘the contemptuous name of a soldier’ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 402). In some dialects of Armenian, *շպակ* [ʃpak] also means ‘newborn baby’s head hat’ or a ‘small window left in the interior wall of the house’ (Սարգսյան 2007, 4: 277) and has nothing common with Polish *szpak* [ʃpak].

¹⁷¹ According to Հայրապետյան (2011, 402), but, in fact, Polish *szpak* [ʃpak] means ‘starling’.

PM: *szpak* [ʃpak] in Polish, besides the sense of the bird (Brückner 1927, 2: 552), has metaphoric (symbolic) uses, at least in the sentences *szpakami karmiony człowiek* (‘man fed with/by starlings’) or *szpak z niego* (‘starling of him’), etc. meaning a ‘sly, cunning, experienced’, or ‘wise person’ (Skorupka et al. 1969, 804; Kopaliński 1987, 1143; Zgółkowa 2003, 41: 399; Narodowe Centrum Kultury etc.). In Ruthenian, we can also find *унак* [ʃpak] with the meaning of a ‘smart and old fox, cunning guy’, etc. (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 1097). The other senses – ‘resourceful man, the contemptuous name of a soldier’ – I could not find in Polish (e.g., Linde 1812, 3: 560; Zgółkowa 2003, 41: 399; Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 247, 577; Kopaliński 1987, 1143 etc.), or in Ukrainian (e.g., Мельничук 2012, 6: 455–456; Фасмер 1987, 4: 469–470; Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 247, 577 etc.), in Vasmer (Фасмер 1987, 4: 469–470), or in other dictionaries. *унак* [ʃpak] can be found with a similar meaning in *Словарь русского языка* of А. Успенского (Евгеньева 1984, 4: 727; see also *Словарь Ушакова*; *Словарь Ефремовой* etc.) and in *Ռուսերեն-հայերեն բառարան* (Russian-Armenian Dictionary) but only as ‘a non-combatant, civilian or petty civil servant (usually with a touch of contempt)’ (bararanonline.com).

R: one can get the impression that the author of the DFW dictionary has written the Russian archaic significance of ‘non-combatant, civilian or petty civil servant’ into Polish resources. *շպակ* [ʃpak] is not in common use in any of the Armenian dialects.

136. **L:** **շուլեր** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 403) [ʃuler] (Pol. *szuler*, Eng. *cardsharp*).

AT: the correct Armenian equivalent of *շուլեր* [ʃuler] is the noun *խախանոց* [χaχaneng], which consists of *խախ* [χaχ] (probably Indo-European **khl-* or **khəl-* from the stem **kel-* (‘repel, move fast’)) with *անոց* [neng] (unknown origine) or the noun *խաբեր* [χabeba] (probably Arabic *ḥabb* (‘cheater’), *taḥbīb* (‘to cheat’)) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 307)). DFW proposes the meanings of ‘cheating in the game, fraudster, scam and fraudulent person’ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 403). In Armenian, there the form *շուլ(լ)եր* [ʃul(l)er] was also borrowed as a Polish word through Russian (Մալխասյան 1944, 3: 533).

PM: in Polish since the 18th century (Brückner 1927, 2: 557). The main meaning is ‘a compulsive gambling player, a cheater in the games’ (Sobol 1995, 1080). *սյւլեր* [ʃuljer] is a Polish loanword in Russian and comes from Middle-Upper-German ‘scholderer, schollerer’ (gambling organizer) (Փաօմբ 1987, 4: 484; cf. Sobol 1995, 1080). As emphasizes Vasmer, we can see an accidental resemblance with the German noun *Schüler* (‘student’) or Polish verb *szulać się* ([ʃulatʰ ʃe] ‘to dangle’) and Russian *шляться* ([ʃljatʰsja] ‘hang around’) or *шляк* ([ʃuljak] ‘buffoon droll’) (Փաօմբ 1987, 4: 484). The noun in Polish means ‘a person cheating while playing cards and gambling or compulsive gambling player’ (Zgótkowa 2003, 41: 464; Linde 1812, 3: 575).

R: rarely, and still in a pejorative sense, it appears in Eastern Armenian (e.g. Հակոբյան 2018; Անդրեասյան 2016 etc.).

137. **L:** **ուրեանիք** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 622) [ureadnik^h] (Pol. *urzędnik*, Eng. *official, clerk*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 160, 641; Ալզերեան 1868, 136, 498; Ալզերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 152, 583).

AT: *սլաշտննէայ* [paʃtoneaj] seems to be the most appropriate equivalent and consists of *սլաշտնն* [paʃton] (position) and the suffix *-էայ* [-ej], highlighting the ‘belonging to some group’. *սլաշտնն* [paʃton] comes from *սլաշտնի* [paʃtel] (‘to serve, adore’) which is from Iranian **pari-štā* (cf. Old Persian *perist*, *parast-*, or Persian *parast*) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 621; Olsen 1999, 654–655). The suffix *-էայ* is from the stem vowel *-ի* [-i] and the element *-այ* [-aj], which is probably of the same origin as the ending *-այ* [-aj] of *-այք* [-aj-k^h] and the personal noun *-այ* [-aj] (means that it is also an initial/basic stem element).¹⁷² Harkavets proposes a second translation with Armenian *գործաւիար* [gortsavar] as the equivalent of Kipchak *urâdnik/urendnik* (‘clerk, manager, official’) (Գարկաբեւ 2010, 1555). This noun consists of *գործ* [gorts] (‘work, job, occupation, employment’),

¹⁷² The suffix *-այ* [-aj] was later also spread on the stems which did not initially end with *-ի* [-i]. In the same way as *-այ* [-aj] of *-այք* [-aj-k^h], *-էայ* [-ej] was also contaminated by foreign forms; cf. *քսողէայ* [kʰakʰdeaj] of Assyrian *χaldāyā*, *հրէայ* [hreaaj] of Assyrian *ihudāyā* (judea), *ւծղնէայ* [mtsɛneaj] of Assyrian *məsallayānē* (profane sectarian), *ղծնէայ* [dʒneaj] of Persian *dužan*, *dižan* (cruel), etc. (Ջահուկյան 2010, 705, 197; Աճառեան 1979, 4: 803; Մալխաստեանց 1944, 1: 51).

the conjunction *u* [a], and the noun *վար* [var] (‘plowing’). *գործ* [gorts] is from Proto-Indo-European **uorgo-* or rather **uerg’o-* (**uorg’o*) from the stem **uerg-* (‘to act, to do’) – cf. Avestian *varəza-*, Greek *έργον*, Upper Middle German *werk* (act) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 170; cf. Աճառեան 1971, 1: 584). *վար* [var] is an Iranian loanword from **vaθ-* which is from Indo-European **uedh-* (‘to steer, to plough, to drive, to take’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 705; cf. Աճառեան 1979, 4: 313–314; Olsen 1999, 685, 747).

PM: the noun *urzędnik* [uzendnik] – the derivative of *urząd* ([uzond] ‘rules, order’) – has had a wide range of meanings: ‘one who holds some office’ (since the 15th century); ‘one who serves, serves someone, is in service with someone’ (to varying degrees of personal dependence), ‘assistant, deputy, administrator’, etc. (Urbańczyk 1982–1987, 9: 444; Boryś 2008, 671). Moreover, *urzędnik* [uzendnik] is a ‘position, function, duty performed by someone in a state or other hierarchy’ (Doroszewski). Additionally, an *urzędnik* [uzendnik] in the past could be somebody like ‘a steward’ or ‘a trustee’ (Linde 1814, 4: 86–87): here we have Proto-Slavic **rěditi* with the prefix **u-* (‘to line up, rank, organize, introduce order, supervise something, take care of something, manage something, dispose of, rule’, etc.) (Boryś 2008, 671; cf. Derksen 2008, 436).

R: the noun is surely a Polish loanword, which, however, does not mean that it must have been borrowed directly from Polish. The Polish word *urzędnik* [uzendnik] has equivalents in Russian and Ruthenian/Ukrainian – *урядник* [urjadnik] from *уряд* ([urjad] ‘office’) with a slight difference in meaning (Мельничук 2012, 6: 45–46; Linde 1814, 6: 85; Фасмер 1987, 4: 169; Крылов 2004; Желехівський 1886, 1: 1015). As we saw above, *urzędnik* [uzendnik] in Polish has meant an ‘employee of (state) office or (government/governor) agency’. Therefore, the explanation of *նրեասնիք* [ureadnik^h] in MAD (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 622) from the fragment of the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocol as ‘subordinate provincial police officer’ or just ‘officer’ seems to be too narrow for Polish reality. The protocol ([...] եկաւ Չալէսքի Սըրուսին **նրեասնիք [ureadnik^h]** և գանկատ առաւ Չասոիկին վերայ Աղանին, գոր պարս է նմայ Ժ (10) ֆլորին [...] (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 622; Գրիգորյան 1963, (246) 213) just states that the *նրեասնիք* [ureadnik^h] ‘complained about someone’. The translation’s confusion arose for another reason. In Eastern Armenian, another word – *նրեասնիք* [ureadnik^h] / *նրյադնիկ* [urjadnik] – from Russian

урядник [urjadnik] functioned with the meaning of ‘subordinate provincial police officer’ (Աղալյան 1976, 2: 1502; Ժիրք 1980, 4: 619 etc.). From the viewpoint of Polish Armenian, the question is: What was the source of the loanword *նրհաւանիք*: MAD’s proposal of Polish *urzędnik* [uzendnik] or Ruthenian/Ukrainian *урядник* [urjadnik] (Желехівський and Недільский 1886, 2: 1015)? The latter seems to be phonetically closer to the loanword (even if we accept the presumption of the Polish language’s impact on *уряд* [urjad] / *урядник* [urjadnik] (Мельничук 2012, 6: 46)). Bozhko’s proposal that *նրհաւանիք* [ureadnik^h] is a Ukrainian (or rather Ruthenian) loanword from *урядник* [urjadnik^h] (Բոժկո 2010, 114) seems to be reasonable.

138. **L:** *ռոտմիստր* (Հայրապետյան 2011, 491 [rotmistr] (Pol. *rotmistrz*, Eng. (*cavalry*) *captain*, *rittmeister*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, (143) 136; Ալգերեան 1868, 116, 110; Ալգերեան and Պրէստեան 1821, 1: 122).

AT: *ռոտմիստր* [rotmistr] in Armenian is still used as ‘old military rank especially for some countries in the past and in pre-revolutionary Russia or cavalry officer rank’ (according to the captain of the infantry and other troops), also as ‘a person of that rank’ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 491; Աղալյան 1973, 2: 1265).

PM: the base is *rota* [rota], which has had the meaning of army detachment since the 15th century from Middle-Upper-German *rote/rotte* (‘military team, company’) (Boryś 2008, 519–520). From that we have *rotmistrz* [rotmistʃ] (‘rota commander’), known in Polish since the 15th century (Urbańczyk 1973–1977, 7: 499; Boryś 2008, 519–520) (or German *Rottmeister* – ‘corporal’ (Boryś 2008, 519–520)).

R: the noun was known also in Kipchak (as *rotmistr* [rotmistr], *rohmistir* [rohmistir], *rokmistir* [rokmistir], *rokmistr* [rokmistr], *roxmistir* [roxmistir], *roxmistr* [roxmistr]), where it was probably a Polish (or even Ukrainian) loanword (Гаркавец 2010, 1206) likely through Armenian. Being a Polish loanword in Russian (*ротмистр* [rotmistr]) (Фасмер 1987, 3: 507; Мельничук 2006, 5: 128), it came into (especially Eastern) Armenian from that language. I could not

find *mnunʻhounʻ* in Western Armenian (cf. Սարգսյան 1991; Սարսապետոյեան 2011).

139. **L:** ստարուստա (Պողոսյան 2014, 186) [sd(t)arusta] or ստարուսայ (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 693) [starosta(j)] (Pol. *starosta*, Eng. *starosta*¹⁷³ (cf. Magakian 2021, 234–235; Bartoszewicz 1923, 738)).

AT: the first could be *սվխազ*¹⁷⁴ ([avag] ‘senior, major’) with an imprecise etymology. The next possible translation is *վարչական կառավարիչ* ([vartʃakan karavaritʃh] ‘administrative manager’), which in modern language seems to be the best translation (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 313; Ջահուկյան 2010, 387). The next possible equivalent is *երեց* [jɛrɛtsʰ] (a more classical perception of the noun) from Proto-Indo-European *preiskʻhu*, a cognate with at least the Ancient Greek *πρέσβυς* ([prezbis] ‘old man’) and Latin *priscus* (‘ancient’), *pristinus* (‘primitive’, ‘pristine’). The original meaning of the Armenian is ‘elder’ or ‘firstborn’. The sense of ‘presbyter, priest’ was formed in the Christian period based on the Ancient Greek *πρεσβύτερος* ([prezviteros] ‘senior’) or/and classical Assyrian *qaš* and *qašā* (*qašīšā* which meant ‘elder, priest’). From here we have Turkish *keşiş* ([keʃiʃ] ‘priest’) (Աճառեան 1973, 2: 52), which is interpreted by Nişanyan as an Arabic word from Aramaic/Syrian *kəšīš* (known in the language at least from Codex Cumanicus) (Nişanyan).

PM: *starosta* – the general sense is, among others, ‘senior, supervisor’ or ‘old man, greybeard’ (Linde 1812, 3: 405; Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 419, 420; Brückner 1927, 2: 514; Фасмер 1987, 3: 747). From the turn of the 13th and 14th centuries (*Encyklopedia PWN*) *starosta* was initially ‘a royal viceroy, exercising full power in a given territory in replacement of the ruling (governor/starosta, land starosta)’, but with time it changed into ‘an official exercising administrative, judicial, and police authority in a given area and the management of royal

¹⁷³ “In the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Poland the starosta was a representative of the king or grand duke in a voivodeship. In Galicja and Podilia the general starosta was in charge of a whole voivodeship. By the end of the 16th century, as the power of the nobility increased, the authority of the starosta diminished” (source: *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*; see more: Kutrzeba 1903).

¹⁷⁴ Precise etymology is unknown. Cf. **ձէխմիստր** [dʒɛχmistr] – entry no. 127.

property (castle staroste), also the tenant of royal goods (non-castle staroste)’ or their ‘administrator’ (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 418; Brückner 1927, 2: 514; Фасмер 1987, 3: 747).

R: the Armenians adopted all of the above-mentioned meanings of the noun apart from ‘old man, greybeard’. Harkavets even shows the Armenian translations for *starosta* as *քղեշխ* [bdeʃχ] (Гаркавец 2010, 1317), an Iranian loanword *bidiaχš* with the meaning of ‘governor, great prince’ (Ջահուկյան 2010, 123), or *էպարքոս* [jepark^hos] (Гаркавец 2010, 1317), from Greek *επαρχος* with the meaning of ‘governor, viceroy’ (Ջահուկյան 2010, 217), etc., which was in basic Armenian vocabulary also as *էպարքոս* [epark^hos] (Rivola 1633, 109; Մերմեր 1698, 88). Neither were ever used by Polish Armenians.

140. **L:** **վայվոդայ/վոյվոդայ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 727, 740) [vajvotaj/vojvodaj] (Pol. *województwo*, Eng. *voivode*¹⁷⁵ (cf. Magakian 2021, 235–237; Bartoszewicz 1923, 799)).

AT: translation of Polish *województwo* into Armenian as *վոյվոդայ* [vojvodaj] by MAD confirms other Armenian sources: *vojvoda* (Turkish loanword where it is a Serbian borrowing) means ‘high-ranking government official, prince, state tax collector’ (Nişanyan; Ջահուկյան 2010, 713; Անանյան 1979, 4: 347). It is worth emphasizing that in Polish Armenian there is no *վայվոդայ* [vajvotaj] but *վոյվոդայ* [vojvodaj]; for example, “[...] ես գալս ձին գնել եմ **վոյվոդային** [**vojvodajin**] ծառայելն՝ Բուսուկսիքին [...]” (‘somebody bought this horse from a serving voivode’) (Գրիգորյան 1963, (192) 184–185). Harkavets believes that the Armenian equivalent of Kipchak *vojvoda* is *գավարսայեան* ([gavarapet] ‘head of the province’)¹⁷⁶ or *խորսայեան* ([xorapet] ‘a high official in the royal palace’ (cf. Մալխասեանց 1944, 2: 285)) (Гаркавец 2010, 1615). *գավարսայեան/գաւարսայեան* [gavarapet] consists of *գավար* [gavar] (‘province’) with the conjunction *ու* [a] and the noun *այեան* [pet] (‘principal, senior, chief’).¹⁷⁷ Acharyan supposes a Chaldean or Caucasian loanword which Jahukyan disputes. In his opinion, it is likely from the Proto Indo-European stem **ghāu* – (‘area’),

¹⁷⁵ A military commander, non-military governor or official of a territorial voivodeship, etc.

¹⁷⁶ In Armenian, *գավարսայեան* [gavarapet] can also be the *wójt* (details in *վոյթ* [vojth]).

¹⁷⁷ *Պետ* [pet] like in the case of **շաֆար** [šafar] – entry no. 132.

which joined with **ghēu-* (‘yawning’, ‘to open wide’) (Աճառնաւոյն 1971, 1: 527; Ջահնկլյաւն 2010, 153). We can also find *գաւառապետ* [gavarapet] as ‘governor of a province (village)’ already in F. Rivola’s *Dictionarium armeno-latinum* in 1633 (Rivola 1633, 70). *խորապետ* [χorapet] is an Iranian loanword (χūr, χūra – ‘majesty, eminence’) which consists of *խոր* [χor], the conjunction *ու* [a] and the previously mentioned noun *պետ* [pet]. However, the etymology of *խոր* [χor] is unknown (Ջահնկլյաւն 2010, 342; Աճառնաւոյն 1973, 2: 399, Olsen 1999, 327).

PM: in Polish, the noun *wojewoda* (or *wojwoda* as in Armenian – *վոյվոդայ* [vojvodaj]) has existed since the 13th century as a common Slavic word and comes from Proto-Slavic **vojevoda* (‘headman, commander’), which consists of **vojь*, **voinь* (‘army’, ‘soldier, warrior’) with **voda* – derived from Proto Slavic **vesti* (‘lead’) with the Sanskrit stem *véti* (‘persecute, strive, chase’) (Boryś 2008, 706; Derksen 2008, 415, 524). There is also a weak presumption that this noun is a copy of Old High German *herizogo* (‘commander’) (Фасмер 1986, 1: 332; Мельничук 1982, 1: 415–416). In Polish reality there were (and still are) different (sometimes close) meanings of *wojewoda*. More precisely, we can say that *wojewoda* was:

- initially a court official, commander of the army in replacement of the ruler, later a high-ranking land official, exercising in a given area, among others, administrative and judicial authority;
- the one who led, the leader, the head, the superior (of the family, religious, military group, etc.);
- governor, prince of Moldova, Wallachia and Transylvania¹⁷⁸;
- the head of a so-called land, namely, a small village district based on Wallachian law, Wallachian voivode;
- a lower royal official;
- ordinator of weights and measures;
- one who imposed taxes on goods, etc. (cf. Urbańczyk 1988–1993, 10: 279–281; Linde 1814, 4: 281).

R: in Armenian, there are many examples of using the noun *վայվոդայ* [vajvodaj] / *վոյվոդայ* [vojvodaj] (mainly *վոյվոդայ* [vojvodaj]), but they are not always Polish loanwords. For example, the Armenian poet Minas Tokhatetsi (16th–17th

¹⁷⁸ Transylvania, Wallachia, and Moldavia were three of the four major provinces of modern Romania (cf. Cristea, 2023)

centuries) describes an evil *vojevoda* of Wallachia,¹⁷⁹ and Ananun Vanetsi describes a cruel Turkish tax-collector who came to the town of Van to collect the taxes,¹⁸⁰ etc. All these (and similar) events described in the literature affect the awareness of the noun *վոյվոդայ* [vojvodaj], giving it a negative connotation which is easier to remember. In fact, the dominant Turkish *voivoda* (known in the language before 1400 (Nişanyan)), due to historic and political factors, determined the way that word was perceived in Armenian. But among Polish Armenians, the most likely route of borrowing of that noun was rather Polish. Moreover, in Polish Armenian's written heritage, *վոյվոդայ* [vojvodaj] is not mentioned as a tax-collector. In favor of this statement is the fact that, though the *voivode* also set taxes and was responsible for them (cf. Gieysztor 1971, 317, 323), tax collection was generally done by the *szafarz*¹⁸¹ since the beginning of the 14th century (cf. Bernat and Biegasiewicz 2013, 575), and the main official, who was in charge of the towns revenue and the administration of the royal goods, was called *wielkorzqđca* [vielkoʒondtsʰa] (at least since the first half of 14th century) (Brzezczkowski 1982, 42). It also seems that *մարզպետ* ([marzpet] ‘chief of the region, state, district or county’) could be a better translation because of the fact that it indicates the governance over a larger area (even comparable to a voivodship). So, *մարզ* [marz] – ‘region, state, district, county’ (from Middle Persian *marz* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 516; Անանեան 1977, 3: 281)) and *պետ* [pet] rather than *գավար* [gavar] (cf. Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 278).

141. **L:** **վոյթ** (Ռազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 740) [vojʰtʰ] (Pol. *wójt*, Eng. *village head*, *voyt*, *village mayor*, *commune head* (cf. Magakian 2021, 237–238; Bartoszewicz 1923, 807)).

AT: all possible equivalents are rather contemporary in nature. *վոյթ* [vojʰtʰ] in MAD is translated as *գավարապետ* [gavarapet] (‘governor, mayor, commune

¹⁷⁹ Cf. “Օլախ ազգին չար վոյվոդան / Այն վոյվոդան պեղծ Շտեֆան / Պեղծ վոյվոդան Օլախ ազգի / Օլախ ազգին չար վոյվոդան / Պատասխանեաց չար վոյվոդան” (The evil voivode of the Wallachian nation / That vile voivode Stefan / That vile voivode of Wallachian nation / Wallachian nation’s bad voivode / Answered the bad voivode) (cf. Թոխաթեցի 1921).

¹⁸⁰ Cf. “Թիլ ՌՃՀԸ (1720) Արաբկերցի ՄաՀմատ փաշայն եկն, որ Փոշաքի ասէին, եկն վոյվոդայ ի Վան Ե խարոջ էառ” (In 1720 Mahmat pasha from Arabkeb, who was called Ptechaki, came as voivode to the town Van to collect the taxes) (Հակոբյան 1951, 371).

¹⁸¹ See details for **շաֆար** [ʃafar] – entry no. 132.

head’),¹⁸² *համայնքի ախագ* [hamajnk^hi avag] (‘community chief’), *ընտրովի առաջնորդ* [əntrovi aradznoɾd] (‘elective leader’) (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 740). In Armenian reality, there is no *վոյթ* [vojɬ^h], so each of these translations (interpretations) could be appropriate under the right or applicable circumstances. The first, *համայնքի ախագ*, consists of two nouns: *համայնք* [hamajnk^h] (‘community’ in the genitive case) is from Iranian *hama-* (‘all, whole’), which comes from Indo-European protoforms **sem-*, **som-*, **sm* etc. (Աճառեան 1977, 3: 20; Ջահուկյան 2010, 440–441) with the genitive – *ի* [i] and *ախագ* ([avag] ‘senior, major’), which is a noun of an unknown source. In *ընտրովի* [əntrovi] / *ընտրեալ* [əntreal] *առաջնորդ* [aradznoɾd], both the adjective *ընտրովի* – ‘elective’ ([əntrovi] of Eastern Armenian) / *ընտրեալ* ([əntreal] of Western Armenian) (Rivola 1633, 123), and the noun *առաջնորդ* ([aradznoɾd] ‘leader’) (Rivola 1633, 31; Olsen 1999, 527, 529) were in common use in Armenian. *ընտրեալ* [əntreal] is a derivative of *դնել* [dnel] from Proto-Indo-European **dhē-n-*, which comes from the stem *dhē-* (‘to put’) similar to Sanskrit *dādhati* (‘... is putting’), Greek *τιθημι* (‘I am putting’), etc. (Ջահուկյան 2010, 201). The noun *առաջնորդ* [aradznoɾd], a derivative of *աջ* ([adz] ‘right’), Acharyan interprets as a Proto Indo-European form from *sādhyo-* or *sādhyo-* (‘straight, direct’) (Աճառեան 1971, 1: 246). Jahukyan proposes the stem **sē(i)dh-* (‘to go straight to the goal, aim, apply’) which could be compared to Sanskrit *sādhati* (‘... brings to the purpose’), *sādhu* (‘straight’), Greek *ίθός* (‘straight’), etc. (Ջահուկյան 2010, 72).

PM: since the 14th-century *wójt* (in Old Polish also *fojt*) has been in use in the language and comes from Middle Upper German *voit / vogt / voget / vout* (‘superior, commune head, governor, ruler’) (Boryś 2008, 709). It originated from Middle Latin *vocatus* (‘vouched’). The general meaning of *wójt* in Polish was ‘originally the hereditary owner of the property received from the feudal lord in exchange for the location of the city under German law, the chairman of the city court bench and manager of the city on behalf of the lord’, this was also sometimes called ‘the village head’ (Urbańczyk 1988–1993, 10: 305–306).

R: borrowing into the Polish Armenian dialect from Polish seems to be certain as *віѳт* [viɣt] in Ukrainian (Мельничук 1982, 1: 397) / Ruthenia (Желехівський

¹⁸² In Armenian, *գավառապետ* [gavarapet] could be also the *voivoda* (see the details in *վայվոդայ* [vajvotaj] / *վոյվոդայ* [vojvodaj] – entry no. 140).

1886, 1: 105) and *voïm* [vojt] in Russian (Фасмер 1986, 1: 335) are also Polish loanwords (like Kipchak *voyt*, *vuyt* (Гаркавец 2010, 1614)) with the same (or very similar) meanings.¹⁸³

142. **L:** **քաբուցին** (Պողոսյան 2014, 212) [kʰap(pʰ)utsʰin] or **քափուչին** (Պողոսյան 2014, 216) [kʰapʰ(p)utʰin] (Pol. *kapucyn*, Eng. *Capuchin*) (cf. Ալգերեան 1868, 110; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 122).

AT: there is not such a word in modern Armenian as *կապուցին* [kaputsʰin] (only as a seldom-used Italian loanword (cf. Հայրապետյան 2011, 272), although this does not eliminate the possibility of a Polish loanword) because there has never been an Order of Friars Minor Capuchin in Armenian Christianity. However, in the case of the dialect of Polish Armenians, it can be assumed that it was borrowed rather directly from the Polish language.

PM: Brückner, giving the source of the noun *Capuchin*, emphasizes the word *kapuza* (‘pointed hood’), which comes from Latin *caputium* and exists also as *kapus* in Polish or *capuce* in French (Brückner 1927, 1: 218) (which comes from Italian *cappuccino* (TLFI)).

R: in MAD, an excerpt from *Travel Notes* by Polish Armenian Simon Le-hatsi where he describes Capuchins in Rome is given as the example (Ալիսեան 1936, 105–106). It is very possible that, being from Catholic Poland, he wrote the Italian *cappuccino* (*cappucci*) with a familiar (Polish) transliteration – *kapucyn* [kaputsʰin]. To Eastern Armenian, the word could have passed from Russian, which the DFW suggests, *կապուցին* [kaputsʰin] (Հայրապետյան 2011, 272), but for Polish Armenians it would have been a Polish loanword.

¹⁸³ The next loanword of Polish Armenians is *վոյթուժին* [vojtʰutʰjun] (‘to be vojt’), which I will not analyze because of its similarity in meaning and usage to the above-mentioned *վոյթ* (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 740; cf. Գրիգորյան 1963, (474) 298–299, (549) 329–330 etc.).

143. **L:** **օսադցա**¹⁸⁴ (Hanusz 1886, 448) [osadts^ha] (Pol. *zalożyciel osady, kolonii*, Eng. *founder of the settlement, colony*; cf. Magakian 2021, 240–241).

AT: (*համայնքի հիմնադիր* [(hamajnk^hi) himnadir] ‘community founder’). *համայնքի* [hamajnk^hi] here is in the genitive form and is from the stem *համ* ([ham] ‘whole, all’), which is rather an Iranian loanword (*ham-*, *han-*, *hāma* etc.) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 440; Աճառեան h. 3 1977, 18). *հիմնադիր* [himnadir] consists of *հիմն* ([himn] ‘base, basis’) from the Proto-Indo-European stem **semen-*/**semu-* (‘base, basis, foundation’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 460), conjunction *ու* [a] and the verb *դնել* [dnɛl] as in the case of **իստիկովադ (առնել)** [istikovat (arnɛl)].

PM: *osadca* (archaic *osadzca* [osadzts^ha]) is ‘a person who brought settlers to some area, inhabited the area, founder of colony’ (Doroszewski; Linde 1809, 2, 1: 548). We have here Slavic **o(b)sada* (‘to settle’, ‘embedding’, ‘placing somewhere’), which comes from Proto-Slavic prefixal **o(b)-saditi* (‘to settle, embed, place’) with the prefix **ob* – from Proto-Slavic **saditi* (‘to settle, plant plants’) (Boryś 2008, 397; Derksen 2008, 442).

R: the option of the Ruthenian loanword *осадчыў/осадыя* [osadt^hyj/osadts^hja] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 576), which J. Hanusz proposes as second to Polish (Hanusz 1886, 449), is possible.

144. **L:** **ֆարմաս(զ)ոն** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 615) [farmas(z)on] (Pol. *farmazon*, Eng. *pharmason, freemason*) (cf. Ասմանզունյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 371).

AT: *ֆարմասոն* [farmason] has numerous meanings in Armenian, but the most important ones are: ‘a follower of pharmasons [freemasons], supporters, followers or members of Pharmasons’ organization and a newcomer (novice) with strange ideas and habits who is alienated from the others’ (Աղայան 1927, 2: 1602; Հայրապետյան 2011, 615) or ‘religious-political movement of the 18th century, as international mystic and secret organization of moral improvement (from French franc maçon)’ (Ժիրք 1980, 4: 815).

¹⁸⁴ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *osàdca* [osadts^ha].

PM: *farmazon* [farmazon] (misspelled from French *franc-maçon*) has been known in Polish since the second half of the 18th century (Brückner 1927, 1: 118; Gloger 1902, 2: 147) and passed to Russian as *фармазон* [farmazon] (Фасмер 1987, 4: 186). The main meanings are ‘freemason’ (archaic), ‘cheater, quack’ (archaic), ‘something stupid’ (archaic), etc. (Gloger 1902, 2: 147; Doroszewski).

R: is evidently a Polish loanword in Russian (Фасмер 1987, 4: 186) and possibly passed into Armenian from Russian; however, French also can be the possible origin (Ժիրք 1980, 4: 815).

145. **L:** *ֆրանտ* (Հայրապետյան 2011, 634) [frant] (Pol. *frant*, Eng. *dandy*, *macaroni*, *coxcomb*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 206, 223; Ալգերեան 1868, 184).

AT: very rare usage and only with the archaic meaning of ‘a man with exterior shine, a luxurious one’ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 634; Աղայան 1976, 2: 1609; Ժիրք 1980, 4: 826).

PM: according to Linde *frant* [frant] is ‘a quack’ (archaic) and ‘cunning, sly, smart man, elegant, dandy, etc.’ (archaic) (Linde 1807, 1, 1: 659; Sobol 1995, 363; Евгеньева 1984, 4: 583 etc.).

R: the fact that, in Armenian, the meaning of *ֆրանտ* [frant] is similar to that for Russian *франт* ([frant] ‘smartly dressed fashionably man, dandy’ (Евгеньева 1984, 4: 583)) suggests that the word was borrowed from Russian, where it could have entered from Polish (Фасмер 1987, 4: 206; Евгеньева 1984, 4: 583).

Eating, drinking

146. **L:** **բիւէ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 119) [pivɛ] (Pol. *biba*, Eng. *spree*¹⁸⁵).

AT: MAD proposes *հարբեցողություն* ([hɑrbɛtsʰoʊtʃun] ‘drunkenness’), which is the derivative of Armenian *արբ-* (drink (Olsen 1999, 541, 542 etc.)) from Indo-European **srbh-*, **srebh-* or **srobh-* (‘to suck, to swallow’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 86) (cf. Arabian *‘inab* – or *‘anb* / *‘anba* (‘grape’), Assyrian *inbu* (‘fruit’) etc. (Աճառեան 1917, 1: 299)).

PM: *biba* (from Latin *bibo* [‘I drink’] (Brückner 1927, 1: 25)) with the correct meaning of ‘binge, libation’ or ‘drunkard’ (Doroszewski) unfortunately is not in MAD’s definition.

R: it is hard to find the link between the Polish loanword in Armenian *բիւէ* [pivɛ] and Polish *biba* [biba], which is still in use. I think their connection is a very far-reaching presumption or, rather, a mistake. In Armenian, as the illustration of the noun in MAD we have the following fragment from the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocol: “[...] իւր բարի կամաւն գրուեցաւ. զի այլ աւելի ի քօրչման չմտնել ու ոչ մեղրի. եւ ոչ քքի. եւ ոչ **բիւէ** [**pivɛ**] մինչեւ ի գատիկին տօնին:” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (421) 278) (‘[...] he voluntarily wrote that he would not go to the inn again [to drink] mead, vodka and *beer* (*բիւէ* [pivɛ]) ‘until Easter’) where the noun *բիւէ* does not mean ‘sprees’ (at least, the context by no means indicates ‘binge’ or anything close to that) but just ‘beer’. Translating *բիւէ* [pivɛ] as a ‘sprees’, the authors of the dictionary probably suggested the title of the above-mentioned protocol: “[...] ինքը այլեւս չի գրադվելու հարբեցողութեամբ” (‘[...] he won’t be drunk anymore’) (Գրիգորյան 1963, (421) 278). So, the right translation of *բիւէ* seems to be only *գարեջուր* ([garedʒur] ‘beer’).

¹⁸⁵ Both the translation and the dictionary’s explanation are according to Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 119).

This interpretation is confirmed by Bozhko, who translates *pɦuɫ* (the same as *pɦuɫ*) as ‘beer’ (Բոժկո 2010, 112), proposing, however (not necessarily well-founded) Ukrainian (even not Ruthenian (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 631)) *пиво* [pivo] (Мельничук 2003, 4: 366) as the origin of the borrowing. After explaining the above-mentioned confusion, it is worth adding that, in modern Polish, *piwo* ([pivo] beer) comes from Proto-Slavic *pivo* (‘beverage, drink’), which is from Proto-Slavic *piti* (‘to drink’) (Boryś 2008, 438; Derksen 2008, 401). Brewing in Poland improved under German influence from the 13th century (Brückner 2917, 2: 415–416). The Armenian equivalent – *գարեջուր* (Rivola 1633, 69), comes from *գարի* ([gari] ‘barley’ (Olsen 1999, 439)) and *ջուր* ([dʒur] ‘water’ (Olsen 1999, 662, 674, 711 etc.)). *գարի* ([gari] ‘barley’) is likely of Indo-European origin – *gher* (‘to get out, to grow’) (Ջսհնուկյան 2010, 151), and *ջուր* (dʒur] ‘water’) comes also from an Indo-European stem **auer-*, **ur-* (‘water, river, rain’) (Ջսհնուկյան 2010, 654), though Acharyan is sure that it is from Proto-Indo-European *yuro-* (Աճարյան h. 4 1979, 134). In modern Eastern Armenian (rather in Yerevan dialect) *պիվա* [piva] can appear only in colloquial language as Russian loanword *пиво* [pivo].

147. **L:** **բրընձա** (Աճարյան 1953, 189; Hanusz 1886, 385¹⁸⁶) [brəndza] (Pol. *bryndza*, Eng. *bryndza/brinza*).

AT: the modern transliteration of *բրընձա* is *բրինձա* [brindza] or *բրինզա* [brinza] which is still in use in Armenian as the name for ‘sheep cheese’ (Աղայան 1976, 1: 206).

PM: the noun *bryndza* [bryndza] is borrowed in Polish from Wallakhians of Romania (*brînză/brânză*), where it was likely introduced by Albanian shepherds. *Brendz*, as a ‘Wallakhian cheese’, is already mentioned in the Dubrovnik acts in 1370 (Brückner dodatek/1927, 43; Фасмер 1986, 1: 223; Հայրապետյան 2011, 107; Linde 1807, 1: 177).

R: on the one hand, there is no doubt that the word came from Polish to the Polish Armenian dialect (Աճարյան 1953, 189); but on the other hand, Armenian

¹⁸⁶ Hanusz’s transliteration is *brəndzà* [brəndza].

sources believe that the name in Eastern Armenian was borrowed from Russian (Հայրապետյան 2011, 107).

148. **L:** բուլկա¹⁸⁷ (Hanusz 1886, 386) [bulka] (Pol. *bulka*, Eng. *loaf*, (*bread*) *roll* (cf. Magakian 2022, 123–124; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 553, 808; Ալգերեան 1868, 437; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 517)).

AT: բուլկա (also բուլկի [bulki]) is ‘a small loaf of bread made from wheat flour’ (Աղայան 1976, 1: 208). In Eastern Armenian, բուլկի is obviously a Russian loanword from *булка* [bulka] (Հայրապետյան 2011, 109).

PM: the noun comes from Proto-Slavic **bula* (**bul’a*) – ‘enormous, something spherical, round’ and has been in use in Polish since the 15th century (Boryś 2008, 46) with the meaning of ‘round, big bread’ (Linde 1807, 1, 1: 193) (*bulka* with the suffix *-ka* is a reducing or minimizing form).

R: Russian and Ruthenian/Ukrainian *булка* are probably from Polish (from Italian *bullā*, or French *boule*) (cf. Фасмер 1986, 1: 239; Желехівський 1886, 1: 49; Мельничук 1982, 1: 290; Brückner 1927, 1: 48). It is difficult to clearly determine the language of the origin of բուլկա [bulka]. Possible sources seem to be Polish *bulka* [bulka] or Ruthenian *булка* [bulka] which J. Hanusz also emphasizes (Hanusz 1886, 386).

149. **L:** բուխանկա (Հայրապետյան 2011, 109) [buχanka] (Pol. *bochenek*, Eng. *loaf* (cf. Magakian 2022, 124; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 533; Ալգերեան 1868, 437; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 517)).

AT: բուխանկա is interpreted as ‘brick form bread’ in DFW as a Russian loanword of Polish origin. Armenian բոքոն [bok^hon] (Ժիրք 1969, 1: 342) / բոքոն [bok^hom] (Մալխասեանց 1944, 1: 394) as synonyms of բոքեղ [bokeղ] (Աղայան 1976, 1: 199) have the same meaning. The last noun comes from Proto-Indo-European **bhōg-* (Աճառեան 1971, 1: 463; cf. Ջահուկյան 2010, 133).

¹⁸⁷ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *bulka* [bul’ka].

PM: *bochenek* is a ‘baked lump of bread or lump of dough prepared for baking in round or longitudinal shape’ (Skorupka et al. 1969, 51). The noun has been known, according to Boryś, since the 15th century as an Upper-Middle-German borrowing (*vochenze/fochenze* as ‘type of pie, white bread’) (Boryś 2008, 34; Brückner 1927, 1: 33).

R: of course, from the Polish noun (*bochen* [boχen], *bochenek* [boχenek], *bochenec* [boχenets]) it passed to Russian (*буханец* [buχanets], *буханка* [buχanka]) (Фасмер 1986, 1: 254), and Armenian borrowed it from Russian. This is a colloquial noun. Kipchak *boχonek* [boχonek] (Гаркавец 2010, 306) seems to be (at least phonetically) closer to Armenian *բրբնի*.

150. **L:** **ժենտիցա**¹⁸⁸ [zentits^ha] (Hanusz 1886, 477) (Pol. *żętyca*, Eng. *żentyca* – ‘a kind of sheep milk whey’ (cf. Magakian 2022, 124; Kurmann et al. 1992, 322)).

AT: I could not find the Armenian equivalent, but it is possible to propose the explanation – *մի տեսակ ոչխարի կաթնալի շինակ* (‘a kind of sheep’s milk whey’).

PM: this noun most probably passed to Slavic languages from Romanian (*jintiță*) (Sobol 1995, 1184; dexonline.ro). Brückner believes that this dairy product is of Slavic origin (“because it means ‘what was drained through the *zinka* (rag)’” (Brückner 1927, 2: 664)), but it spread through the Wallakhian shepherds (Brückner 1927, 2: 664). Thus, the Wallakhian trail appears (cf. Tamminen 2004, 201–228), which, due to the proximity with the border of Romania at that time, is not entirely unreal, although it is not certain either.

R: here the possibility of a Polish root source is very large, especially when one considers the very close border with Romania at that time: in the Kutu dialect the word perhaps appeared either directly from Romanian or through Polish (*żętyca* [zentyts^ha]), and even, as J. Hanusz presumes (Hanusz 1886, 477), through Ruthenian (*женцица*) [zentyts^hja] (Желехівський т. 1 1886, 220).

¹⁸⁸ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *żentică*, *żętyca* [zentits^ha].

151. **L:** **կապուստա** (Eastern Armenian) / **գաբուստա** (Western Armenian)¹⁸⁹ (Hanusz 1886, 40) [for both: *kapusta*] (Pol. *kapusta*, Eng. *cabbage*). (cf. Magakian 2022, 125; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 130; Ալգերեան 1868, 103; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 115).

AT: the equivalent of *կապուստա/գաբուստա* [kapusta] is *կաթամբ* [kaθamb] – an Iranian loanword (cf. Persian *kalam*, *karamb*) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 376). In Armenian, there are also dialectal and colloquial (Սարգսյան 2002, 2: 197; 2012, 7: 100) forms. First: *քալամ* (Rivola 1633, 383) [kʰalam], which Acharyan defines as a Persian loanword in one of the Turkish dialects (*kelem* [kʰelem] or *kʰalam* [kʰjalam]) (Աճառեան 1973, 2: 493), which in Azerbaijani is currently *kələm*. Second: *լահանա* [lahana], which Nişanyan notes in *Codex Cumanicus* from 1303 as *lahana* (Nişanyan). At the beginning of the 19th century, we could also find *կաթամբ* [kaθamb] next to *լահանա* [lahana] as synonyms (Ciakciak 1829, 108). *կապուստա/գաբուստա* [kapusta] has never been used in Western or Eastern Armenian.

PM: the word *kapusta* [kapusta] (various types of *cabbage* and even *young leaves*) has been used in Polish since at least 1419 (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 239). Slavic languages, including Polish, probably borrowed the word from Latin *caput* (‘head’) and *compos(i)ta* (‘formed’) (Словарь Шанского; Фасмер 1986, 2: 188; Boryś 2008, 222).

R: J. Hanusz has doubts whether the word *գաբուստա* [kapusta] entered into the Kutuy dialect from Polish or Ruthenian (Hanusz 1886, 403). We can extend this eventual catalogue even to Russian. However, from an areal perspective, Polish seems to be a very possible source of borrowing.

152. **L:** **կիշկա**¹⁹⁰ (Hanusz 1886, 428) [ki]ka] (Pol. *kiszka*, Eng. (*a kind of*) *sausage*, *kishka/kishke*; Magakian 2022, 125).

¹⁸⁹ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *gabustà* [kapusta].

¹⁹⁰ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *kishkà* [ki]ka].

AT: *կիճկա* [kiʃka] is a kind of *կրշիկ* ([j]εʃik] ‘sausage’). It is a Turkish dialectal loanword, for example, *erişgi* (Մայիսստեղծ 1944, 1: 602; Անտեսան 1973, 2: 68), *erişgi* from Kayseri¹⁹¹ (Kelimeler.gen.tr), *irīşgin(k?)* from Adana¹⁹² (Ջահուկյան 2010, 228; Անտեսան 1973, 2: 68), etc., including other forms: *irişgin*, *erişgil*, *erişgin*, *erişki*, *erişkin*, etc. (cf. Güner and Tietze 2010, 208). Hr. Palanduzyan also proposes the translation of *կիճկա* (probably from Russian) in Armenian as ‘intestine’ (Փայսնդուկյան), which is almost impossible to find in practical use in Armenian (I could not find it anywhere). The final use is with the figurative meaning of *կիճկա* is ‘a gluttonous soldier’ (ԲԶՏՀԲԲ 2013), maybe under the influence of the Russian proverb *кишки марш играют* (‘guts play march’) – ‘to be extremely hungry’? In Western Armenian additionally we have *խնուր* [χtʃuɾ] (Գայայեան 1938, 121).

PM: *kiszka* [kiʃka], since the 16th century, was known as ‘the part of the digestive tract, intestine with filling, type of sausage or even as lighter gut; long and narrow bag, filled with gunpowder which leads to the dig chamber in excavations for blowing things up’, etc. (Linde 1808, 1, 2: 1001). The noun comes from Proto-Slavic dialectal **kyšʔka* (‘guts or part thereof, intestine’) which was probably the original diminutive with the suffix *-ʔka* from Proto-Slavic *kyša* (‘something sour, acidic, humidified’), which was a derivative (with the suffix **-ja*) from Proto-Slavic **kysèti* (‘to get sour’), **kysnoʔti* (‘start fermenting, to turn sour’) (Borys 2008, 231; Linde 1808, 1, 2: 1001; Derksen 2008, 266–267). The next possible source is Sanskrit *kōṣṭhas* (‘internal organs, intestines’) or *kōṣas* (‘box, cover, lid’). The Greek (κύστις – ‘bladder, balloon’) or even Avestan (*kusra* – ‘full, plenty of’) also cannot be excluded. (Фасмер 1986, 2: 242; cf. Derksen 2008, 266–267). However, the word’s origin seems to have no definite etymology.

R: in Polish Armenian, the noun *կիճկա* [kiʃka] was probably in use only in the dialect of Kutuy. It is an obvious Slavic borrowing either from Ruthenian (*кишка* [kyʃka]) (Hanusz 1886, 428; Желехівський 1886, 1: 344) or from Polish (*kiszka* [kiʃka]) as it was a product known primarily in Poland and widely understood in Ruthenia, but it was foreign, for example, to the Czechs, the Balkans, etc. (Brückner 1927, 1: 231).

¹⁹¹ A city in Central Anatolia, Turkey.

¹⁹² A major city in southern Turkey.

153. **L:** կռուլա¹⁹³ (Hanusz 1886, 430) [krupa] (Pol. *krupa*, Eng. *groat, barley*). (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 78, 413; Ալգերեան 1868, 63, 343; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 69, 402).

AT: one of the possible (and probably the most appropriate) translations is *ձավար* ([dzavar] ‘boiled and large minced wheat, beech, or barley’) (Աճառեան 1977, 3: 147), probably from Proto-Indo-European **iuo-*, from the stem **ieuo* (‘grain, cereal’), but this is not certain (Ջահուկյան 2010, 474; Աճառեան 1977, 3: 148).

PM: *krupa* [krupa] – according to Boryś, it is ‘cleaned and peeled, finely crushed raw cereal or groats’ and even ‘atmospheric precipitation in the form of ice or snow clumps’ (Boryś 2008, 264). In Old-Polish *krupa* [krupa] also meant ‘peeled seed, groats’, etc., which is from Proto-Slavic **krupa/*krŭpà* (‘peeled, peeled grain, grainy substance, groats, hail’) from Proto-Indo-European **krou-p-* or **kru-p-*, which came from the Proto-Indo-European stem **krou-* or **kru-* (‘hit, smash, break’) (Boryś 2008, 264; Derksen 2008, 252).

R: the Polish origin of *կռուլա* [krupa] – the hulled kernels of various cereal grains (oat, wheat, rye and barley) – for Armenian seems to be obvious, although Hanusz does not reject the possibility of Ruthenian *крупна* [krupa] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 384; cf. Мельничук 1989, 5: 109–110).

154. **L:** հարբուզ¹⁹⁴ (Hanusz 1886, 412) [harbuz] (Pol. *arbuz*, Eng. *watermelon*). (cf. Magakian 2022, 125–126; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 1078; Ալգերեան 1868, 792; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 954)).

AT: the noun *խարպիզակ* [χarpizak] / *խարբզակ* [χarbzak] (Rivola 1633, 168) – also mentioned by Hanusz (1886, 412) occurs in Armenian (now archaic); however, in the same dictionary of Rivola, its modern equivalent is already *ձևերուկ*

¹⁹³ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *krupa* [krupa].

¹⁹⁴ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *harbiuz* [harbuz].

[dzmeruk], which in Latin is interpreted as *cucumis aquaticus* (‘water cucumber’) (Rivola 1633, 231). Acharyan derives this noun from Middle Persian, in which *χarbūzak* consists of *χar* (‘donkey’) and *būzak* (‘cucumber’), ‘donkey cucumber’, which in the later Persian changed into *χarbūza* or *χarbuza* (arbuz) (Աճառեան 1973, 2: 34; Ջահրեան 2010, 323).

PM: the word *հարբուզ* ([harbuz] ‘watermelon’) used in the Kutuy dialect, was once also *harbuz* [harbuz] in Polish (Doroszewski; Sobol 1995, 416). In contemporary Polish there are two different words: *dynia* ([dynia] ‘pumpkin’) and *arbuz* ([arbuz] ‘watermelon’) (SJP; Sobol 1995, 70, 416). Linde writes that there were many watermelons (also *harbuz*, *kakbuz* [kakbuz], *garbuz* [garbuz]) in Polish Podolia and Ukraine (Linde 1807, 1, 1: 24), that is, areas very close to Kutuy (where Hanusz noted the word). This fact is also emphasized by Gloger. He specifies a Turkish origin of *harpuz* [harpuz] (from Persian *kherbuze* [χerbuze], similar to Acharyan’s example of *χarbūzak*), and indicates that Krzysztof Kluk, a Polish botanist of the 18th century (Kluk 1777, 236) also writes that they are abundant in Podolia and Ukraine (Gloger 1900, 1: 60). Gloger, however, focuses on another phenomenon related to watermelon: “When a suitor, who was trying to get the hand of his bride, was to be rejected (and courtship usually took place in autumn), he was given and treated to watermelon” (Gloger 1900, 1: 60; Желехівський 1886, 1: 137). Brückner, next to the Turkish origin of *harbuz* (in Turkish *karpuz*), emphasizes its importance primarily as *dynia* ([dynia] ‘pumpkin’), but also notes that the word has passed into Polish from Ruthenian *harbuz* (Brückner 1927, 1: 168) (*зарбуз* [harbuz] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 137)). Nişanyan writes that the word first appeared in Turkish in *Codex Cumanicus* (the beginning of the 14th century) and also emphasizes its Persian roots – *χarbūz/χarbūza* (Nişanyan), which Vasmer also accepts (Фасмер 1986, 1: 83–84). In Kipchak we find just *χarbuza* (*χärboz*, *χärbozä*) – ‘pumpkin’ or ‘watermelon’ (Гаркавец 2010, 811).

R: it is difficult to clearly indicate which language the word was borrowed from. However, the most realistic seems to be the conclusions of Hanusz – Polish or Ruthenian – because it is unlikely that this noun in the version *հարբուզ* [harbuz] stayed in the dialect of Kutuy from basic Armenian vocabulary.

155. **L:** շինկա¹⁹⁵ (Hanusz 1886, 464) [ʃinka] (Pol. *szynka*, Eng. *ham*) (cf. Magakian 2022, 12; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 424; Ալգերեան 1868, 349; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 409).

AT: there are two apt translations. First: *սւյնիս* [apuxt] (from Middle Persian **apuxt* (‘raw’) (Մալխասեանց 1944, 1: 209; Ջահուկյան 2010, 70), ‘a specially prepared and dried meat (beef, lamb etc.)’ (*basturma* (Bezjian 2009)) Մալխասեանց 1944, 1: 209). Second: *խոզսւյնիս* [χozapuxt] (Azarian 1848, 669, 741), with the same meaning but made from pork. The origin of *խոզ* [χoz] is uncertain (Աճառեան 1973, 2: 382–383). It is surprising that, although the Armenians borrowed *szynka* [ʃinka] from Polish, they also gave Polish the Armenian word *սւյնիս* [apuxt] for ‘headcheese (brawn) or mortadella’ (Linde 1807, 1, 1: 5; cf. Zdanowicz 1861, 1, 1: 5), which was defined by Brückner as ‘smoked meat’ from the Armenian *apucht* [apuxt] (since the 17th century) (Brückner 1927, 1: 2). Pisowicz points out that Polish Armenians till now pronounce the word as *abuxt* and write it in Polish *abucht*.

PM: *szynka* [ʃynka] in other Slavic languages, commonly pronounced *szunka* [ʃunka], comes from German *Schinken* (Brückner 1927, 2: 561), and since the 18th century was used for naming the ‘rear part of a pork half-carcase and the sausage (ham) made of this meat’ (Boryś 2008, 611).

R: it is not surprising that the Armenians accepted the name *szynka* [ʃinka]. In total, this dish is not an Armenian product (cf. Zeuthen 2007, 4), although it has its Armenian equivalent (*խոզսւյնիս* [(χoz)apuxt] (Ciakciak 1837, 181). Even from the perspective of the Kutuy dialect, it seems clear that the noun *szynka* [ʃinka] was borrowed from the language in their surroundings with which the local Armenians interacted. Although we have Belarusian *шынка* [ʃynka] (Мельничук 2006, 6: 416) and Ruthenian/Ukrainian *шинка* [ʃynka] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 1089), Polish *szynka* [ʃynka] (Linde 1812, 3: 586) remains the most likely source for the Armenian borrowing (Hanusz 1886, 464).

¹⁹⁵ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *synkà* [ʃinka].

156. **L:** **սոնչիկ** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 445) [pontʃʰik] (Pol. *paczek*,¹⁹⁶ Eng. *donut*; cf: Magakian 2022, 126–127).

AT: in Armenian, *սոնչիկ* [pontʃʰik] has the same direct meaning as *փքաբլիթ* [pʰkʰablitʰ] (Ժիրք 1980, 4: 692; Հայրապետյան 2011, 445; Աղայան 1976, 2: 1544) and, figuratively, *սոնչիկ* [pontʃʰik] as ‘plump and fat (very affectionately about children and women)’. *փքաբլիթ* is from *փուք* [pʰukʰ] (rather from Proto-Indo-European *phu-* ‘to blow’ (Անանեան 1979, 4: 529)) and *բլիթ* [blitʰ] (probably from Proto-Indo-European **bhli-t-* or **bhlē-* – ‘blow, swell’ etc. (Ջահուկյան 2010, 130)), which Olsen qualifies as a word of possibly unknown source (Olsen 1999, 949).

PM: *paczek* [pontʃʰek] was already noted and described by Linde at the beginning of the 19th century (Linde 1811, 2, 2: 606–607), but it has a much earlier origin. At least since the 15th or 16th centuries, the word has been known in Polish (as the diminutive form from *բեկ* [penk] – ‘resulting, bursting plant shoots’) as ‘type of fried dough, fried pie’ (Urbańczyk 1970–1973, 6: 60; cf. Brückner 1927, 2: 421).

R: it is obviously a Polish loanword in Russian (Фасмер 1987, 3: 326; Логинов 2007), but it should be *paczek* [pontʃʰek] and not *paczek* [patʃʰek], as is in DFW. In Armenian, without a doubt, it is a Russian loanword from *пончик* [pontʃʰik]. In modern Armenian, there is also a common (informal) form *սոնչիկ(ս)նց* ([pontʃʰik(a)notsʰ] place of *սոնչիկ* [pontʃʰik] – ‘café, cafeteria’) as a derivative from *սոնչիկ* [pontʃʰik] with the suffix *-ng* (the meaning of place) (Ջահուկյան 1995, 140). This noun is still in use as the name of a well-known café in Yerevan.

157. **L:** **սովիդո** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 445) [povidlo] (Pol. *powidla/powidło*, Eng. *jam, marmalade, plum jam, fruit paste*) (cf. Magakian 2022, 127; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 507, 575; Ալգերեան 1868, 413, 451; Ալգերեան and Պրեխտեան 1821, 1: 487).

¹⁹⁶ Spelling according to Հայրապետյան (2011, 445).

AT: *սովիդլո* [povidlo] in Armenian means ‘sweet thick food cooked from mashed fruits’ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 445; Աղայան 1976, 2: 1226), and there is no correct equivalent in the language (cf. Աղայան et al. 1957, 3: 200; Ղարիբյան 1977, 785; Hy.glosbe.com etc.). It is in daily use, but it could be replaced by *ջեմ* [dzem], which is probably entered Armenian from English *jam* (through the Russian *джем* [dzem], where it is a 20th century borrowing (cf. Свиридова 2014, 82), is more likely).

PM: this noun was known in Poland from at least the mid-15th century as ‘a fried fruit processing, mainly plum’ (Urbańczyk 1970–1973, 6: 515). At the beginning of the 19th century, Linde accurately describes the various types of *powidl* (*powidelko*) – ‘from plums, pears, apples,’ etc. (Linde 1811, 2, 2: 987), and Brückner gives the origin: “*powidl* (as plum jam), from the Czech which originally was about ‘frying’ (fruit) in general” (Brückner 1927, 2: 433).

R: *повидло* [povidlo] (seldom *повидла* [povidla]) is a Polish loanword in Russian (Фасмер 1987, 3: 294) and *սովիդլո* [povidlo] was probably not borrowed into Armenian language directly from Polish but rather through Russian.

158. **L:** **ռակ**¹⁹⁷ (Hanusz 1886, 457) [rak] (Pol. *rak*, Eng. *crayfish*, *crawfish*) (cf. Magakian 2022, 127; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 208; Ալգերեան 1868, 186; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 211).

AT: *խեցգետնի* ([χets^hgeti(n)] ‘crayfish’) is the derivative of *խեց* ([χets^h] ‘crayfish covering, clay pot’ etc.) from Proto-Indo-European **khed-sk-* of the stem *(s)*k(h)ed-* (‘to slit, break, stove’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 328).

PM: the noun *rak* [rak] has been known in Polish since at least the beginning of the 15th century (Urbańczyk 1973–1977, 7: 431) and has an uncertain etymology.

¹⁹⁷ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *rak* [rak].

R: as the source of borrowing in the Kutuy Armenian dialect, Hanusz proposes Ruthenian *րակ* [rak] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 795) or Polish *rak* (Hanusz 1886, 457). The noun *նուլ* [rak] is known in modern Armenian only as a Russian loanword from *րակ* [rak] (Հայրապետյան 2011, 470).

159. **L:** **սկվարկա**¹⁹⁸ (Hanusz 1886, 459) [skvarka] (Pol. *skwarka*, Eng. *pork rind, crackling(s)*) (cf. Magakian 2022, 127; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 207).

AT: Armenian equivalents *խարչի* [χարչi], *խորչոզի* [χորչozi], *խարչիզա* [χարչiza], etc. are derivatives of *խարչիծ* ([χարչits] ‘small, cuttings’), which is probably Proto-Indo-European compound of *խիծ* [χits] from **khid-io-* (‘to cut’) coming from the stem **(s)k(h)eid-* (‘to cut’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 310).

PM: *skwarka* [skvarka] comes from *skwarzyc* [skvaʒytʃ^h] (since the 15th century), the source of which is Proto-Slavic **skvariti* (‘cause melting, heat up, toasting’ etc.) (Boryś 2008, 556; cf. Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 267; Urbańczyk 1973–1977, 7: 356; Urbańczyk 1995–2002, 11: 320). Still, the general meaning is ‘deep fried piece of fat or a greasy piece of skin’ (Linde 1812, 3: 277) or ‘fried piece of bacon, lard, meat’ (SJP PWN).

R: there is no doubt that in Armenian (precisely in the Kutuy dialect), as Hanusz mentions, that noun is a Polish loanword (Hanusz 1886, 459).

160. **L:** **սմալեց** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 502) [smalets^h] (Pol. *smalec*, Eng. *lard, pork fat*) (cf. Magakian 2022, 127–128; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 531; Ալգերեան 1868, 424; Ալգերեան and Պրինտեան 1821, 1: 501).

¹⁹⁸ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *skvarkà* [skvarka].

AT: the Russian loanword *смалец* [smalets^h] is of Polish origin (Фасмер 1987, 3: 683) – *smalec* [smalets^h], and is explained in Armenian as ‘melted pork fat, pork fat’ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 502) as a culinary term.

PM: in Old Polish, where it is a Middle-Upper-German loanword (*smalz*) known since the 15th century, it was *szmalec* [ʃmalets^h] – ‘melted fat, lard, fat, butter’ (Boryś 2008, 561). The noun is still used with the old meaning of ‘fat obtained mostly from melted suet or pork fat’ (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 319).

R: there is no evidence that Polish *smalec* [smalets^h] passed directly into Armenian. Obviously the Russian *смалец* [smalets^h] is the origin of the Armenian *սմալեց* [smalets^h].

161. **L:** **սսրուցլիկ**¹⁹⁹ (Hanusz 1886, 460) [struts^hlik] (Pol. *strucel*, Eng. *poppy seed roll*; cf. Magakian 2022, 128).

AT: there is no equivalent in Armenian.

PM: Brückner points out that *strucel* [struts^hel] (*kolacz* [kolat^h], *strucla* [struts^hla]) has been present in Polish since 1472 and comes from German *Stritzel*, *Strutzel* (Brückner 1927, 2: 520; Gloger 1903, 4: 286).

R: the most likely source of borrowing for *սսրուցլիկ* [struclik] (*strucel/strucla* (Linde 1812, 3: 441)) in the Kutuy dialect is obviously Polish. However, Hanusz also suggests the possibility of borrowing (at least in the Kutuy dialect) from Ruthenian (Hanusz 1886, 460). I thought also for a long time about the spelling of Hanusz (*Strùclik*). It is unclear why he wrote with a capital letter. It could have been coincidence or an attempt to emphasize that the noun is in German.

¹⁹⁹ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *strùclik* [struts^hlik].

162. **L:** **վիշնա**²⁰⁰ (Hanusz 1886, 473) [viʃna] (Pol. *wisnia*, Eng. *cherry*) (cf. Magakian 2022, 128; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 151; Ալգերեան 1868, 125; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 140).

AT: *բալ* [bal] (the synonym of *կեռաս* [keras] (Rivola 1633, 197), Greek κέρασος [kerasos] (Ջահուկյան 2010, 400)) is Persian *bālu* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 112; Olsen 1999, 1066; Աճառեան 1971, 1: 383).

PM: *wisnia* or *wisznia* [viʃnia] has been known in Polish since the 15th century, coming from *višbna* (*wisnia*), which is related to Old-German *wihсила*, Middle-Upper-German *wihsel*, possibly with Latin *viscum* ('mistletoe'), etc. (Boryś 2008, 703; Urbańczyk 1988–1993, 10: 239).

R: could be a Romanian (Hanusz 1886, 473) or Polish loanword. As a borrowing from Russian *вишня* [viʃnia], it still appears in modern Armenian colloquial language.²⁰¹ Polish Armenians could also be the source of Kipchak *višnâ* (Гаркавец 2010, 1601–1602).

163. **L:** **փիվա**²⁰² (Hanusz 1886, 456) [p^hiva] (Pol. *piwo*, Eng. *beer*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 86; Ալգերեան 1868, 70; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան h. 1 1821, 77).

AT: *գարեշուր* [garedʒur] as in the case of **բիւէ** [pivɛ] – entry no. 146.

PM: *piwo* [pivo] as in the case of **բիւէ** [pivɛ] and **բիվնիցա** [pivnits^ha] – entry no. 104.

²⁰⁰ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *višnâ* [viʃna].

²⁰¹ For example, in: *Խոհեղ լուսանկարի մասին* (Thoughts on the photo). 2012, http://edgar.marukyan.com/2012/06/blog-post_15.html; *Բարով անհավանական համեղ պիրոգ...* (Incredibly tasty pie with cherries...). 2020, <https://entertrain.lin.am/am/entarm/177027> etc.

²⁰² The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *phivâ* [p^hiva].

R: for *ϕηϕω* [phiva] as a version of *ϕηϑ* [pive], I presented detailed explanations in the entries for *ϕηϑ* [pive] and *ϕηϑϋηγω* [pivnits^{ba}]. For *ϕηϕω* [phiva], Hanusz allows the possibility of *γαρηζυρη* [garedzur] with the transliteration *kari čur* [gari dzur] and proposes the source of borrowing Ruthenian *нуво* [pyvo] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 631) or Polish *piwo* (Hanusz 1886, 456).

Animal world, nature

164. **L:** կռուկ²⁰³ (Hanusz 1886, 430) [kruk] (Pol. *kruk*, Eng. *raven*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 763; Ալգերեան 1868, 586; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 701).

AT: ագրավ [agrav] (or արջնագրավ [ardznagrav]) – a noun with an unclear etymology. Usually is treated as an onomatopoeia, with similar formations in Indo-European and non-Indo-European languages (e.g. Sanskrit *kārava*, Latin *corvus*, Turkish *karga* (*qarya*), Arabic *yurāb* etc.). In Proto-Indo-European there was the onomatopoeic stem *kor* (or *qor*) with the meaning of *cawing*, which constituted the above-mentioned forms (Ջահուկյան 2010, 21; Աճառեան 1971, 1: 79).

PM: *kruk* [kruk] (also *krak* [krak] etc.), known in Polish since the 15th century, is an onomatopoeic verb from Proto-Slavic **krukъ* (raven) – a noun from the Proto-Slavic verb **krukati* (‘make a hoarse sound, croak’) (Boryś 2008, 264; Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 375; Linde 1808, 1, 2: 1145; cf. Derksen 2008, 252).

R: according to Hanusz կրուկ [kruk] could be from Polish (*kruk*) or Ruthenian (крык [kruk]) (Желехівський 1886, 1: 384). Both eventualities are possible.

165. **L:** կրոլիկ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 315) [krolik] (Pol. *królik*, Eng. *rabbit*, *bunny*). (cf. Magakian 2022, 125; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 755; Ալգերեան 1868, 582; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 696).

AT: according to DFW, it is a Russian loanword which came from Polish *krolik* [krolik] (cf. Фасмер 1986, 2: 380; Brückner 1927, 1: 269) with the literal meaning of ‘small king’ from Latin *cuniculus*. The noun appears as an archaic form

²⁰³ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *kruk* [kruk].

instead of Armenian *նագար* ([tʃagar] ‘rabbit, cony’), *նագարենի* ([tʃagareni] ‘rabbit meat’), *նագարի մորթի* ([tʃagari mortʰi] ‘rabbit fur’) and just *կրոկիկ* ([krolik] ‘hare or bunny’), etc. (Հայրապետյան 2011, 315) *նագար* could be an Iranian loanword, but the etymology is uncertain (Olsen 1999, 939; Ջահուկյան 2010, 485).

PM: for *krolik* [krolik] or *królik* [krulik] in Polish there are several meanings: ‘royal governor managing a certain territory, king of a small country, prince, magnate, royal official’ or ‘(zoological) a rabbit’ etc. (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 402; Linde 1808, 1, 2: 1137; SPXVI).

R: Harkavets notes that Polish *królik* [krulik], which is literally interpreted as ‘king, little king’, is considered to be a calque from German *Künigl, Königshasse* (Гаркавец 2010, 758–759; Фасмер 1986, 2: 380). Some sources explain that the noun has been in Polish since the 15th century with the meaning of ‘rodent’, especially in dialects, but *król* (as a calque from Middle-Upper German *küniklīn*, Old German *küniglin* – so *królik* from Latin *cunīculus*) was mistakenly associated with Middle-Upper-German *künik* which now means *König* (king) and is interpreted by folk etymology as ‘little king’ (Boryś 2008, 262–263; Мельничук 1989, 3: 97; Brückner 1927, 1: 269).

166. **L:** **նոսաղըլ, նոսաղէլ** (Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան 2015, 30) [nosatəj], [nosatɛj] (Pol. *narowy*, Eng. *balkiness, vice*).²⁰⁴

AT: with the meaning of a ‘balkiness’ or ‘vice’ this noun does not appear in the Armenian language.

PM: with the meaning of a ‘balkiness’ or ‘vice’ this noun does not appear in the Polish language.

R: this adjective appears in the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court Protocol: “[...] խոստացել էր. Չի **նոսաղըլ [nosatəj]** ջիհնէր եւ **նոսաղէլ [nosatɛj]** էլաւ” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (458) 292) (‘assured that the horse has not **նոսաղըլ**

²⁰⁴ Translations according to Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան (2015, 30).

([nosatəj] glanders²⁰⁵), but it has նոսաղէյ ([nosatej] glanders). The adjective undoubtedly meant ‘glanders’ (Гаркавец 2010, 1025), so it was about Polish *nosacizna* ([nosatʰizna] ‘glanders’). Harkavets is quoting the very passage of the court protocol that is also mentioned by Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան (2015, 30). The author provides the source of the borrowing in Ukrainian – *носатий* [nosatyj], bypassing, however, the Ruthenian *носатий* [nosatyj] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 533) with the same meaning of ‘glanders’. A possible source of borrowing could indeed have been Ruthenian/Ukrainian. The Armenian equivalent is *իլախիւն* [χlaxt].

167. **L:** նորա²⁰⁶ (Hanusz 1886, 445) [nora] (Pol. *źródło*, Eng. *source, wellspring*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 901, 1084; Ալկերեան 1868, 668, 795; Ալկերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 803, 959).

AT: the best translation is *աղբյուր* ([aɸbjur] ‘water source, wellspring’) which comes from Proto-Indo-European **br̥eur-* from the stem **bhreu-* (‘move vigorously, boil’) (Չահուկյան 2010, 36; Աճառեան 1971, 1: 125). Accidental coincidence with *նորա* [nora], which is the genitive singular of *նա* ([na] ‘he, she, it’), e.g.: *տուն նորա* ([tun nora] ‘his, her or its house’). For precision, I must also give *սկունք* ([akunk^h] – ‘fountain, the place where water’s source originates’), which is a derivative from *սկն* ([akn] ‘eye’). The noun probably comes from Proto-Indo-European **oku-n-*, **oku-ī-* (‘double form, grammatical dual’ = *two eyes*). (Չահուկյան 2010, 30) or is composed from Proto-Armenian **akh-* with *-kon* (**akhkon* > **ak(k)n* > *akn*) (Martirosyan, 2010, 23). However, besides J. Hanusz’s proposal, the word could also be translated into Armenian as *որջ* ([vordʒ] ‘beast den/nest’) with an unknown etymology.

PM: according to Boryś *nora* [nora] / *nura* [nura] has been known in Polish since the 16th century as ‘a pit, den, lair’, or ‘cavity in the ground serving as a hideout for an animal’ or, figuratively (Boryś 2008, 367; Linde 1809, 2, 1: 340), ‘a miserable apartment’. In the 16th–17th centuries, the plural meant ‘streams, currents,

²⁰⁵ “Glanders is a contagious zoonotic infectious disease that occurs primarily in horses, mules, and donkeys” (CDC).

²⁰⁶ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *nora* [nora].

depths’ (Borys 2008, 367; Linde 1809, 2, 1: 340–341). The word comes from Proto-Slavic **nora* as ‘cavity, hole (in the ground), depression’ and is the verbal noun from Proto-Slavic **nerti*, **nbro* (‘immerse yourself, plunge into’) with the change from **e* into **o*, typical for such words (Borys 2008, 367; cf. Derksen 2008, 349, 355–356; Brückner 1927, 1: 365–366).

R: Hanusz proposes as the origin of the Armenian borrowing of *նորա* [nora] the Polish *nora* or Ruthenian *нора* [nora] with the meaning of ‘water source’ (at least for the Kutuy dialect) (Желехівський 1886, 1: 352). It seems that the Polish meaning of *nora* as ‘source’ is not entirely certain and clear, but it is possible, although in Ruthenian, besides the meaning of the ‘underground cave or hole in the ground’, it is obviously ‘a water source’ (Желехівський 1886, 1: 352).

168. **L:** **սլավա**²⁰⁷ (Hanusz 1886, 452) [pluta] (Pol. *pluta* as Eng. *rain, rainy weather* or Pol. *splaw* as Eng. *rafting*).

AT: in the case of *pluta* [pluta], there is no one word that fits in Armenian. At most, we can have an explanation, for example, *վատ եղանակ* ([vat (j)εkanak] ‘bad weather’). According to the interpretation of Hanusz, the apt translation of *սլավա* [pluta] in Armenian could be *լսւն(ստարնալ)* ([last(arak^hum)] ‘rafting’), which consists of *լսւն* ([last] ‘raft’) (Մեղրեցի 1698, 131) – probably a Proto-Indo-European loanword **lǝg^hda-* from the stem *lǝg^h(h)-/*lǝg^h(h)-* (‘branch, oak bush’) (Չսհնկյան 2010, 292), with the conjunction *ս* [a] and relatively modern *ստարնալ* [arak^hum], which is a derivative from *սք* ([ak^h] ‘foot’) and is probably a North-Caucasian loanword (Չսհնկյան 2010, 106; Անստան 1971, 1: 36)

PM: we have two possibilities. The first, *pluta* ([pluta] ‘rain, rainy weather’), has been known since at least 1466 (Urbańczyk 1970–1973, 6: 154) and likely comes from Proto-Slavic *plūtò* (‘flotsam’) (Derksen 2008, 406). The second, *splaw* ([splav] ‘rafting’) (Hanusz 1886, 452) as ‘transporting, transporting something with the flow of water, release’, has been known since 1488 (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 350) and comes somewhat from Proto-Slavic *pluti* (‘swim, sail’) (Derksen 2008, 406).

²⁰⁷ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *plutà* [pluta].

R: in this case Hanusz's interpretation concerns *splaw*. His conviction that the noun is a Romanian (where it could have entered from Bulgarian) loanword seems justified *-plută* ([pluta] 'raft, float') (Oczko 2010, 210). However, Hanusz also suggests that the word could have been borrowed from Polish *pluta* (Hanusz 1886, 452), which in my opinion is confirmed by the fact that in the dialect of Polish highlanders in Bukowina, not far from Kutu, apart from the significance of 'rainy, rainy weather', the noun *pluta* is also 'something made of boards for sailing to the other coast' (Greń and Krasowska 2008, 167).

169. **L:** պուհաչ²⁰⁸ (Hanusz 1886, 454) [puhatʰ] (Pol. *puchacz*, Eng. *eagle-owl*, *madge-owlet*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 293; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 610; calfa.fr).

AT: *բվե՛ն* [bvətʃ] / *բու՛ն* [bvətʃ] (cf. Մալխասեանց 1944, 1: 389) is an onomatopoeia from Indo-European times (cf. Greek βύας, βύζα, Latin *bubo*) and also exists in non-Indo-European languages (Ջահուկյան 2010, 137), cf. Arabic بومة [būma]. The synonym is հավապատիր [havapatir] (Աղայան 1976, 1: 832; Гаркавец 2010, 1183; calfa.fr).

PM: *puchacz* [puχatʰ], (archaic form: *puhacz* [puh/χatʰ]) as a 'big owl or eagle-owl / madge-owlet' (Urbańczyk 1973–1977, 7: 395–396; Linde 1811, 2, 2: 1271) has been known in Polish since the 15th century and is also an onomatopoeia from 'utter a hoot' (Brückner 1927, 2: 447; Boryś 2008, 502; Hanusz 1886, 454).

R: I do not exclude the possibility that Ruthenian *пуґач* [puhatʰ] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 787) may also be the source of the loanword in Polish Armenian, but geographically and historically, Polish seems to be a more reliable source. I also do not exclude the possibility that Kipchak *puhač*, *пуґаč* (Гаркавец 2010, 1183) could have come from Armenian.

²⁰⁸ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *puhàč* [puhatʰ].

170. **L:** ջոբոկ (ջոբուկ?)²⁰⁹ (Hanusz 1886, 397) [dʒobok (dʒobuk?)] (Pol. *dziób*,²¹⁰ Eng. *bea(c)k*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 83; Ալգերեան 1868, 66).

AT: Hanusz only selects *dziób* (in Armenian *լոնուկ* [ktutʰ]), which means that he did not note other meanings of the word in the Kutý dialect. M. Arct also mentions, among others, ‘the elongated end of a jug or other container, an end-tube for coming out the gas, the end of a revolver cock which hit the cartridge’, etc. (Arc 1916, 1: 258). *լոնուկ* [ktutʰ] probably consists of Proto-Indo-European protoform **gu-d-* (from the stem **geu-* (‘bend, make an arch’)) with the suffix *-ուկ* [utʰ] (Ջահուկյան 2010, 434).

PM: *dziób* [dʒiub], *dziub* [dʒiub], *dzióbek* [dʒiubek] (‘beak, the nose of a bird’) comes from Proto-Slavic **zobъ* (‘beak, crop’). In Polish, *dź-* is constituted under the impact of *dziobać* ([dʒiobatʰ] / *dziubać* ([dʒiubatʰ] (‘prick with a beak, hit with something pointed, prick, chop’) (Boryś 2008, 145; Brückner 1927, 1: 11; Linde 1807, 1, 1: 604; SPXVI).

R: it can be assumed that the word came from Ruthenian *дзюбок* [dʒjubok], but the Polish *dzióbek* [dʒiubek] seems likely as well as Lemki dialect *дзюбок* [dʒjubok] (СНЭА) (including the specificity of phonetics). In Armenian, the Polish middle *ó* [u] could have easily be transformed into *o* [o].

171. **L:** սղրուս (Պողոսյան 2014, 180) [strus] (Pol. *strús*, Eng. *ostrich*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 650; Ալգերեան 1868, 505).

AT: the Armenian equivalent is *ջալլամ* [dʒajlam], which is possibly a Semitic word (cf. Arabic *zalīm*, Old German *zilmān*) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 650).

PM: *strús* [struʃ] is probably from German *Strauss* (Latin *struthio*) (Brückner 1927, 2: 521).

²⁰⁹ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *dʒobòk* [dʒobok].

²¹⁰ According to Hanusz (1886, 397).

R: the case of Kipchak is interesting: the equivalents of the *սիրու* in that dialect comes from *strus* or could have been borrowed from Armenian *ճայլամ* (ջայլամ [dʒɑjʲɑjlam]) (Գարկաբեւ 2010, 374, 1324) or (as Acharyan and Harkavets emphasize), *համբար* [hambar] (Գարկաբեւ 2010, 1324, Անստեան 1977, 3: 23; cf. Մեղրեցի 1698, 174). The illustration in the NWEA comes from the *Միմեռն դարի Լեհացոյ Ուղեգրութիւն, Տարեգրութիւն եւ յիշատակարանք* (Travel memoirs of the dpir Simon Lehacy), who was aware that *սիրու* [strus] is understandable only to Polish Armenians, while *ջայլամ* [dʒɑjlam] is a word known to all Armenians; therefore, in his book, he mentioned both (Ալիմեան 1936, 229). It does not follow from the context that he meant different birds.

172. **L:** **սքալա** (Պողոսյան 2014, 188) [skʰala] (Pol. *skala*, Eng. *rock, stone*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 807, 828, 933; Ալգերեան 1868, 615, 628, 686; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 736, 752, 825).

AT: *ժայռ* [zɑjɾ] or *քարաժայռ* [kʰɑɾɑzɑjɾ]. Acharyan does not exclude that Arabic *‘ajar* and Persian *χāra* with Middle Persian *‘jerera* may be in the stems of these nouns (Անստեան 1973, 2: 225). Harkavets also suggests identical and several similar translations from Kipchak *skala* (‘as rock’) to Armenian (Գարկաբեւ 2010, 1281); however, it is very likely that this noun passed to Kipchak through Armenian (and not the other way around).

PM: *skala* probably comes from Proto-Slavic **skala* (‘a rock lump, originally something split’, etc.), a noun formed from the verb **skoliti* (‘to split’), and from the stem of Indo-European (*s*)*kel-* (‘to cut’) (Boryś 2008, 550). In Polish, it has been in use since at least the 16th century (Brückner 1927, 2: 493), mainly with meanings similar to the noun *rock* – ‘stone block, large boulder, stone, rocky part of the mountain or crevice, crack in the ground or rock’ (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 214).

R: NWEA suggests that the sources of loanword could also be Russian *скала* [skala] (Պողոսյան 2014, 188; cf. Фасмер 1987, 3: 630–631), which does not seem to be (entirely) justified. Except for the most obvious source of the borrowing, Polish (*skala*), due to linguistic and geographical proximity Ukrainian

скала [skala] could be an option (Мельничук 2006, 5: 262) (or rather the Ruthenian *скала* [skala] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 870)). In Russian *скала* [skala], with the meaning of the ‘bowls of the scales’, has been in use since the 13th century (Фасмер 1987, 3: 631), but in Polish Armenian sources there is no use of *սրսլա* [sk^hala] with that meaning.

173. **L:** **սոսնա**²¹¹ (Hanusz 1886, 460) [sosna] (Pol. *sosna*, Eng. *pine*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 698; Ալգերեան 1868, 537; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 641).

AT: *սոսնա* [soʃi] is a noun with an unknown etymology.

PM: *sosna* [sosna] as a tree is the same for all Slavs (Brückner 1927, 2: 507–508; Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 336). The etymology of the noun is not entirely certain. Boryś dates its origin in Polish to the 13th century from Proto-Slavic **sosna*, probably the noun form of the feminine of the Proto-Indo-European adjective **kasno-* (‘grey’) (Boryś 2008, 567). Vasmer questions the origin of *sosna* in **kasno(s)* and proposes **sop-sna*/**sop-snъ* from Slavic **sopěti* (‘sniffle, blow’) (Фасмер 1987, 3: 726–727) etc.

R: both languages (Polish *sosna* and Ruthenian *сосна* [sosna] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 897)) could be the source of (Kuty) Armenian’s *սոսնա*’s borrowing (Hanusz 1886, 460).

²¹¹ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *sosnà* [sosna].

Traditions, religion

174. **L:** բրովոտէն/բրովոտա (Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան 2015, 30) [provoden]/ [provoda] (Pol. *przywódca*, Eng. *leader*).²¹²

AT: there is no equivalent/translation in the Armenian language.

PM: there is no equivalent/translation in the Polish language.

R: this noun appears in a number of protocols of the Armenian Court in Kamianets-Podilskyi and everywhere in the same sentence: բրովոտէն յետև առաջին չորեքշաբթի (Գրիգորյան 1963, (82) 134–135, (93) 140, (303) 234, (523) 318, (535) 324) (‘on the first Wednesday after բրովոտա’ [brovot(a)]). The interpretation of բրովոտա [provoda] as *leader* is a misunderstanding. Bozhko and Harkavets propose a Ruthenian/Ukrainian origin of the noun – *Проводи* [provody] (Гаркавец 2010, 1183; Божко 1993, 85; Բոճկո 2010, 112). *Проводи* [provody] in Ruthenian (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 768) or in Ukrainian (Гаркавец 2010, 1183; Божко 1993, 85; Բոճկո 2010, 112) is explained in Orthodoxy as the commemoration of the dead on the graves after Easter week (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 768; Гаркавец 2010, 1183). In addition, Bozhko confirms the fact that the names of church holidays were used for relative dating of the protocols (Божко 1993, 85; Բոճկո 2010, 112). The Armenian equivalent is *վանկոյն* ([merelots^h] ‘the day of dead people’) (Rivola 1633, 259). There are several days for commemorating memories of the deceased in the Armenian Church. The noun is a derivative of *վն* ([mer] ‘passing, death, end’) and comes from the Proto-Indo-European stem **mer-* (‘death, to die’) – cf. Avestan *mərəta* (‘dead’), Persian *mīrad* (‘he/she dies’), etc. (Ջահուկյան 2010, 523; Olsen 1999, 783, 786). Treating this loanword as Polish does not seem to be justified. In fact, it was borrowed by Polish Armenians, but rather from Ruthenian/Ukrainian.

²¹² Translations according to Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան (2015, 30).

175. **L:** **գարնավալ** (Պողոսյան 2014, 52) [karnaval] (Pol. *karnawal*, Eng. *carnival* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 138; Ալզերեան 1868, 112)).

AT: the following nouns are possible. The first, *դիմակահանդես* [dimakahandes], consists of *դիմակ* (‘[dimak] mask’) from Middle Iranian *dēmak* (‘face, form, shape, figure’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 199), *ու* (conjunction), and *հանդես* (‘[hande(ē) s] festivity’) from Middle Persian *handēs* or Avestan *handaēsa-*, *andes* (‘to appear, to act’) (Աճառեան 1977, 3: 40; Ջահուկյան 2010, 44; cf. Olsen 1999, 890). The second, *տոնահանդես* [tonahandes], consists of *տոն* ([ton] ‘feast’) – from Proto-Indo-European *dapni-* (‘sacrifice’), which comes from the stems *dāp-*, *dəp-* (‘to divide, to distribute’) (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 442) and *հանդես* as above. Both are still in use in Western (*տոնահանդես* [tonahandes]) and Eastern (*տոնահանդես* [tonahandes]) Armenian. Another, and very apt translation of *գարնավալ* [karnaval] (a rather precise counterpart) is *բարեկենդան* [barekendan] (Ալզերեան 1868, 112), which has been known in Armenia since the pagan times (before 301 A.D.) and which Christianity adopted as *carnival* (Մալխասեսյան 1944, 1: 339; Աղայան 1976, 1: 175). The noun is a combination of *բարի* [bari] (without a clear etymology) and *կենդան* [kendan] / *կենդանի* [kendani] from the Proto-Indo-European *g²iyā* form (Ժիրբ, h. 1, 1969: 293; Աճառեան 1973, 2: 565). The Persian language has borrowed the word *baryandān* (*carnival*) from Eastern Armenian (Աճառեան 1971, 1: 422)

PM: *karnawal* [karnaval] is from Italian *carnevale* (from *carne*, *vale!* = ‘meat, farewell!’), French *carnaval* (Kopaliński 1990, 255; Sobol 1995, 532), or German *Karneval* (Պողոսյան 2014, 52). The etymology is not clear in Polish (Kopaliński 1990, 255), but Latin origin, *carnem levare* (‘remove meat’), is the most logical. Besides the meaning ‘carnival’, it still means the ‘last (three) days before Lent’ (SPXVI) (similar to Armenian *բարեկենդան* [barekendan]). Linde even specifies *karnawal* as *mięsopust* (Linde 1808, 1, 2: 966) ([miensopust] ‘leaving off meat for the entire time of Lent’ (Gloger 1903, 3: 221).

R: regarding religious meaning, the equivalent of Polish *karnawal* in Armenian is *բարեկենդան* [barekendan] or *բարիկենդան* [barikendan] – the Feast of the Armenian Apostolic Church, which marks the period from the Feast of St. Sarkis to the Great Lent. On that day, the priestly class and the people

are invited to join in feasts and merriment so as to enter the ensuing fast with a happy heart and endure to the end. The literal meaning of this noun is ‘good life’ and probably is a Proto-Armenian word (Աճառեան 1971, 1: 422). It is hard to say when and from which language the word *գարնախալ* [karnaval] passed into the Polish Armenian dialect. The Polish Armenians probably borrowed it from Polish, but in Eastern and Western Armenian it is known as a French loanword (Մկրտչյան and Խաչատրյան 2016, 350). E. Aghayan even proposes *կարնախալ* [karnaval] as the only *դիմակահանդես* [dimakahandes] synonym (Աղայան 1976, 1: 696).

176. **L:** **խառնարք** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 178) [j(e)armark^h] (Pol. *jarmark*, Eng. *fair* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 329; Ալզերեան 1868, 287; Ալզերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 433)).

AT: *տոնախալսման* [tonavatʃar] consists of *տոն* ([ton] ‘fête’) with the conjunction *ա* [a] and *խալսման* ([vatʃar] ‘sale’): *տոն* is Proto-Indo-European from *dapni-* (‘sacrifice’) which is from *dāp-* or *dəp-* (‘to divide, to distribute, to share’) (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 441). *խալսման* [vatʃar] is an Iranian loanword (cf. Middle Persian *vāčār* or Persian *bāzār*) (Ջահնկյան 2010, 702; Olsen 1999, 908).

PM: the origin of *jarmark* (*jarmark*, *jermak*, *jermark*, *jormark* or diminutive *jarmarek*) is Middle High German *jārmarkt*, which in modern German is *Jahrmarkt* (*Jahr* – year and *Markt* – market) (Boryś 2008, 204; Ludwig 1716, 958). The meaning has been ‘market held regularly (once a year) at a specified time or gift (present) brought from the fair’ since the 15th century (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 116; Brückner 1927, 1: 199; Linde 1808, 1: 860).

R: neither *խառնարք* nor its other derivatives ever functioned in Eastern nor Western Armenian. It is without doubt a Polish loanword for Polish Armenians. The Russian noun *ярмарка* (since the 15th century) (Фасмер 1987, 4: 561) and Ruthenian *ярмарка* [jarmarka] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 1115) / Ukrainian *ярмарок* [jarmarok] (probably the 17th century)

(Мельничук 2012, 1: 552) were also brought from Polish. The noun likely passed into Kipchak as *yarmark*, *yarmarka* (Гаркавец 2010, 1660) through Polish or Polish Armenian.

177. **L:** լասկա²¹³ (Hanusz 1886, 435) [laska] (Pol. *laska*, Eng. *grace, mercy, favour* etc. (cf. Ասմանգույան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 335, 405, 584; Ալգերեան 1868, 292, 338, 459; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 339, 396, 544 etc.)).

AT: appropriate translations include *նորմ(ած(ույթյուն))* [voɔorm(atsutʰjun)] and *գույթ* [gutʰ] (‘grace, mercy, favor’, etc.). *նորմ(ած(ույթյուն))* consists of *նորմ* [voɔorm] (possibly the Proto-Indo-European stem *ol-` *el- (‘to destroy, harm’), (Ջահուկյան 2010, 601)), *-ած* [ats] which comes from the stem of *ածել* [atsel] (Ջահուկյան 1994, 55). An Indo-European origin of the noun constituting *-ած* [-ats] with the transformation of the Indo-European *g*’ into Armenian *δ* [ts] (Ջահուկյան 1994, 55) and the suffix *-ույթյուն* [utʰjun], as in the case of **ձէխմիսր** [dzeχmistr] (cf. Ջահուկյան 1995, 140; entry no. 127) is also possible. The next noun – *գույթ* [gutʰ] likely comes from Proto-Indo-European **ghōdh-to-* from the stem **ghedh* (‘to unite, to be closely connected, to adapt to each other’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 171).

PM: has been in use since the 14th century and is from Proto-Slavic **laska* (‘caressing, caresses’ etc.), probably from the deverbative Proto-Slavic noun **laskati* (‘to show lust, love, stroke’ etc.). The other possible origin is the Proto-Slavic noun **lās-sk-ā* from Proto-Indo-European **lās-* (‘greedy, avid, grasping, wanton’ etc.), parallel to the Proto-Slavic verb **laskati* (Boryś 2008, 296; cf. Derksen 2008, 269). The Old Polish noun *laska* [laska] has not changed its meanings much: ‘kindness, consideration, favor usually shown by someone higher to the lower’ (including the matter of religion and cult), ‘love, mercy, pity, goodness’ (also in matters of religion and cult) (Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 98, 99).

²¹³ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *laskà* [laska].

R: Hanusz somewhat doubts whether the source of the loanword is Ruthenian (Желехівський 1886, 1: 397) or Polish (Hanusz 1886, 435), but there is no reason to look for a source of borrowing besides Polish.

178. **L:** լուլա²¹⁴ (Hanusz 1886, 434) [lula] (Pol. *fajka*, Eng. *pipe* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 699; Ալգերեան 1868, 537; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 642)).

AT: *ծխամորժ* ([tsχamortʃ] ‘tobacco pipe’) is the equivalent of լուլա [lula] in the Polish Armenian dialect, especially for those from Kutu. The noun consists of *ծուխ* [tsuχ], which probably came from Hittite *tuhh(uā)i* (‘smoke’) (Չահուկյան 2010, 367), the conjunction *ու* [a] and *մորժ* [mortʃ] possibly from Proto-Indo-European **morkio-* (**morgio*) from the stem **mer-* (‘mash, embrocate’) (Չահուկյան 2010, 535). The next meaning of լուլա in Armenian is *խոփակ* ([χոփակ] ‘pipe’). The noun is probably from Proto-Indo-European *k(u)holou-*, which is from the stem **kuel-* (‘rotate’) or the stem **(s)kel-* (‘bend’) (Չահուկյան 2010, 339).

PM: *lulka* [lulka] comes from Turkish *lüle* [ljule] (cf. *Osmanlıca sözlük* pos. 5508; Nişanyan) as ‘tobacco pipe’ (Brückner 1927, 1: 321; Linde 1808, 1, 2: 1309).

R: indeed, the noun լուլա [lula] in the dialect of Kutu suggests that Turkish, where the word was already known at the very beginning of the 15th century (Nişanyan), is a possible, but not the only, source of borrowing. In Armenian, as I have already pointed out, լուլայ ([lulaj] ‘tube, pipe’) was borrowed from Persian (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 293; Մալխասեանց 1944, 2: 211; Աճառեան 1902, 153): Acharyan gives examples of versions of Persian *lule* in various dialects (close to the dialect of Kutu) of Armenian: *լիլէ*, *լիլիէ* [ljule] or *լիլա* [ljula] (‘pipe, furnace pipe or tap’ etc.) (Աճառեան 1902, 153). It seems that the word could have remained in the Kutu dialect from the basic Armenian vocabulary or have been borrowed from Polish or even Ruthenian (*люлька* [lju-lka] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 419)).

²¹⁴ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *lulà* [lula].

179. **L:** կվարտալնիկ²¹⁵ (Hanusz 1886, 430) [kvartalnik] (Pol. *kwartalnik*, Eng. *quarterly*). (Cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 751; Ալգերեան 1868, 579; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 692).

AT: երամսյակային [eramsjakajin] consists of երեք [jerekh] ‘three’, ամիս [amis] ‘month’ and the suffix -ային [ajin]. երեք comes from the Proto-Indo-European *treies-/tréyes, *tri-/tīi as in Sanskrit *traya*, Greek τρεις, Hittite *tri*, etc. (Ջահուկյան 2010, 224; Աճառեան 1973, 2: 50). ամիս comes from the Proto-Indo-European stem *meñsos-* (cf. Sanskrit *māsa*, Latin *mensis* etc.). The Armenian initial add-on is *u* [a] or the influence of the noun *ամ* [am] ‘year’ or just initial throat reflection (Ջահուկյան 2010, 45; Աճառեան 1971, 1: 158). The suffix -ային [-ajin] probably consists of the element -*u(j)* [aj] and suffix -*hū* [in] (Ջահուկյան 1994, 56).

PM: *kwartalnik* ([kwartalnik] ‘quarterly’) generally means periodical, quarterly published magazine (SJPPWN), being the derivative of *kwarta* [kvarta] – the fourth part of the higher order unit of measurement (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 474; cf. Gloger 1902, 3: 127) and comes from Latin *quarta* (‘fourth part’) at least since the 14th century (Sobol 1995, 628–629). *Kwartalnik* was the same as *kwartnik* [kvartnik] (Sobol 1995, 629; Brückner 1927, 1: 287), which meant ‘a monetary unit equal to one-third of a half-grosz²¹⁶ or appraiser (expert) appointed by the city council and responsible for construction matters within one district – bricklayer or carpenter’ (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 475). Linde notes *kwarta*, *kwartalny*, *kwartalnie*, *kwartalowy* etc. but not *kwartalnik* (Linde 1808, 1, 2: 1198). As a magazine in Polish *czasopismo* (‘periodical, magazine’), we obviously have copied from the German *Zeitschrift* (*Zeit* and *Schrift* – ‘time’ and ‘writing’).

R: unfortunately, Hanusz does not explain which definition fit *kwartalnik* or in what sense the Armenians from Kutuy used that noun.

²¹⁵ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by J. Hanusz was *kvartalnik* [kvartalnik].

²¹⁶ *Grosz* – Polish coin, a hundredth of a zloty.

180. **L:** **պաշորկա**²¹⁷ (Hanusz 1886, 449) [patʃ^horka] (Pol. *paciorka*, *paciorka* with the meaning of *koral*, *koraliki*, *naszyjnik*, Eng. *bead*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 83; Ալգերեան 1868, 66; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 73; Młynarczyk 2010, 126–127)

AT: the first translation is *նլունքսուստիկ* ([ulunk^hahatik] ‘bead’), which consists of *նլունք* ([ulunk^h] ‘bead’) from the Proto-Indo-European stem **olen-* **el-* – ‘to bend, buckle’ (from that also ‘vertebra’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 747), with the conjunction *ս* [a] and noun *սուստիկ* ([hatik] ‘kernel, granule’) – probably a Hittite (or close language) loanword as *hattāi-* (‘to cut, punch, tear’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 450; cf. Olsen 1999, 17). The second one is *համրիկ* ([hamritʃ^h] ‘rosary (bead)’), which is a derivative of *համար* [hamar] from Middle Persian **ham-māra-* (‘reckoning, consideration’) (Olsen 1999, 685, 737, 889) or Persian *hamār* (‘number, account, size’) (Մալխասյանց 1944, 3: 28). The last possibility is *տերորիսյու* ([terokormja] ‘rosary, prayer beads’) a combination of *տեր* ([ter] ‘The Lord, Master’), as the derivative of **tiayr/*tēayr* from **tē-* (‘great’) (Անանեան 1979, 4: 401, Ջահուկյան 2010, 728; cf. Olsen 1999, 612, 673, 682, 905) with *այր* ([ajr] ‘man, adult male’) – rather a Proto-Indo-European stem but with an uncertain origin (probably from **anrio* ‘under the influence of **ario* – ‘master’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 49) and *որիսյու* [(v)okormja], which could have come from Proto-Indo-European **ol-* from the stem **el-* (‘to destroy, damage’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 601) or, as Acharyan notes, directly from the stem *orm-* (Անանեան 1977, 3: 556)

PM: *paciorka* [patʃ^hiorka] has been used in Polish since the 10th–11th centuries (Brückner 1927, 2: 390; cf. Doroszewski).²¹⁸ However, as a loanword in Armenian, we do not know what meaning of the noun *pacierz* [patʃ^hiez] (the diminutive of ‘children’s evening prayer’) (Doroszewski) was because, as noted by Hanusz, *paciorek* could also mean ‘a small knob of glass, wood, mineral, etc., usually with a hole for threading (thread with knobs, beads)’ or, in the plural, ‘string with knobs shifted by one’s fingers when saying certain prayers (rosary)’ (cf. Doroszewski). Recall that in the plural, *pacierze* [patʃ^hieze] also meant ‘the spine, the

²¹⁷ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *paćorkà* [patʃ^horka].

²¹⁸ For the main details of the creation of the Polish language see: Klemensiewicz (2002, 19–21), and about the oldest literary monument noting Poland see: Bielowski (1864, 179).

cross' (Borys 2008, 407). Given that Hanusz himself does not isolate any of the above-mentioned meanings, it could be said that at the end of the 19th century, it could be possible that the speech concerned *pacierz* ([patʃ^hieʒ] 'prayer') and not *koraliiki* ([koraliki] 'beads').

R: this noun does not exist in Eastern or Western Armenian and is typical for Kutuy dialect.

State and attributes of statehood

181. **L:** **գերբ** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 121) [gerb] (Pol. *herb*, Eng. *coat of arms*; cf. Magakian 2021, 228; Bartoszewicz 1923, 222, 243).

AT: *գերբ* [gerb] currently is rarely used and only in colloquial speech, but in the 1960s and 1970s, it was even used in formal context (Ժիրք 1969, 1: 392). The right equivalent in Armenian is *զինանշան* [zinanʃan] (‘coat of arms’), which consists of *զէն(-ք)* [zen(kh)] – Avestan *zaēna* and Middle Persian *zēn* (‘gun’) (Ջահուկյան 1987, 525), and the conjunction *ու* [a] with the noun *նշան* [nʃan] from Middle Persian or Persian *nišān* (Ջահուկյան 1987, 537) (‘symbol, sign, mark’).

PM: since the 15th century (Boryś 2008, 194) it has meant ‘an emblem, a sign of nobility, distinguishing one noble family from another’ (Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 542), or ‘the state organization, region, office’ (SPXVI; Linde 1808, 1, 2: 827), etc. The noun comes from Old-Czech (*h*)*erb* – ‘hereditary emblem of the noble family’ from Upper-Middle-German *erbe* (‘inheritor, heir’) (Sobol 1995, 426).

R: *herb* came into Russian (герб [gerb]) or Ruthenian/Ukrainian (герб [herb]) through Polish (*herb*) (Фасмер т 1 1986, 403; Желехівський 1886, 1: 139) but in Armenian it is (at least phonetically) obviously a Russian loanword.

182. **L:** **դալլառ/դալլար** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 2009: 158) [t^(h)ajlar / t^(h)ajlar] (Pol. *talar/taler*, Eng. *thaler*).

AT: *թալեր* ([t^haler]) was a German coin (now inactive) sometimes equal to 3 marks (Մալխասսեանց 1944, 2: 75; Ժիրք 1972, 2: 124; Յարութիւնեանց 1912, 112). This German loanword in Polish passed into the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court Protocols (Գրիգորյան 1963, (52) 121–122, (70) 129–130, (251) 216, (256)

218, (480) 302 etc.) and into the Polish Armenian dialect, so *ղալլալ* [t^(h)ajlar] / *ղալլալ*) [t^(h)ajlar] could be considered to be a Polish loanword.

PM: from the German *thaler/taler* (Ղալալալյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 2009, 158; Hammer 2007, 53–57; cf. Ludwig 1716, 447) and known as loanword.

R: it is unlikely that Armenians would have borrowed *taler* from Kipchak (Гаркавец 2010, 1373) because it also penetrated there from Polish, although Ukrainian cannot be completely ignored (it is rather possible the word moved in the opposite direction – from Armenian to Kipchak). The Armenian sources also sometimes propose Ukrainian as the source of the loanword (Արաջյան et al. 2017, 218–219) (the same as the Ukrainian author Bozhko (Բոժկո 2010, 112)), but these suggestions seem to be misguided. In the case of Ukrainian, in the 15th or even 16th centuries, we can at most talk about Ruthenian (*маляр* [taljar] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 946)) which, similar to Ukrainian (*маляр/талер* [taljar/talar]), also got this noun from Polish (Мельничук 2006, 5: 510). Linde writes that Archduke Zygmunt Rakuzki began to beat *talár*, *taler* around 1487 (Linde 1812, 3: 596), although Brückner talks about 1518 (Brückner 1927, 2: 564; Gloger 1903, 4: 354). As we saw above, the *taler* is so marginal in the Armenian consciousness that it currently appears in dictionaries only as a former German coin (*Taler*) (Աղայան 1976, 1: 412; Ժիրք 1972, 2: 124).

183. **L:** *կարտեձ* (Հայրապետյան 2011, 279) [kartetʰ] (Pol. *kartacz*, Eng. *cannister shot / grape-shot*). (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 408).

AT: the Polish equivalent of Armenian *կարտեձ* [kartetʰ] in DFW is *kartecza* [kartetʰa], which is incorrect – there is no *kartecza* [kartetʰa] in Polish but *kartacz* [kartatʰ] has existed since the 16th century (WSOPWN). Moreover, in translation into Armenian, two concepts are involved – *kartacz* [kartatʰ] and *kartusz* [kartuʃ] – as one notion. The first part of the Armenian translation’s explanation (*մանրագնդակի արկ, մանրագնդակով հրետանույն* (Հայրապետյան 2011, 279)) refers to ‘a small balls’ projectile or artillery bomb with small balls’, which in fact can be translated as Polish *kartacz* [kartatʰ] – “an artillery bullet

filled with pieces of metal (choppers), later with metal balls – used from the 16th to the mid-19th century” (Sobol 1995, 533). The second explanation (*խոշոր կոստրակի դրոշմակալի համար* (Հայրապետյան 2011, 279)) is ‘a big duck shot for a hunting rifle’, which can be closer to Polish *kartusz* [kartuʃ] – ‘a cylindrical container, initially a paper one, since the 19th century a metal one, containing the charge of gunpowder loaded from the side of the barrel outlet’ (Sobol 1995, 533).

PM: details of the explanation in Polish as in the previous point.

R: *картечь* [kartetʃʰ] (or *картеча* [kartetʃʰa]) Vasmer deduces in Russian from the French *cartouche* (Фасмер 1986, 2: 204), which comes from Italian *cartoccio* (TLFI), but not from the incorrect Polish *kartecza*. In Polish, Linde sees no practical difference between *kartacz* [kartatʃʰ], *kartecz* [kartetʃʰ] and *kartusz* [kartuʃ], which supports Vasmer’s position (Linde 1808, 1, 2: 969). However, he also interprets *kartusz* [kartuʃ] separately with the military meaning that interests us (Linde 1808, 1, 2: 969–970). *Kartacz* is a loanword in Polish from German (*Kartätsche*) and *kartusz* [kartuʃ] – a French word (*cartouche* but rather through Old English *cartage*) (Sobol 1995, 533; Dębowiak and Waniakowa 2012, 223). For details about the differences and similarities between *kartacz* [kartatʃʰ] and *kartusz* [kartuʃ] I refer to the article by P. Dębowiak and J. Waniakowa (Dębowiak and Waniakowa 2012, 219–225) as that is not the focus of this study. It is difficult to say from which language it was borrowed into Armenian – directly from French (TLFI), Turkish (Nişanyan), Ruthenian (Желехівський 1886, 1: 336) or Russian, but in any case, not from Polish.

184. **L:** *կիվեր* (Հայրապետյան 2011, 283) [g(k)ivɛr] (Pol. *kiwior*, Eng. *shako* – like Polish *czako*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 856).

AT: *կիվեր* [g(k)ivɛr] is a tall military cap, decorated with feathers (Հայրապետյան 2011, 283) and has no equivalent in Armenian. There is probably an accidental semi-resemblance with Armenian archaic *քիվլահ* ([kʰivllah] ‘type of hat’) from Persian *kulāh* (Մալխաստեանց 1945, 4: 576) or *քիլ* ([kʰiv] ‘edge of the building roof, protruding part’) which is from the Proto-Indo-European stem **skēu-* (‘cover, wrap’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 784).

PM: in Polish, *kiwior* [kivior], *kiwier* [kivier] or *kiwiorek* [kiviorek] is ‘a high and wide Persian or Turkish cap type or turban’ known since the 16th century (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 281; Gloger 1902, 3: 31; Linde 1808, 1, 2: 1002). According to Vasmer, the noun comes from Old-Russian *киверь* [kiver], noted first in Russian in 1378 with a very uncertain etymology (Фасмер 1986, 2: 228–229). Brückner is of the same opinion (Brückner 1927, 1: 231).

R: geographically and chronologically, borrowing from Polish seems unlikely, but borrowing from Russian is probable.

185. **L:** **հազովնիցայ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 394) [hakovnitʰaj] (Pol. *hakownica*, Eng. *arquebus/culverin*). (cf. Ալգերեան 1868, 44, 193; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 240).

AT: probably the apt translation (equivalent?) is *արկերբուզ* ([arkebuz] ‘arquebus’), which can be found in Armenian only as a foreign loanword of French or Russian origin (Հայրապետյան 2011, 71) or *կուլեյրին* ([kuljevrin] *culverin*) (Брокгауз and Ефрон 1897, 22: 215–216) – a rifle with tinder in Western Europe (Հայրապետյան 2011, 71).

PM: according to Gloger, it is the oldest hand firearm, whose name’s etymology comes from German *Hakenbüchse* and French *haquebutte*. Over the centuries, this gun has undergone various improvements: its length and weight were reduced, and it has been transformed into ‘arquebus, musket, blunderbuss, blaster, rifle’, etc. In documents of the Polish infantry from 1471, we find the terms *hakownicza* [hakovnitʰa] and *akownicza* [akovnitʰa] (Gloger 1901, 2: 231; TLF; Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 535).

R: Bozhko supposes that the noun in Armenian is a Ukrainian loanword (Բոժկո 2010, 112) (or rather Ruthenian – *заківниця* [hakivnytsʰja] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 135)). Phonetically, the Armenian *հազովնիցայ* [hakovnitʰaj] could have not come from Polish through Ruthenian/Ukrainian *заківниця* [hakivnytsʰja], which was also borrowed from Polish (Мельничук 1982, 1: 454). Armenian could also be the source for Kipchak *hakovnica* (Гаркавец 2010, 562).

186. **L:** **հրոշ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 441) [hroj] (Pol. *hrosz*, Eng. *grosh*²¹⁹).

AT: *հրոշ* [hroj] was a monetary unit only for Polish Armenians (e.g. Գրիգորյան 1963, (14) 101–102, (23) 105–106, (31) 111, (201) 189–190 etc.).

PM: *grosz* ([groʃ] from German *Grosse*) has been in use in Polish since the 14th century (1/100 part of *zloty*²²⁰) and was a silver coin, 1/48 part of the above-mentioned *grzywna* [gzyvna], which came from Old-Czech *gros* (Boryś 2008, 180; Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 498).

R: in Slavic languages, the noun *grosh* spread via the Polish *grosz* [groʃ] from German *Grosch/Groschen* (Фасмер 1986, 1: 462). Phonetically, in Polish Armenian *հրոշ* [hroj] is much closer to Ruthenian/Ukrainian *ґриш* [hriʃ] (Мельничук 1982, 1: 599; Желехівський 1886, 1: 160) or Kipchak *hroš* (*γροš*) (Гаркавец 2010, 598) [vroʃ] than to Polish *grosz* [groʃ]. We cannot, therefore, claim that Kipchak *hroš* was borrowed from Polish Armenians. In Armenian, under the influence of Turkish *kuruş* [kuruʃ] (Nişanyan), that noun was also known as *կորոշ* [k/goroʃ] (Rivola 1633, 202), *ղորոշ* [vor(r)uʃ] (Ժիրք 1974, 3: 430), etc. In modern Armenian, *grosh* as a copper coin, is an old, dated Russian loanword, which has been in use since the 16th century (Հայրապետյան 2011, 131; Մալխասևանց 1944, 1: 478).

187. **L:** **մոնիդայ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 527) [monitaj] (Pol. *moneta*, Eng. *money*²²¹) (cf. Ասմանզուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 168)

AT: *մոնիդայ* [monitaj] was used in Polish Armenian in the sense of *money* (e.g. Գրիգորյան 1963, (18) 103, (149) 164–165).

PM: *moneta* has been known in Polish at least since 1425 as ‘money minted with bullion’ (Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 325), which is known among the Slavs since 10th century (Brückner 1927, 2: 409).

²¹⁹ Similar to *penny*.

²²⁰ Polish monetary currency.

²²¹ According to Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 527).

R: *մոնիդայ* [monitaj] was clearly a borrowing from Polish and was in common use among Polish Armenians. The noun also appears in Kipchak in the form *monita*, *moniṭa* (Гаркавец 2010, 981), where it could get through the Armenian language, because Ruthenian and Ukrainian forms sound *монета* [moneta] (Гаркавец 2010, 981; Желехівський 1886, 1: 452; Мельничук 1989, 3: 507) and the Polish one is as the Latin form – *monēta* (Zgółkowa 1999, 21: 418; Sobol 1995, 737).

188. **L:** **շապլա** (Գազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 588) [[fabla] (Pol. *szabla*, Eng. *saber/sabre*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 819–820; Ալգերեան 1868, 622; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 744).

AT: *թուր*²²² [thur] (sword) is from Indo-European **tōr-* from the stem **ter(ə)-* – ‘to mash, to rub, to wipe, to puncture’ (cf. Greek *τείρω* – ‘worn out, exhausted’, *τορεύω* – ‘puncture, cut’ etc.) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 275; Անանեան 1973, 2: 208). The second, more precise translation is *սուր* [sur] (‘saber/saber’). The noun is from the Indo-European stem **kō-* (‘sharpen’) – **kō-ro-* (cf. Sanskrit *çū-la-* – ‘lance’, Avestan *saēni* – ‘sharp edge, apex’ etc.) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 690; cf. Անանեան 1979, 4: 254).

PM: *szabla* ([[fabla] ‘saber’) is a small arm with a single-edged (very rarely double-edged) blade mounted in the handle and could also be referred to as a ‘sword’ (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 526). *Miecz* [mietʃ^h] is a ‘sword’ that is an incisive weapon with a wide blade and a long blade mounted in the handle (Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 201). *Szabla* has been in use since about the 15th century in Polish (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 526). The word probably penetrated into Polish from Hungarian *szablya* [sablja] (from the verb *szabni* [sabni] – ‘to cut’). One cannot exclude either the possible influence of ancient Russian, where the word was already known in the 10th century (Boryś 2008, 590; Фасмер 1987, 3: 541; Brückner 1027, 2: 538): The *Trésor de la langue Française informatisé* does not exclude the possibility of Polish or Russian intermediation in case of the penetration of the Hungarian *szábyla* into German, from which it apparently passed into French (TLFI): Boryś even supposes that the word originated in Tungusic languages – *sele-me* (Boryś 2008, 590): There are also doubts about a Hungarian

²²² Ibidem, 588.

origin (Фасмер 1987, 3: 541). Linde also pointed to Hungarian as a possible source of *szabla* but added that it comes from Asia. In all cases, the final etymology is unclear. W. Kwaśniewicz notes that, due to its connections with the East, *szabla* appeared in early medieval Kievan Rus' and Hungary, and in the case of Russia, according to him, penetrated into the language through military ties with the Khazars, Cumans (Polovtsians) and Pechenegs (Kwaśniewicz 1981, 158–159).²²³ *Miecz* has existed in Polish since at least the 14th century. It comes from the Proto-Slavic *mečъ* [**mek-jo-*], close to Proto-German **mēkja-* (but it is not a German loanword) (Boryś 2008, 323). All in all, its origin is not entirely clear (Фасмер 1986, 2: 612–613; Мельничук 1989, 3: 454–455). “This etymon has often been considered a borrowing from Germanic, but the Slavic short vowel does not match the long vowel of the Germanic forms” (Derksen 2008, 305).

R: now it is difficult to say why *saber* was translated as a ‘sword’. In any case, in both languages (according to Linde (Linde 1809, 2, 1: 73) and Acharyan (Աճարյան 1979, 4: 254)), the Armenian and Polish words are practically synonyms. It is also difficult to agree with the thesis of the Ukrainian source of *шабля* ([ʃablja] ‘saber’) (Բոճըր 2010, 112) for Armenians in Poland, especially considering when the Ukrainian language came to be (cf. Subtelny 2009, 154, 222 etc.). At most, we can theoretically take into consideration Ruthenian *шабля* (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 1081) ([ʃablja] ‘saber’), which does not seem to be finally substantiated. Geographically and chronologically, Polish seems to be the most reliable source for շարիս [ʃablja].

189. **L:** շտիկ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 403) [ʃtik] (Pol. *szytych*,²²⁴ Eng. *blade*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 97; Ալգերեան 1868, 80; Ալգերեան and Պրէստեան 1821, 1: 88).

AT: the most appropriate explanation in Armenian is *սուր ծայր / ձէր* ([sur tsajr / tser] ‘pike, sharp edge’), or *սվին/սուին* ([svin] ‘bayonet’) (Հայրապետյան 2011, 403; Rivola 1633, 342). *սուր* is Proto-Indo-European **kō-ro-* from the stem **kō-* (‘sharpen’) as Sanskrit *çū-la-* (‘lance’), Avestan *saēni* (‘sharp tip, top’), etc.

²²³ See also Zajęczkowski (1949, 87–94); cf. Polak (2015); Голубовский (1884), etc. for details about Khazars, Cumans and Pechenegs.

²²⁴ According to Հայրապետյան (2011, 403).

(Ջսհուկյան 2010, 690), but *ծայր* [tsajr] is of an unknown origin (Ջսհուկյան 2010, 359; Աճառեան 1973, 2: 443). *սվին* [svin] is an unknown loanword; for example, in Assyrian as *sūwīnā* (‘lance’), in Arab and Persian as *zupin/zōbīn* (‘short lance’), etc. (Աճառեան h. 4 1979, 249). There is also a rather very dubious explanation for Arabic *zabana* (‘to push, hit’) (Ուրիշեան 1998, 2: 177). *Բառզիրք Հայոց* explains *սվին* [svin] in a slightly different way – ‘saw blade’ / ‘pattern sickle’ (Մեղրեցի 1698, 189). A close example can also be found in *Նոր բառզիրք հայկազան լեզուին* (Ալեքսիքեան et al. 1837, 2: 731). There is also another etymology of *շտիկ* [ʃtik] in Armenian – a Dutch loanword through Russian (Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 542). In the same way, A. Yevgenyeva explains the etymology of the noun *sztyk* [ʃtik] but as ‘a special knot when tying thick ropes’ (Евгеньева 1984, 4: 735).

PM: *sztych* [ʃtiχ] comes from German *Stich*, and since the 16th or 17th centuries it has had several meanings (‘image carved on a metal plate’, ‘recess in the ground of the shovel over the entire length of the blade’ etc.), of which, in our case, we are only concerned with ‘sharp end of mēlée weapon, spitz’ (Sobol 1995, 1079; Brückner 1927, 2: 556; Linde 1812, 3: 571). As W. Dobrowolski sees it, *շտիկ* [ʃtik] in Polish is only a ‘Russian bayonet’ (Doroszewski). Semantically, the concept of Russian *штык* [ʃtyk] is much closer to the Armenian meaning of *շտիկ* [ʃtik], also proposed by some Armenian dictionaries (Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 542; Հայրապետյան 2011, 403 etc.). Moreover, it is hard to find the form *sztyk* [ʃtyk] in Polish dictionaries (cf. Krasnowolski and Niedźwiedzki 1920; Linde 1812, 3: 584–585; Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8; SPXVI; Zgólkowa 2003, 41; Sobol 1995, etc.).

R: contrary to appearances, the explanation for *sztyk* [ʃtyk] and not *sztych* [ʃtiχ] in Armenian is not clear. Russian sources cite Polish language as an intermediary for that loanword from German (Фасмер 1987, 4: 481–482; Словарь Шанского; Евгеньева 1984, 4: 735; Словарь Крылова etc.). Gavriil Uspenski even tries to explain how the final letter “k” came from Russian: he claims it probably arose under the influence of the word *в-тык-ать/втыкать* ([vtykat’] to stick, so is also with the *штык* [ʃtyk]) (Словарь Успенского). As we see the Polish usage of *sztyk* [ʃtyk] is rare and typically refers to a type of Russian white weapon (also in Ukrainian version (Мельничук 2012, 6: 475) – *штык* [ʃtyk]). If the Armenians (rather Polish Armenians) borrowed the noun *sztyk* [ʃtyk] (as *շտիկ* [ʃtik]) from

Polish, they would have introduced *štik* [ʃtik] into Kipchak. However, there we see *štiχ/štiχ* [ʃtyχ] as ‘sharp end, spearhead’ (Гаркавец 2010, 1359). The conclusion seems to be simple – Eastern Armenian borrowed the noun from the Russian *штык* [ʃtyk], while Polish Armenians could have used *sztych*, the version still rooted in Polish [ʃtyχ] in the 16th century. Finally, there is one more ambiguity, it is difficult to unequivocally and definitively determine whether the source of Armenian *շտիկ* [ʃtik] comes from Polish *sztyk* [ʃtyk] or from *sztych* [ʃtyχ].

190. **L:** **ռայդցա** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 675; cf. Мельничук 2006, 5: 29) [rajdts^ha] (Pol. *radca*, Eng. *councilman*, *counsellor*, *councillor*) (cf. Ասմանգույյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 202; Ալգերեան 1868, 181; Ալգերեան and Պրէստեան 1821, 1: 205).

AT: in the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court Protocols, I read at least once about *ռայդցա* [rajdts^ha] – “[...] Ես այլ դարձեալ գնացի **ռայդցաներուն** [rajdts^hanerun] առջեւն եւ նոցա հրամանաւ կալայ զայն մարդն եւ ետու նստուցել [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (230) 203–204) (somebody was imprisoned by the decision of the *councilmen*). *ռայդցա* [rajdts^ha] is an equivalent of Armenian *խորհրդակալ/պաշտոնատար անձ* ([χorhrdakan/paʃtonatar andz] ‘advisor, deputy, official’) which is a derivative of *խորհուրդ* ([χorhurd] ‘council, advice’) and comes from a stem of unclear origin, probably an Iranian loanword (Անանեան 1973, 2: 409; Ջահուկյան 2010, 345; Olsen 1999, 624, 912) – *χorh*, *χoh* as *thought* – “**hvarθa-*, base *hvar-* (‘to grasp in mind’), Khotanese *hvarāka-* = *nāsāka-* (‘grasping’), similar in use to *grab-* (‘grasp’) in Sogdian *γrb* (‘understand’), Yagnobi *γriv-* (‘know, understand’) Chorasmian *γiβ-* (‘grasp, think’)” (Schmitt and Bailey 2024; Olsen 1999, 258).

PM: *radca* [radts^ha], *raca* [rats^ha], *radźca* [radzts^ha], *radźsa* [radzsa], *rajca* [rajts^ha], *rajdca* [rajdts^ha], *rajdźca* [rajdzts^ha] (since 15th century) meant ‘the one who gives advice, adviser, member of a team appointed as an advisory or deciding body, member of the city council, the supreme municipal authority in cities under German law’, etc. (Urbańczyk 1973–1977, 7: 423; cf. SPXVI; Boryś 2008, 509; Linde 1812, 3: 5–7) but *rada* ([rada] ‘advice, council’) has been known since the 14th century (from Old High German loanword – *rāt*) (Boryś 2008, 508).

Brückner adds that it is, however, a West Slavic loanword from German *Rath* that went through Polish to Ruthenian (Brückner 1927, 2: 452).

R: for *rajca* [rajca] in Kipchak (also possibly a Polish loanword) Harkavets proposes Armenian *հյուպատոս* [hjupatos] (Гаркавец 2010, 1193) (from Ancient Greek ὕπατος (Ջահուկյան 2010, 462)), which, however, is a much higher position in the government administrative hierarchy (Աճառեան 1977, 3: 100; Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 111 etc.) than *ռայդցա* [rajdts^ha]. In the Armenian, for the noun *ռայդցա* [rajdts^ha], there are slight differences in the interpretation. *Ռայդցա* [rajdts^ha] is interpreted by Ruben Ghazaryan as *radca* [radts^ha] (Գազարյան 1993, 169); in MAD it is *redca* [redts^ha] (Գազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 675) (probably a typographical error), when we already know that *ռայդցա* [rajdts^ha] is *rajdca* [rajdts^ha]. The proposal of Bozhko that *ռայդցա* [rajdts^ha] is a Ukrainian loanword (Բոժկո 2010, 112) (*райця* [rajtsja]) seems to be unjustified. The loanword went from West to East, so Armenians had the opportunity to borrow the noun rather from Polish (Brückner 1927, 2: 452; Zubrzycki 1844, 13). In fact, in Ukrainian (or Ruthenian (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 794)) *радник* ([radnyk] ‘member of the council’) has existed since the 14th century, but the base (*rada* [rada]) was borrowed through Old Polish or Old Czech from Middle Upper German. Moreover, the form *ռայդցա* [rajdts^ha] borrowed by Armenians is much closer to Polish than to Ukrainian. In Ruthenian, we can also find *радний* ([radnyj] ‘member of the council’) (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 794). In the *Բառգիրք Հայոց* from 1698 we read *խորհուրդ* ([χorhurđ] as ‘thinking, secret’), *խորհրդական* ([χorhrđakan] as ‘scientist’), *խորհող* ([χorhogh] as ‘intellectual’) (Մեղրեցի 1698, 145). In the *Dictionarium armeno-latinum* from 1633, there is not *խորհրդական* [χorhrđakan], but we can find *խորհուրդ* [χorhurđ], *խորհուրդք* [χorhurđk^h] (plural of *խորհուրդ*), etc. (Rivola 1633, 177).

191. **L:** **սեյմ** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 502) [sejm] (Pol. *Sejm*, Eng. *Sejm/Seym*; cf. Magakian 2021, 233–234; Bartoszewicz 1923, 714)).

AT: the Armenian explanation says that *սեյմ* [sejm] is the name of ‘the class-representative bodies of several countries in the feudal period and is also the supreme body of a chamber of state power in the Polish People’s Republic’ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 502; Աղայան 1976, 2: 1290; Ժիրք 1980, 4: 286).

However, the Polish People’s Republic ceased to exist in 1989 and since then *Sejm* [sejm] has been the lower house of the Parliament of the Polish Republic (cf. Biuro Analiz Dokumentacji 2012).

PM: the noun *sejm* [sejm] or *sjem* [sjem] (from Proto-Slavic **сьѣмѣ* – ‘meeting, assembly’) (Boryś 2008, 541) has been in Polish since the 15th century and means ‘congress, assembly of states with a nationwide or territorial coverage and discussing matters concerning the entire country, province, or land’ and just ‘council, assembly’, etc. (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 147; Brückner 1927, 2: 484; Boryś 2008, 541). In Kipchak, we can also find the word *seym* [sejm] with the meaning of “nobility Congress of Polish-Lithuanian state” (Гаркавец 2010, 1263), which is a Polish loanword passed to Kipchak through the intermediary of Armenian.

R: The Russian *сейм* [sejm] is a Polish loanword (Фасмер 1987, 3: 592; Евгеньева 1984, 4: 69), which was also borrowed into Armenian. The noun *sejm* was so widespread in the Caucasus region that there was a Transcaucasus Sejm, and even earlier, there was an attempt to create the Sejm of Azerbaijani Turks in Elizavetpol (Тунян 2015, 213), which was one of the guberniyas of the Caucasus Viceroyalty of the Russian Empire (cf. Брокгауз and Ефрон 1894, XIA: 618–621). Currently, in Armenian, *sejm* is used primarily to refer to the parliaments of Lithuania and Poland.

192. **L:** **չերվոնեց** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 405) [tʰervonetsʰ] (Pol. *czerwonec*, Eng. *chervonets*).

AT: *չերվոնեց* [tʰervonetsʰ] is an archaic, but almost understandable, noun in Armenian and means “ten-ruble banknote in circulation from 1922 to 1947” (Աղայան 1076, 2: 1161; Ժիրք 1980, 4: 136; Հայրապետյան 2011, 405). The second definition just provides historical information: “an ancient Russia five or ten rubles of gold” (Աղայան 1076, 2: 1161; Ժիրք 1980, 4: 136; Հայրապետյան 2011, 405).

PM: in Polish, *czerwonec* [tʰervonietsʰ] was the name of coins and banknotes used in Russia and the USSR, derived from the Polish *red zloty* (only used with these meanings) (*Encyklopedia PWN*). The word comes from the Polish adjective

czerwony ([tʰervony], *czyrwiony* [tʰyrviony], *czyrwony* [tʰyrvony] etc.) – ‘red’ (Nitsch 1953–1955, 1: 371). This word comes from **červjenъ*, **červenъ* (red), which was originally from *červiti* (‘dye red, lay eggs of insects’) (Derksen 2008, 93).

R: *չերվոնեց* [tʰervonetsʰ] is obviously a Russian loanword (despite Polish origins).

193. **L:** **տեքրեղ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 757) [dekʰret] (Pol. *dekret*, Eng. *decree*, *edict*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 232, 296; Ալգերեան 1868, 204, 254; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 232, 293).

AT: *տեքրեղ* [dekʰret] in Armenian is ‘a decision having the force of law, a judgment’ (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 757, Գրիգորյան 2017, 60 etc.), but with this explanation the MAD sends us to an entry with classical transliteration *տէգրէթ* [dekret] (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 757), which is a Latin loanword in Armenian, while *տեքրեղ* [dekʰret] is a Polish loanword for Armenians from Poland (cf. Գրիգորյան 1963, (32) 111–112, (103) 145–146, (118) 153–154 etc.). The noun *դեկրետ* [dekret] can also be found in the Eastern Armenian transliteration but only with a historical (archaic) meaning – ‘the decision of the higher authority; the body that has the power of law or the title of legal act’ (Ժիլբբ 1969, 1: 489; Հայրապետյան 2011, 140 etc.).²²⁵

PM: in the 15th and 16th centuries in Poland, it was a normative act issued by the king, usually in matters of trade, duty, etc. In the Old Polish law (i.e., at least since the 13th century (see details: Kutrzeba 1927)), the ‘court verdict’ was determined in this way (Sobol 1995, 216; SJP PWN; Bąk et al. 1969, 4: 576–578), which is visible even in the 16th-century Armenian Court protocol of

²²⁵ In modern Armenian, there is another meaning of decree. Decree in everyday life is just like an ‘ordinance’ and is a social guarantee for working women, as well as for women on a military service contract or equivalent. It is provided to pregnant women so that they can prepare for childbirth and rest, heal, and spend time with the newborn after the baby is born (Woman-Channel).

Kamianets-Podilskyi – “[...] Ուստի այսպիսի **սեփրեղին [dek^hretin]** խայլի եւ ընդունեցին Բ (2) կողմն այլն: [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (32) 111–112) (the court judgment (referred to as a *սեփրեղ* [dek^hret], which was approved by two sides). In general, the noun *dekret* has been quite widely used in Polish (and is still) as ‘judgment, award, decision (of a court, tribunal, king, or parliament) in disputable matters, act, resolution, ordinance, law issued by a secular or clerical authority, divine commandment, divine court judgment, providence, fate, the canonic law’ (Bağ et al. 1969, 4: 576–578).

R: for Western Armenian (out of Poland), it was clear that *սեփրեղ* [dekret] (from *decretum*) or *սեփրեղայ* [dekretal] (from *decretalia*) come from Latin and Middle Latin (Ղազարյա 1993, 169; Ղազարյան 2001, 90, 94) (the last one – *սեփրեղայ* [dekretal], as ‘judicial law’ (Գրիգորյան 2017, 58, 60), does not exist in the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court Protocols). The Kipchak transliteration of *dekret* (also *degret*, *tegrer*, *tekret*) (Гаркавец 2010, 421) suggests that the noun could have been borrowed as an Armenian loanword in Kipchak. As in many cases and here also, the voiced alveolar stop *d* [ɲ] passes into a voiceless alveolar stop *t* [tʰ], the voiced velar stop *g* [q] passes into a voiceless velar stop *k* [kʰ], the voiceless velar stop *k* [kʰ] passes into an aspirated *k^h* [p] and voiceless alveolar stop *t* [tʰ] passes into a voiced alveolar stop *d* [ɲ] (cf. Ղազարյան 1993, 169). It seems obvious that *սեփրեղ* [dek^hret] is a Polish loanword; however, Bozhko also proposes a Ukrainian source (Բոժկո 2010, 112) as *սեփրեղ*’s [dek^hret] etymology. The word was in use in Polish by the 15th century and as a juridical term even before the 13th century. In Ukrainian, it appeared in the 16th century (Мельничук 1985, 2: 27–28) (here we can also consider Ruthenian (декрет [dekret]) (Желехівський 1886, 1: 176)). The primacy of the Polish language over Ruthenian/Ukrainian in this case (especially for geographical and chronological reasons) seems obvious. It is interesting that *սեփրեղայ* [dekredal] / *թեփրեղայ* [t^hek^hredal] (from *decretale* in Old French) also occurs in the Armenian language of France, albeit in the 12th–13th centuries (Doïmadjian-Grigoryan 2015, 144).

194. **L:** **սեփուղաղ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 757) [deputat] (Pol. *deputat*, *deputowany*, *poseł*, Eng. *allowance*, *deputy*) (cf. Magakian 2021, 238–239; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 40, 243; Ալգերեան 1868, 24, 213; Bartoszewicz 1923, 620)).

AT: the translation of *inłepniusz* [deputat] into *պատգամաւոր* [patgamavor] ('deputy, representative') proposed by MAD is only partly precise; in the 16th century, that meaning had less importance in Polish. *պատգամաւոր* [patgamavor] is the derivative of *պատգամ* ([patgam] 'message, commandment, aphorism'), which is noted by the dictionaries even in the 17th century (but not *պատգամաւոր* [patgamavor]) (Rivola 1633, 314; Մեղրեցի 1698, 267). *պատգամ* [patgam] comes from Middle Iranian **patgām* – 'message, news' (cf. Sogdean *patγām*, Persian *paiγām*, Assyrian *petgāmā* etc. (Անանեան 1979, 4: 38; Ջահուկյան 2010, 624; Olsen 1999, 901) *-աւոր* [-avor] is from the stem vowel **-ā/ə-* and Indo-European **bhor-*, which is an ablaut of **bher-* ('to carry, to bring'). Later, the stem vowel was interpreted as the interfix *-ու-* (-a-) and the suffix was applied to other stems (Ջահուկյան 2010, 802).

PM: *deputat, deputowany*, from *deputatus* – granted to someone (Sobol 1995, 224) – was a person with the authority of a governor granted on time from a higher authority. In Poland, that was usually the name of the main tribunal judges from lands and voivodships chosen by the citizens (Linde 1807, 1, 1: 420; cf. Doroszewski). But the latter meaning slowly disappeared. At the end of 19th century, we have only "legation, a group of people selected to submit the wishes of their principals or to settle a given public matter / delegation/ legal additional income besides the salary / a representative of a society, nation or state / member of parliament" (Arct 1899, 67).

R: the meaning of 'deputy' is primary, but we can conclude from the vocabulary quoted in the **MAD** (from the Kamianets-Podilskiy Court protocol) that it does not only refer to a *deputy* but more broadly to 'judges/courts': "[...] զի թագաւորն յաշխարհս չէր եւ ազգի [...] դատաստաններ էլանել է. որ կոչի **սէքուդադներ [deputatner]**. զի այնպիսի դատաստանին առջեւն չէրդային" (Գրիգորյան 1963, (77) 301–302) ('[...] the courts of the nation / people which are called *սէքուդադներ* [deputatner] [...]'). Bozhko proposes Ukrainian as the source for *սէքուդադներ* [deputat] (Բոժկո 2010, 112) – *denymam* ([deputat] 'deputy'), but does not show any Ukrainian traces. The unique evidence here may be (but not certainly) the fact that *denymatovatu* [deputatovaty] / *noculamu* [posylaty] ('to be deputies', 'to be send') had been used in Ruthenian/Ukrainian since the 16th century, however, *denymam* [deputat], similar to Polish *deputat*, since the 17th century (Мельничук 1985, 2: 34;

Желехівський 1886, 1: 177). In Eastern Armenian, the noun is also considered to be archaic, but the Russian loanword *denymam* [deputat] is sometimes used in everyday language (Փափեր 1986, 1: 499) (also borrowed from Middle Latin *deputatus*).

195. **L:** **բարձու** (Պողոսյան 2014, 204) [rat^huʃ] (Pol. *sąd*,²²⁶ *ratusz*, Eng. *court, town hall / guildhall*), **նաբձու** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 675) [rat^huʃ] (Pol. *więzienie*, Eng. *prison*)²²⁷ and **նատուշա** [ratuʃa] (Հայրապետյան 2011, 472) (Pol. *ratusz*, Eng. *town hall*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 417, 423; Ալգերեան 1868, 394; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 409).

AT: for *բարձու* [rat^huʃ] in Պողոսյան 2014, 204. *դատաստանարան* ([datastan-aran] with the meaning of ‘court’) an Iranian source is suggested (Pahlavian *dāt*, Avestan *dāta*) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 186; Olsen 1999, 876) with the suffix *-արան* [-aran] (from Iranian *-a-dān(a)-, from the stem element -a- + dāna- (place) (Ջահուկյան 1994, 60; Olsen 1999, 339–341). However, *քաղաքապետարան* ([k^haʁak^hapetaran] with the meaning of the ‘town hall’) comes from *քաղաք* ([k^haʁak^h] ‘town, city’) and is from Assyrian *kalak* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 774; Olsen 1999, 693) or *kəraχ*, *karχa* (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 542) with *պետ* [pet] (as in the case of **ջաֆար** [ʃafar] – entry no. 132) (Olsen 1999, 905) and *-արան* [-aran] (the same meaning as above). *նաբձու* [rat^huʃ] in Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 675 as *բանտ* ([bant] with the meaning of ‘prison’) from Iranian *band* (similar to Avestan *banda* or Persian *band* – both meant ‘chains’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 118; cf. Աճառեան 1971, 1: 409; Ջահուկյան 1987, 518; cf. Olsen 1999, 870). For *նատուշա* [ratuʃa] in Հայրապետյան 2011, 472 we can find the most contemporary explanation – ‘urban autonomous body in a number of European countries and Russia in the 18th–19th centuries’ or ‘the building of that body’ – and the interpretation that the noun comes from Russian *pamyua* [ratuʃa], which is a Polish loanword (*ratusz*) from German (*Rathaus* – *Rat* (‘advice’, ‘council’) and *Haus* (‘house’)) (Հայրապետյան 2011, 472).

²²⁶ According to the supposed meaning of the example of G. Alishan as NWEA explains.

²²⁷ According to Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 675) (as interpreted in the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocol).

PM: *Ratusz* (‘town hall’), since the 15th century, is the building that is the seat of the city authorities (from German *Rathaus* – *Rat* (‘council’) and *Haus* (‘house’) (Urbańczyk 1973–1977, 7: 441; Boryś 2008, 511).

R: the example in the NWEA describes people who went to the Polish *ratusz* (‘town hall’) where a man was sitting (*նստուցել է Խաչքոն* (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 675; cf. Գրիգորյան 1963, (226) 200); ‘to sit’ in Armenian also means ‘to be in the prison, to be arrested, to be incarcerated’, etc.). This fragment does not only express the meaning ‘prison’, even if the author of the text (quoted as MAD’s illustration) gives us other similar illustrations, for example, the statement of Voytko, who had been imprisoned in a Polish *Ratusz* (‘town hall’), etc. (Գրիգորյան 1963, (226) 200). The same narrowing process we also have in the case of *դատաստանարան* ([*datastanaran*] court) in the NWEA: “[...] բերեալ ի **քաթուղն [rat^hս]** (**դատաստանարան**) [*datastanaran*] զերկուքն այլ [...]" (Պողոսյան 2014, 204; Ալիշան 1896, 46) (‘brought both to the *քաթուղն* [town hall]’). Here the author of the text, describing the trial and sentence of marital treason in Kamianets-Podilskyi, additionally interprets the noun *քաթուղ* [rat^hս] as *դատաստանարան* ([*datastanaran*] ‘court’) because the word was not common for Armenians, but was in use in Polish Armenian. In the Middle Ages, people could be arrested and imprisoned in the town halls, but that does not mean that the first and unique meaning was ‘prison’ or ‘court (of justice)’. More precisely, ‘the town hall’ was ‘a house that usually housed the city court, town hall and city council’ (Gloger 1903, 4: 140). Neither in Kipchak (where the word could have been passed through Armenian) is *ratus* [ratuʃ] a prison (Гаркавец 2010, 1193). It is most likely that this (the so-called judicial) mental influence remained in the dialect of Kutuy, where, until the end of the 19th century, the ‘office’ or the ‘magistracy’ was called *tad̂st̂an*²²⁸ ([*datsdan*] ‘court, trial’), from Iranian *dātastān* (cf. Middle Persian *dātastān* or Persian *dādīstān*) – and the ‘official’ or the ‘clerk’ was *tad̂standži*²²⁹ ([*dat̂sdandʒi*], ‘someone who leads the trial, makes binding decisions’) – *tad̂st̂an* with the Turkish suffix *-ci/-çi* appended to the words to create a noun, denoting a profession, occupation, etc. (cf. Göksel and Kerslake 2005, 58–59).

²²⁸ Hanusz (1886, 465).

²²⁹ Ibidem.

196. **L:** **քրօսքա** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 820) [k^hrosk^ha] / **քրէսքա** (Գրիգորյան 1963, (150) 166–167) [k^hresk^ha] (Pol. *króćica*,²³⁰ Eng. *pistol*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 700; Ալգերեան 1868, 538; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 642).

AT: there is no equivalent in Armenian with this exact meaning, so the equivalents proposed by MAD are very precise: *ատրճանակ* [atrʃanak] (‘pistol’), *կարճափող հրացան* [kartʃap^hoʁ hrats^han] (‘short barrel rifle’). *Ատրճանակ* [atrʃanak] is rather from Iranian **āturjanak*: from *ātur* (‘fire’) and Old Persian *jan* (‘hit, kill’) (Անանեան 1971, 1: 290; Մալխասեանց 1944, 1: 251). The noun appears in Armenian only in the 18th century, although the form is much older (Ջահուկյան 2010, 83). Thus, *հրացայլ* ([hrats^haj^h] ‘fire jetting’) could be more probable chronologically (Rivola 1633, 226; cf. Ժիլբբ 1974, 3: 393; Աղայան 1976, 1: 906; Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 149), which was already noted in 1633, and is a derivative of *հրացան* [hrats^han] (Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 149) with the same (or at least synonymous) meaning. Both are derivatives of *հուր* ([hur] ‘fire, flame’) from Proto-Indo-European **pur-* / **peuōr-*, from the stem **pun-* (‘fire, flame’), similar to Greek πύρ, Old High German *fuir*, etc. It is also possible to add the Armenian noun *իշտոն* [p^hʃto] (Սուքիասյան 2009, 1168) / *իշտոնով* [p^hʃtov] (Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 65) / *իշտոնֆ* [p^hʃtof] (Մալխասեանց 1945, 505) (‘an old one-shot gun’), which is rather from Turkish *piştov* [pisʃtov] (in use in Turkish since 1680) and, at least because of the phonetics, we can conclude that it came there from Hungarian (Nişanyan). However, this is a later borrowing, after the times of the Kamianets-Podilskyi Protocols. *իշտոն* [p^hʃtoj] or *իշտոնով* [p^hʃtov], even at the beginning of the 19th century, was translated into English with the meaning of ‘bladder’ (Aucher 1819, 15); however, there was also the French equivalent *fusée* (‘rifle’) (Aucher 1817, 2: 641). A bit later, the same lexicographers also noted it in English with the additional meaning of ‘cartridge, fusee’ (Brand 1825, 600) (also with the meaning of ‘flintlock, rifle’).

PM: a possible source for the Armenian *քրօսքա* [k^hrosk^ha] / *քրէսքա* [k^hresk^ha] could be Polish *kroszka* [kroʃka] then *króćica* (*krocica*, *krucica* ‘*krocice*’) [krutʃ^hits^ha (krotʃ^hits^ha, krutʃ^hits^ha, krotʃ^hits^he)]. Both mean ‘pistol, small gun’ (cf. Krasnowolski and Niedźwiedzki 1920, 1: 139; Linde 1808, 1, 2: 1140,

²³⁰ According to Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 820).

1134; Brückner 1927, 1: 270), but *króćica* (the Polish explanation proposed by MAD), which is from Slavic **kortьk* (short) (Derksen 2008, 236), came into use in Polish only in the 17th–18th centuries (SJP PWN), after the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court Protocols. Thus, we can exclude any form of derivation from *króćica* [krutʰitsʰa].

R: I do not exclude that the noun may also have been influenced by Ukrainian, namely the affectionate expression *кроска, крошка* [kroska, kroʃka] (Мельничук 1989, 3: 96), but it is difficult to agree completely with Bozhko’s statement that *քրեսքա* [kʰreskʰa] has a clearly Ukrainian origin (Բոժկո 2010, 112). In both cases, the same protocol expressly refers to “lethal” intentions: “[...] վասն ի՞նչ պատճառի իմ վերայ **քրօքա** [kʰroskʰa] կու վերցնիս [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (150) 166–167) (‘why did you aim at me with a *քրօքա* [kʰroskʰa]?’) or “[...] մտաւ իւր տունն եւ **քրեսքան** [kʰreskʰa] պատրաստեց ընդդէմ ինձի [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (150) 166–167) (‘he entered into the house and prepared *քրեսքան* [kʰreskʰa] against me’).

197. **L:** **օպոզ** (Պողոսյան 2014, 220) [oboz] (Pol. *obóz*, Eng. *camp*) (cf. Magakian 2021, 239–240; Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 133; Ալզերեան 1868, 106; Ալզերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 118; Bartoszewicz 1923, 538)).

AT: *համբար* ([tʃambar] ‘camp’), a loanword from Middle Persian *čambar* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 487; Olsen 1999, 892) and *թափոր* ([tʰapʰor] ‘procession, cortege’), from Turkish *tabur* (‘infantry, company’), known at least since the beginning of the 17th century, could be equivalents of *օպոզ* [oboz] (Աճառեան 1973, 2: 167; Nişanyan).

PM: in Polish *obóz* or *tabor* since the 15th century, with the initial meaning of *camp* – ‘a fortified place in the open air where, for example, the army gathers and stays during a military expedition’ (Borys 2008, 375, 625; Urbańczyk 1065–1969, 5: 365; Urbańczyk 1982–1987, 9: 80).

R: In Kipchak, we can find *tabor* (Гаркавец 2010, 1363) and *oboz* (Гаркавец 2010, 1030) (as synonyms). As an Armenian equivalent of the first noun,

Harkavets proposes *բանակ* ([banak] ‘army’) / *բանակապետի* ([banakatek] ‘(army) encampment’) – probably an Iranian loanword in Armenian, but its primary source is not known (Չահնկյան 2010, 118) and for the second noun, *հանգրվան* ([hangrvan] ‘asylum, haven’), which could also be an Iranian loanword (Չահնկյան 2010, 446). The next point is that the old version of Polish *tabor* was *tabór* [tabur] (Boryś 2008, 624–625; Doroszewski) which seems to be closer to Turkish (Nişanyan). However, there is a presumption that the word originally came from Old Bohemian *tábor* (Linde 1812, 3: 590; cf. Boryś 2008, 624–625). *Obóz* has a slightly wider usage. It is a Proto-Slavic noun **obozъ* from **obvozъ* (‘what is transported, to transport from place to place’, i.e. ‘weights, luggage, rolling stock, temporary residence of the army’, etc.) (Boryś 2008, 375). A similar meaning of *obóz* can also be found in Ruthenian *обоз* ([oboz] ‘war camps, carts’) (Желехівський 1886, 1: 545). We can suppose that the noun passed to Armenian from Polish or Ruthenian, after which it could have passed to Kipchak.

Uncategorized

198. **L:** **ժիլա**²³¹ (Hanusz 1886, 477) [zila] (Pol. *żyła*, Eng. *vein* (cf. Ամմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 1059; Ալգերեան 1868, 778; Ալգերեան and Պրէնստեան 1821, 1: 937)).

AT: the apt Armenian equivalent/explanation is *երակ* [jerak] (Rivola 1633, 109), which is from Iranian **rak/rag* (Ջահուկյան 2010, 220; cf. Մալխասեանց 1944, 1: 571; Աճառեան 1973, 2: 36; Olsen 1999, 879). For Kipchak, *žila* (‘nerve, vein’), Harkavets also proposed Armenian *ջիլ* ([dzil] ‘tendon’) and *ամոլաջիլ* ([amoladzil], both nerves of thigh and their union (Աղայան 1971, 1: 34)) (Гаркавец 2010, 1798), or *ամոլաջիր* ([amoladzir]) (Гаркавец 2010, 1798) (with the same meaning as *ամոլաջիլ* [amoladzil]). *ամոլաջիր* [amoladzir] occurs in Armenian rather as *ամոլաջիլ* [amoladzil] (Աղայան 1976, 1: 34). *Ջիլ* [dzil] is a Proto-Indo-European loanword from the stem **guhsla* (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 127) with the general meaning of ‘tendon’ or *nervus* (Rivola 1633, 327; Մեղրեցի 1698, 274). *ամոլաջիլ* [amoladzil] is a compound noun (*ամոլ* [amol]) both (Մեղրեցի 1698, 15; Աճառեան 1971, 1: 160)) with an uncertain etymology (Աճառեան 1971, 1: 160)) and linked to the above-mentioned *ջիլ* [dzil] with the conjunction *ու* [a].

PM: the noun has been known in Polish since the 15th–16th centuries and comes from the Proto-Slavic **žila* (‘vein, tendon’) (Boryś 2008, 759; cf. Derksen 2008, 562) and means ‘a vessel in the human body containing blood’ (Urbańczyk 1995–2002, 11: 616; Brückner 1927, 2: 669).

R: the possible path of the borrowing for Polish Armenian could be, as Hanusz supposes (Hanusz 1886, 477), Polish *żyła* or Ruthenian *жила* [zyła] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 222; Фасмер 1986, 2: 55; Мельничук 1985, 2 197). Chronologically

²³¹ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *žylà* [zila] (Hanusz 1886, 477).

(Boryś 2008, 759) and geographically, Polish seems to be a more appropriate source.

199. **L:** լուզա (Հայրապետյան 2011, 260) [luza] (Pol. *luza*,²³² Eng. *pocket* (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 710; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտան 1821, 1: 650)).

AT: the Armenian explanation of the DFW is the most appropriate – ‘billiard ball sack’ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 260).

PM: the Armenian translation contains an error: *luza* is given instead of *luza*. The Polish meaning is ‘one of the six holes in the pool table to which the balls fall’. *Słownik języka polskiego* suggests French *blouse* as a source of the borrowing (Karłowicz et al. 1902, 2: 828) as confirmed by TLFi.

R: several Russian sources interpret *луза* [luza] as the Polish loanword (Евгеньева 1983, 2: 203; Kartaslov.ru etc.). The noun, however, could have instead penetrated into Armenian through Russian and is not very widespread.

200. **L:** լոդ (Гаркавец 2010, 927; Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 297) [lot] (Pol. *lot/lut*, Eng. *lot/loth*).

AT: Harkavets proposes *դիդրաքմա* [didrak^hma] or *դիդրաքսանա* [didraxama] as ‘double drakhma’ (Гаркавец 2010, 927), which we can find with the same meaning in Armenian dictionaries (cf. Անտոնյան 1926, 1: 667–668; Մալխասյան 1944, 1: 593).

PM: in Polish, *lot* [lot] (rather *lot* [lot]) is interpreted as a unit of weight – 1/32 pounds, approximately 12.80 g (Linde 1808, 1, 2: 1292; cf. Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 132) – and is a loanword from Middle High German *lōt* (since 14th century (Boryś 2008, 306; cf. Kluge 1891, 220)).

²³² Spelling according to Հայրապետյան (2011, 260).

R: we find this noun in the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocol as weight unit (Գրիգորյան 1963, (136) 160–161).

201. **L:** յօթօղ (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 297) [lok^hot(d)] (Pol. *lokietć*, Eng. *ell*, *elbow*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 298, 300; Ալգերեան 1868, 256, 257; Ալգերեան and Պրէստեան 1821, 1: 296)).

AT: the translation MAD proposes յօթօղ²³³ as *արմունկ* [armunk] from Polish *lokietć* [lokietʃ^h] – a unit of measurement (from elbow to tip of median) (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 297; Կիրակոսյան 2017, 24). Jahukyan explains *արմունկ* as Indo-European **ar-(ə)-ma-* from the stem **ar-* (‘adjust’) with the suffix *-nկ(ն)* [uk(n)] (cf. Sanskrit *īrmá-* (‘hand’, ‘front paw’), Avestan *arəma* (‘arm’, ‘hand’), Latin *armus* (‘forearm’) etc.) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 93). H. Kirakosyan adds some other comparisons: Avestan **frārāθni-* (<*frārāθni-drājah-* as ‘one ell length’), Old Persian *arašni* (‘unit of measure’) etc. (Կիրակոսյան 2017, 24). In Armenian, as Harkavets also noted (Гаркавец 2010, 179, 926), we also have *կանգուն* ([kangun] ‘a unit of measurement (rather from elbow to tip of median)’) (Մալխասյան 1944, 2: 382) with an unclear etymology. Acharyan writes about possible Greek (αγκών – ‘ell’) or Persian (*kang* – ‘arm’, which was from the fingertips to the middle of the chest) sources, etc. (Աճարյան 1973, 2: 511; cf. Olsen 1999, 606–607). The last option is *արշին* [arʃin] – ‘a unit of measurement (mainly from elbow to tip of the median)’ rather from the Russian unit of measurement *аршин* [arʃin] (Մարգարյան 2001, 1: 133) of Turkish origin (Фасмер 1986, 1: 93) or directly from Turkish/Kipchak *arşin* [arʃin], where it came from Middle Persian (Nişanyan). Of course, these units of measurement, in different historical periods and different countries, were also of different lengths (in Lviv, for example, it was 59.40 cm (Гаркавец 2010, 926), in Armenia 76.7 cm (Մանանդյան 1930, 120) etc.).

PM: Polish *lokietć* comes from Proto-Slavic *olkъtь* (Мельничук 1989, 3: 283) or *olkъtь* (*olkъte/olkъti*) (cf. as measure of length, Lithuanian *úolektis* etc.) (Borys 2008, 300; cf. Brückner 1927, 1: 311; Фасмер 1986, 2: 514). The meaning is

²³³ As in the following example: “[...] ԻԳ (23) յօթօղ ուարուս. որ է արժէքն Ա (1) Ա (1) հրոշ” [‘about a tablecloth of 23 elbows length and its cost ...’] (Գրիգորյան 1963, (92) 139–140).

‘elbow (joint) at the hand also the forearm and length measure varies depending on the area, usually about 60 cm’ (Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 116).

R: the form *lokot* never existed in Polish (cf. Boryś 2008, 300; Brückner 1027, 1: 311; Фасмер 1986, 2: 514; Urbańczyk 1963–1965, 4: 116; Мельничук 1989, 3: 283, etc.). The source of the noun could be Russian or Ruthenian *локоть* [lokotʹ] (Фасмер 1986, 2: 514; Желехівський 1886, 1: 413) or even Ukrainian *локот* [lokot] (Мельничук 1989, 3: 283), which is more likely as Bozhko supposes (Բոժկո 2010, 112). Harkavets proposes *կանգուն* [kangun] (Гаркавец 2010, 926).

202. **L:** **կազել** (Պողոսյան 2014, 102) [kazel/gazel] (Pol. *kazać, skazywać* and many other assumptions, Eng. *to order, to punish* and other numerous derivations) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 648–649, 745; Ալգերեան 1868, 503, 574; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 599).

AT: the most appropriate verbs in Armenian according to NWEA are *դատել* ([datel] ‘to judge’) and *պատժել* ([patzel] ‘to punish’). *դատել* [datel] is a verb from *դատ* [dat], similar to the cases of *բարձու* [ratʰu], *բամբակ* [pametnij], *մինութայ* [minutʰaj], *փրորարար* [pʰrokʰurator]. The verb *պատժել* [patzel] (from the noun *պատիժ* [patiz]) is an Iranian loanword without a reliable source: it could be from Middle Persian *paddahišn, patdahašn, padašn* (‘remuneration, compensation’) or from Old Iranian **patīzā* (‘mutual request’) etc. (Անանյան 1979, 4: 41; Ջահուկյան 2010, 625).

PM: the general sense in Old-Polish was ‘recommend, command, order, make something happen, force to something’ (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 251; Boryś 2008, 225) or in modern Polish ‘tell someone to do something’ (SJP PWN).

R: NWEA interprets the word as a Russian loanword from *казать* ([kazatʹ] ‘to punish’) (Фасмер 1986, 2: 159) and gives a text of Simeon Lehatsi (Պողոսյան 2014, 102) as an illustration of where the verb comes from: Այլ եւ որիչ եւ զսս դատաստան ունին եւ սուր, որ զիս զոյս եւ զաւազակս **կազեն** [kazen] եւ զիսստեն (Ակինեան 1936, 338). It is about ‘a judgment, condemning someone to punishment and beheading’. The comment of Father (vardapet) Nerses Akinean

about Russian *казать* [kázat'] as 'to punish' in the footnote on the same page seems to be a misunderstanding. According to Russian sources (Фасмер 1986, 2: 159; Словарь Даля; Евгеньева 1983, 2: 14, etc), the verb *казать* [kázat'] does not literally mean 'to punish' and can only be interpreted (or even overinterpreted) with that meaning. Perhaps Nerses Akinean was wrong about *казнуть* [kaznit'] ('to execute, put to death') or (more likely) the comment could have been mistakenly acknowledged as *каратъ* [karat'] ('to punish'). This is more likely since Simeon Lehatsi writes about 'condemning and beheading' in the (quite awkward) text that follows (կազնիւ եւ զկազնիւն [kazen jev gɫʰaten]) 'the thief and the robber'. Etymologically, the verb *казнуть* (coming from **kāzàti* ('to show')) (Derksen 2008, 222) is cognate with *казнь* [kazn'] (coming from **kaznъ* ('punishment, execution')) (Derksen 2008, 222), but in Russian the word does not have the meaning 'to punish' (as suggested by Nerses Akinean). The case is a little bit complicated because Simeon Lehatsi created a new verb in Armenian by adding an Armenian suffix *-իւ* [en] (3rd person plural in the tense closest to Present Simple) to the Slavic stem *kaz/kāz* (*казать* [kázat'], *казнуть* [kaznit'], *казнь* [kazn'], *kazać* [kazaɫʰ], *każń* [kazn] etc.). Moreover, in the beginning of the 17th century, if we speak about Slavic languages, it is hard to talk about Polish Armenians' knowledge of the Russian language, rather they were acquainted with Ruthenian *казати* [kazaty] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 329–330) or modern Ukrainian (Фасмер 1986, 2: 564; Драгоманов 1870, 754–801; Соловьев 1947, 24–38; Онацький 1960, 903–904, etc.). Thus, we could have:

- *kaz* [kaz] + *իւ* [en] = Polish *kaz* with Armenian *իւ* [en] – *kazիւ* [kazen] (Arm. կազնիւ [kazen]),
- *каз* [kaz] + *իւ* [en] = Ruthenian *каз* [kaz] with Armenian *իւ* [en] – *kazիւ* [kazen] (Arm. կազնիւ [kazen]).

The loanword seems to be of Polish origin. It has existed in the language since the 14th century as a verb for 'ordering or even forcing someone to do something' and also as the noun *kazanie* with the meaning of 'court sentence or court judgment' (Boryś 2008, 225; Brückner 1927, 1: 223, 224). In modern Polish *kazanie* means 'sermon'.

203. **L:** կուլակ²³⁴ (Hanusz 1886, 430) [kulak] (Pol. *kulak*, Eng. *fist*). (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 348; Ալգերեան 1868, 301; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 350).

AT: the Armenian equivalent is *բրունկ* ([brunts^hk^h] ‘fist’), which is the derivative of *բրնն* ([burn] with the same meaning) coming from the Proto-Indo-European **bhōr-* or **bhōr-no-* from the stem **bher-* (‘to bring, take’), for instance, Sanskrit *bharitra-m* (‘hand’) etc. (Ջահուկյան 2010, 140; cf. Աճառեան 1971, 1: 486–487).

PM: Linde defines *kulak* [kulak] as ‘the fist formed into a sphere’ (Linde 1808, 1, 2: 1180). Brückner interprets *kulak* as ‘fist’, which is from Hungarian *kulyak* (Brückner 1927, 1: 281). Vasmer supposes that the noun comes from Turkic *kulak/qulaq* (cf. Starostin, Dybo, and Mudrak 2003, 637) cognate with Turkish *kol* (an arm – known at least since the 15th century (Nişanyan)) (Фасмер 1986, 2: 408–409).

R: Hanusz supposes that the noun *կուլակ* (also well-known in Kipchak (Гаркавец 2010, 762) probably through Armenian) could have been borrowed from Polish *kulak* or from Ruthenian/Ukrainian (Желехівський 1886, 1: 388) *кулак* [kulak] with the same meaning. In Armenian, *կուլակ* is known as Russian loanword from *кулак* ([kulak] ‘fist’) but only with the meaning of a rich peasant who uses and abuses poor ones (Մալխասեանց 1944, 2: 480).

204. **L:** մախինա (Հայրապետյան 2011, 343) [maχina] (Pol. *machina*, Eng. *machine*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 564; Ալգերեան 1868, 444; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 526).

AT: the explanation in Armenian is ‘too big, a giant thing’ (Հայրապետյան 2011, 343). The equivalent of *մախինա* in Armenian is *մեքենա(j)* [mek^hena(j)] as *հնար* [hnar], *հնարք* [hnark^h], *ճարտարություն* [tʃartaruth^hjun] (‘knack, dexterity, handiness’, etc.) (Մերերցի 1698, 211; Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 312), which probably passed into Armenian and Latin (*machina*) (Աճառեան 1977, 3: 310)

²³⁴ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *kulàk* [kulak].

from Greek μηχανή (*mēkhanē* – ‘device’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 524) or via Syriac (Olsen 1999, 926). *մախինա* [*maχina*] can mainly be found in Armenian in the expression *deus ex machina* (in Latin or Armenian alphabets). But still, we can find the noun *մախինացի* ([*maχinatshia*] – ‘machination, manipulation’) in Armenian from the word *machina* (Յարութիւնեանց 1912, 214; Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 235; Olsen 1999, 926; Մելիք 1930/2016, 146 etc.). However, that word also has a literary equivalent – *մեքենայություն* [*mekʰenajutjun*].

PM: we can still find the word *machina* [*maχina*] in Polish as ‘tool’ or ‘device’ (SPXVI). Linde explains the noun as ‘any tool for multiplying the effects of any force’ (Linde 1809, 2, 1: 3). In Polish, the noun *machina* also comes from Latin *machina* and is mainly used with the meaning of ‘a large and heavy machine or a complex, too complicated system’ (Sobol 1995, 672; cf. Brückner 1927, 1: 317).

R: Russian *машина* [*maχina*] is obviously a Polish loanword (Фасмер 1986, 2: 584; Мельничук 1989, 3: 419) and is the source for the rare Armenian form *մախինա* [*maχina*].

205. **L:** շրուքայ (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 594) [*ʃtʰukʰaj*] (Pol. *sztuka*, Eng. *piece, item, unit*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 506, 695, 1044; Ալզերեան 1868, 535, 757; Ալզերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 659, 909).

AT: MAD proposes two nouns very close to each other with the meaning of *huun* [*hat*] (‘item, piece’) and *միավոր* [*miavor*] (unit). *huun* [*hat*], according to Jahukyan, does not have a very clean origin. It could probably have come from Hittite (or close to Hittite), for example, *hattāi-* (‘to cut, to puncture, to tear’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 450). *միավոր* [*miavor*] is the Proto-Indo-European word **smio-* from the stem **sem-* (‘one, together’), similar to Greek μή (Ջահուկյան 2010, 526; Աճառեան 1977, 3: 317–318).

PM: *sztuka* [*ʃtuka*] (piece, item) has been in Polish since the 14th century (also – ‘one, something, someone’) as a Middle Upper German loanword from *stuck(e)*/

stück(e) (Boryś 2008, 607). Even through, according to Brückner, it spread into Ruthenian (as *штuka* [ʃtuka]) via Polish (Brückner 1927, 2: 555) in the 17th century (Фасмер 1987, 4: 480), we can also add Ukrainian since the 16th century (*штuka* [ʃtuka]) (Мельничук 2012, 6: 482; Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 1100).

R: it seems that there is little doubt regarding borrowing from Polish.

206. **L:** շտուկա²³⁵ (Hanusz 1886, 463) [ʃtuka] (Pol. *sztuka*, Eng. *art*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 58; Ալգերեան 1868, 45; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 49).

AT: *արվեստ* [arvest] seems to be an Iranian loanword – Old-Persian *aruvasta* (in the same meaning) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 94).

PM: has been known since the 14th century (as ‘one thing, a part, an example’, etc.), but in Polish Armenian, according to J. Hanusz, the meaning of ‘art, proficiency in doing something, artistry’ has to be taken into consideration. The noun is a Middle-Upper-German loanword from *stuck(e)/stück(e)* (‘a part, unit, thing, piece of a larger whole’, etc.). In Polish, the word took on a new meaning of ‘art, craft’ in association with the Old-Polish meaning of ‘masterly made item by a craftsman (a craftsman’s product, in particular a product entitling him to obtain the degree of journeyman or foreman)’ (Boryś 2008, 607; cf. Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 581–582).

R: according to J. Hanusz, the word in at least the Kutuy dialect (in my opinion generally in Polish Armenian speech) passed from Ruthenian *штuka* [ʃtuka] (Желехівський and Недільський т. 2 1886, 1100) or Polish *sztuka* [ʃtuka] (Hanusz 1886, 463).

²³⁵ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *štukà* [ʃtuka]

207. **L:** շ(հ)րկա²³⁶ (Hanusz 1886, 459) [ʃiarka] (Pol. *siarka*, Eng. *sulfur/sulphur*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 951; Ալգերեան 868, 687).

AT: *ծծուկ* [tstsumb] has an uncertain etymology (cf. Աճառեան 1973, 2: 462) but is an apt translation of *sulfur/sulphur*.

PM: the chemical element *siara* [ʃiara], *szara* [ʃara], *siarka* [ʃiarka], *szarka* [ʃarka] has been known in Polish since the 15th century. It is from the Proto-Indo-European stem **sĕra* with an uncertain etymology (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 162; Linde 1812, 3: 224; Boryś 2008, 544).

R: it can be said with certainty that շ(հ)րկա [ʃiarka] is a Polish loanword. From the explanations by Hanusz it appears that it is the chemical element *sulfur* (Hanusz 1886, 459), but it is possible that the noun could have been used at least (but not only) in the Kutu dialect to also mean *colostrum*.

208. **L:** պլամա²³⁷ (Hanusz 1886, 452) [plama] (Pol. *plama*, Eng. *stain*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 919; Ալգերեան 1868, 679; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 816).

AT: *բիծ* ([bits] ‘skin blemish’, ‘mark’, ‘pimple’, ‘blemish’, ‘dirt’, ‘defect’) (Մեղրեցի 1698, 55; Rivola 1633, 61; Աղայան 1976, 1: 191) could be a Proto-Indo-European loanword from **bhidio-* (or **bhid-s-*) from the stem **bheid-* (‘to break, slit’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 129), which, according to Olsen, is inflectionally unclear (Olsen 1999, 501).

PM: the noun *plama* [plama] comes from Proto-Slavic *plĕna* (Boryś 2008, 439). In Polish, it has been in use since the 17th century (Boryś 2008, 439) and is a synonym of nouns such as ‘desecration, freckle’, ‘being dirty’ (Urbańczyk 1970–1973, 6: 87, 196, 309) etc.

²³⁶ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *śirkà* [ʃiara].

²³⁷ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *plamà* [plama].

R: the noun is a clear borrowing from Polish because, as Brückner emphasizes, it does not occur in other Slavic languages (Brückner 1927, 2: 417).

209. **L:** **պոլոնիզմ** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 444) [polonizm] (Pol. *polonizm*, Eng. *polonizm*).

AT: the word *պոլոնիզմ* [polonizm] is seldomly used in Armenian. It is a Polish loanword and means ‘Polish word or phrase borrowed in other languages’. The Armenian equivalent is *լեհաբանություն* [lehabanut^hjun] (Հայրապետյան 2011, 444). Here we have *լեհ* ([leh]²³⁸ ‘a Pole’) – possibly a loanword from Ottoman Turkish *لَه* [leh / lah] (Կարապետյան 1912, 714), the conjunction *ու* [a] and *բան* ([ban] ‘word, thought, idea, understanding’) from Proto-Indo-European *bhā* – ‘to speak’ (Աճառյան 1940, 1: 40–41) with the suffix – *ություն* [-ut^hjun] (like in **ձեխմիսոր** [dzeχmistr] – entry no. 127).

PM: in Polish it comes from French *polonisme*, which means ‘a word, phrase, grammatical form borrowed from the Polish language’ (Sobol 1995, 881).

R: in Armenian it could have been borrowed indirectly from Russian but also (less possible) directly from Polish. It is hardly ever seen apart from the professional literature.

210. **L:** **պոլոնիստիկա** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 444) [polonistika] (Pol. *polonistyka*, Eng. *Polish studies, polonistics*).

AT: is used very rarely in Armenian and means ‘knowledge of Polish (but not only the language/literature)’. The Armenian equivalent is *լեհագիտություն* [lehagitut^hjun] (Հայրապետյան 2011, 444): *լեհ* [leh], *ու* [a] and *գիտ* [git] from the Proto-Indo-European stem *ueid-/*uoid- (‘to see, to know’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 160) with *-ություն* [-ut^hjun]²³⁹.

²³⁸ Latin equivalents in Middle Armenian are *Sarmatia, Polonia* (Poland) and *Sarmata* (Pole) (Rivola 1633, 156).

²³⁹ Similar to **ձեխմիսոր** [dzeχmistr] – entry no. 127.

PM: humanistic discipline dealing with Polish literature and the Polish language.

R: in Armenian it could have been borrowed indirectly from Russian but also (less possibly) directly from Polish. It is hardly ever seen apart from the professional literature.

211. **L:** **ռաթայ** (Գազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 675) [rat^haj] (Pol. *rata*, Eng. *instal(l)ment*) (cf. Ասմանզուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 493).

AT: *մուծում/մուծանք* [mutsum/mutsank^h], *վճար* [vtʃar] was proposed by MAD (Գազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 675) with the meaning ‘payment’. In Middle Armenian, we can find some (at least two) nouns as appropriate equivalent of ‘installment’. *մոյծ* [mojts] for *մուծում*, *մուծանք* [mutsum/mutsank^h] (verbal forms of *մուծել* [mutsel], *մուծանել* [mutsanel] ‘to pay’) (cf. Rivola 1633, 266; Մեղրեցի 1698, 216) and *վճար* [vtʃar] (verbal form of *վճարել* ([vtʃarel] ‘to pay’). *Մոյծ* [mojts] (*մուծել* [mutsel], *մուծանել* [mutsanel] etc.) is probably Proto-Indo-European *(s)mug- from *(s)meug stem (‘to slide’, ‘to creep’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 537). *վճար* (still valid in both Armenians) is an Iranian borrowing (cf. Middle Persian *vičar/vičār* – ‘fee’, ‘end, termination’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 713). In Modern Persian the form *guzār* (‘loan payment’) continues *vičār* (Աճառեան 1979, 4: 345). Verb *վճարել* [vtʃarel] in 1633 was already mentioned in Latin as *soluere debitum* (Rivola 1633, 353) (‘to pay the debt’).

PM: *rata* ([rata] ‘installment’) proposed by MAD still means ‘a part of monetary receivables, debt within the given period’ and comes from German *Rate*, from Latin *rata (pars)* (‘deducted (part)’) (Sobol 1995, 938; Brückner 1927, 2: 454; Դարձաբեւ 2010, 1192–1193).

R: there are many protocols of the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court in which the matter of the *installment* (with the above-mentioned meaning) is discussed.²⁴⁰

²⁴⁰ See details: “[...] Եւ պիտի վճարէ ի Դ (4) **ռաթան** [rat^han]. Այսինքն է ամէն տարի բաժին ԺԵ (15) – ական ֆլորին [...]. [...] զի Վաստն վաւական արասցէ զամէն **ռաթան** [rat^han] իւր ժամանական նախդ սպիտակով. առանց խօսաց [...].” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (46) 118); “[...] վճարեց այս տարուն զմի **ռաթան** [rat^han] ԺԵ (15) ֆլորին [...].” (Գրիգորյան 1963,

It is worth adding that I did not find *նաթայ* [ratʰaj] (e.g. Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 675; Գրիգորյան 2017, 60; Ղազարյա 1993, 170 etc.) in the protocols of the Kamianets-Podilskiy Court. There is only *նաթա(ն)* ([ratʰa(n)] ‘installment’). The example given in MAD (“[...] զի Վասրոն վաւական արասցէ զամէն **նաթան [ratʰan]** իւր ժամանական նախդ սախտակով. առանց իուսաց [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (46) 118) simply testifies to the meaning of *նաթա* [ratʰa] but not *նաթայ* [ratʰaj]. Moreover, in Polish the word *rataj* had a slightly different meaning. *Rataj*, since the beginning of the 15th century “meant feudally dependent peasant who, in exchange for a loan for his (household) development, was obliged to work for the feudal lord, also a landless rural worker, hired for manual labor” (Urbańczyk 1973–1977, 7: 440, cf. **òrtajb* in Derksen 2008, 376; Brückner 1927, 2: 454). For Polish Armenians, there is a small possibility that the noun *նաթայ* could mean *credit*²⁴¹ because, for example, in both Ukrainian and Kirchak (Гаркавец 2010, 1192–1193) (also Ruthenian (Желехівський and Недільский 1886, 2: 797)) the word *pama* [rata] and *rata* meant ‘installment’ and could have been borrowed from Polish (Мельничук 2006, 5: 29) or through Polish from Latin (Мельничук 2006, 5: 28). However, it is worth remembering that Polish *rataj* as well as Ruthenian/Ukrainian *pamaï* [rataj] (Желехівський and Недільский 1886, 2: 797) also meant ‘field worker’.

(265) 221); “[...] Վասրո չաղչիպանն ետուր Բ (2) ուսում **նաթան [ratʰan]** ԺԵ (15) ֆորին [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (287) 229); “[...] եթէ չվճառէ ի գրեպ ժամանակն **զնաթան [zratʰan]** [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (528) 320–321), “[...] եւ երեր զառաջին **նաթան [ratʰan]** [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (542) 326–327) etc.

²⁴¹ For *credit* in Armenian there are at least three possibilities: *սպարիկ* [aparik], *վարկ* [vark] or *կրեդիտ* [kredit].

- *սպարիկ* [aparik] consists of *սպ* [ap] (a prefix that gives the word a negative meaning) or *սպա* (as the alternative form of *սպ*) – probably from Iranian languages (cf. Avestan or Old Persian *apa* – ‘far, except’) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 65). The next element is *ար* [ar], the Proto Indo-European stem **ar-* (‘adjust’), which could be compared with Greek *ἀρραίσχω* (‘set, fasten, attach, adjust’), Tocharian a *ihharwār* – ‘ready’, etc. (Ջահուկյան 2010, 75);
- *վարկ* [vark] we can find in *Բառգիրք Հայոց* in Armenian as early as 1698 with the meaning of *counting* (Մեղրեցի 1698, 297). It is probably an Iranian loanword from the Indo-European stem **uer-* – ‘to notice, to pay attention’ (Ջահուկյան 2010, 707). *Վարկ* was well known even in Old Armenian (Grabar) (Խաչատրյան 2016, 395).

For *credit* there were also dialectal forms: *նիսիա/նիսյա* [nisia/nisja] (Մալխասեանց 1944, 2: 463) or *վերասի* [verasi], *վերեսի* [veresi] (Թահմազ 128), which is a Turkish loanword from *veresiye* (‘to give the money’ later), noted first in the language in 1317 (Nişanyan).

212. **L:** **սգալքա** (Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան 2015, 30) [skalk^ha] (Pol. *skalnica*, Eng. *saxifrage* (plant)).²⁴²

AT: the authors propose *քարկոտրուկ* [k^harkotruk] (known also as *քարքեկ* [k^harbak] Սուրիսյան 1967, 669)), which is a kind of plant often used for crushing urinary tract/bladder stones (Ժիրք 1980, 4: 723; Ճլրեճեան et al. 1992, 2: 1091 etc).

PM: the apt Polish translation of *քարկոտրուկ* [k^harkotruk] is *skalnica* [skalnits^ha].

R: both Polish and Armenian translations have nothing to do with the actual meaning of *սգալքա* [skalk^ha]. The plural of the noun appears in the protocol of the Court in Kamianets-Podilskyi. From the context, it follows that it is an expert opinion: **սգալքաներն** ([skalk^hanern] the skalk^has) was used to make the *ջիլցա* [dzilts^ha] / *շիլցա* [tʃ^hilts^ha] – women’s frontal jewelry (cf. Գրիգորյան 1963, (556) 332–333). Thus, as Harkavets explains, *սգալքա* [skalk^ha] (Ukrainian *скалка* [skalka]) is simply the constituent elements of the *ջիլցա* [dzilts^ha] / *շիլցա* [tʃ^hilts^ha] – women’s frontal jewelry (Гаркавец 2010, 385, 1783) – something similar to the cylinder-shaped pendants.²⁴³ This loanword is rather of Ruthenian/Ukrainian origin but not Polish, even if it appears in the Kamianets-Podilskyi protocol.

213. **L:** **սիրըյ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 702) [sirəj] (Pol. *siwy*, Eng. *gra(e)y*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 411; Ալգերեան 1868, 341; Ալգերեան and Պրեմսեան 1821, 1: 399).

AT: *գորշ* ([gorʃ] ‘gray’) or *մոխրագույն* ([moχragujn] ‘gra(e)y’). *գորշ* [gorʃ] is probably Proto-Indo-European **ghor-s-* from the stem **gher-* – ‘to shine’ (cf. Old High German *grāu*, German *grau*, English *grey*, French *gris*, Old Upper German *grīs*, German *greis* – ‘grey’ etc.) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 170; Աճառեան 1971, 1: 584). However, the etymology is not quite certain (Olsen 1999, 962). The next possible translation is *մոխրագույն* [moχragujn] from

²⁴² Translations according to Գրիգորյան and Պարոնյան (2015, 30).

²⁴³ Private correspondence with Professor Oleg Leszczak from 9.04.2022.

մոխիր ([moχir] ‘ash’), again with an uncertain origin but could have probably come from *մոծիր* ([motsir] ‘coal duff’, ‘fire spark’, ‘piece of burning wood’, ‘thin ash on the fire’) (Աղայան 1973, 2: 1025; Սարգսյան 2007, 4: 74) and is perhaps from the Indo-European stem **smē-* (**smei-*) – ‘scrape, scratch’ (Չառնուկյան 2010, 533). After the conjunction *ու* [a], we have *գույն* ([gujn] ‘color’), which is an Iranian borrowing (cf. Sanskrit *guṇa* – ‘color’, Middle Persian *gūn/gōn* – ‘color’, Modern Persian *gūnāgūn* – ‘spotted, pied’, Avestan *gaona* – ‘color’ etc.) (Չառնուկյան 2010, 167; Անտոնյան 1971, 1: 578; Olsen 1999, 219 etc.).

PM: the translation of Polish *siwy* (proposed by MAD) is correct, but the origin of *սիրայ* [sirəj] *siwy* ([ʃivy] ‘gra(e)y’) is not precise. The adjective likely comes from West-Slavic **χοi-ro-* (Фасмер 1987, 3: 610–611).

R: the misunderstandings come from the context of the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court Protocol: something obvious in the 16th century is not always as clear in modern times. For example, in “[...] վասն զի ի յետ այս կովին Բ (2) կով այլ գողացած է՝ Ա (1) բռնվլլ **սիրայ** [sirəj] եւ միւսն թուիս” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (389) 263–264) (it is about ‘stolen a gray cow with dark meat’), the context itself leads to defining the Polish noun *սիրայ* [sirəj] as *siwy* [ʃivy]. Currently, this word is understood as the equivalent of ‘gra(e)y’, which in that time was also a ‘white gray species of horses and cattle’ or ‘blue purple’ and ‘dark blue’ colors (Urbańczyk 1977–1981, 8: 213). *Siwy* [ʃivy], which comes from Proto-Slavic *sivъ*, could also mean also ‘white gray, silvery (hair)’ (Borys 2008, 549; Derksen 2008, 451–452). If the Armenians borrowed Polish *siwy* into Armenian the loanword might have also been *սիվի(յ)* [sivi(j)] or *շիվի(յ)* [ʃivi(j)] – similar to Kipchak *siviy* [sivyj] from Polish *siwy* (Гаркавец 2010, 1273) (maybe also through Armenian). *սիրայ* [siryj] seems to be rather a Ruthenian/Ukrainian loanword from *сіпуї* [siryj] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 868; Мельничук 2006, 5: 224, 256), which Bozhko also confirms (Բոճկո 2010, 112).

214. **L:** **սվոյեց** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 717) [svojets^h] (Pol. unknown noun, no translation but interpreted as ‘ornamented necklace on hand, bracelet’²⁴⁴, Eng. same as for Polish).

AT: same as in Polish. The equivalent could be *սալարանջան* ([aparandžan] ‘bracelet’).

PM: an unknown noun.

R: the problem of that word is visible in the following fragment of the Kamianets-Podilskiy Court Protocol, in which the Court mentions in an inventory list two *սվոյեց* [svojets^h] (“[...] Բ (2) ճուֆդ սրրշաներն ոսկէջրած. Ա (1) քօլիսք կապուտ չուխի աղուեսով. Ա (1) շապիկ նախշուն. Ե (5) բլախօթ. նամիդցով Դ (4). Բ (2) **սվոյեց** [svojets^h]. գոր սուման կանի այս իրաց Խ (40) դայլառ:” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (283) 228)). However, even the entire context of the inventory does not make it possible to unequivocally state that *սվոյեց* [svojets^h] is a ‘bracelet’ (as in the interpretation of MAD). Bozhko marks the word *svojec* [svojets^h] as part of the home property (furnishings) but does not translate it (Բոժկո 2010, 112). In another article on the same topic, he mentions another variant of *svojec* [svojets^h] – *suvojec* [suvojets^h] – but also without translation (Божко 1993, 85). We can also find *субоец* [suvojets^h] in Belarussian (Карпюк 1992, 140) with the meaning ‘roll’ or ‘scroll’ (from Ruthenian/Ukrainian *субіў* [suvij]) with almost in the same meanings – ‘a scroll is a piece of fabric of a certain length that is stored rolled into a tube’ (Сум; Желехівський and Недільский 1886, 2: 932; cf. Фасмер 1987, 3: 581; Словарь Шанского)). So, it is possible that *субоец* [suvojets^h], due to vowel reduction (**u** [u]) changed into *սվոյեց* [svojets^h] in the Polish Armenian dialect. The text cited from the protocol (Գրիգորյան 1963, (283) 228) could actually contain mention of a *սվոյեց* [svojets^h] as ‘a fabric scroll’ instead. We find there a list of missing items and among them the mentioned *svojec* [svojets^h] and nothing indicates that the protest is about an ‘ornamented necklace for the hand, bracelet’ (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 717). Incidentally, it is worth noting that, in the previous part of the mentioned protocol, jewelry was also mentioned, so it could have led the dictionary authors to guess about the ‘bracelet’. On the other hand, it could be presumed that the said bracelet may have looked like a ‘scroll (spiral)’. Thus, the explanation of MAD is nearly accurate.

²⁴⁴ According to Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան (2009, 717).

215. **L:** վալ²⁴⁵ (Hanusz 1886, 471) [val] (Pol. *wal*, Eng. *dam*, *weir*, *embankment*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 222, 301, 1083; Ալգերեան 1868, 197; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 224, 956).

AT: *ամբարտակ* ([ambartak] ‘dam’, ‘weir’, ‘rampart’, ‘embankment’) is an Iranian loanword **anbārtak* (ex. Persian *ambārda*) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 44; Անտեան 1971, 1: 150).

PM: in the Polish Armenian dialect, the word *wal* [val], as explained by Hanusz (1886, 471), was used with the meaning of “longitudinal earth embankment used to defend against the enemy, against water or a border, road” (Urbańczyk 1988–1993, 10: 39; Hanusz 1886, 471). The noun had been known in Polish since the 15th century and is a Middle-Upper-German loanword – *wal* (‘embankment’, ‘defensive wall’) from Latin *vāllum* (‘embankment’, ‘palisade’) (Boryś 2008, 677).

R: Vasmer confirms that this noun has penetrated to most Slavic languages through Polish (Фасмер 1986, 1: 268), including, of course, geographically closer to Armenians, Ruthenian *вал* [val] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 54). Polish, therefore, remains a possible source of borrowing, as *wal* became the part of the vocabulary in the 17th century (Brückner 1927, 2: 599). The same noun occurs in Kipchak as *val* [val] (Гаркавец 2010, 1585) possibly through Armenian.

216. **L:** վենզել (Հայրապետյան 2011, 543) [venzel] (Pol. *monogram*, Eng. *monogram*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 599; Ալգերեան 1868, 471; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 559).

AT: in DFW *վենզել* [venzel] is explained (but not translated) as a *monogram* (Հայրապետյան 2011, 543) (with Russian meaning) which is, however, more common with Armenian *անվանագիր* [anvanagir] (Աղայան 1976, 1: 79; Ժիրք 1969, 1: 135): *անուն* ([anun] ‘name’) derivative of *անվան* (as genitive) with *գիր* ([gir] writing). *անուն* [anun] is from a Proto-Indo-European stem and a relative of Sanskrit *naman*, Old Persian *nāma*, etc. (Անտեան 1971, 1: 208) and *գիր*

²⁴⁵ The Armenian transliteration is my proposal. The original (transcription) given by Hanusz was *val* [val].

[gir] is likely also Proto-Indo-European from **uēro-* from the stem **uer-* (‘tear, grate, shear’) (Չահուկյան 2010, 162).

PM: Polish *węzeł* [venzel] comes from Proto-Slavic **vǫzľb* (*węzeł*) from Proto-Slavic *vęzati* (*więzać*) with suffix **-ľb* and the change of the native vowel **ę* → **ǫ* (Boryś 2008, 686; cf. Derksen 2008, 521). In Polish, the meaning of *węzeł* [venzel] is different. The noun has been known in Polish since the 15th century as ‘weave on a thread, cord, place of thread threading, tying the ends of threads, cord, knot or issue to explain, solutions, problem’, etc. (Urbańczyk 1988–1993, 10: 97–98). Polish *węzeł* in *DFW* is properly translated into Armenian simply as *node* (Հայրապետյան 2011, 543). The modern meaning of Polish *węzeł* is ‘knot’.

R: the word *вЕНЗЕЛЬ* ([venzel’] ‘monogram’) in Russian is an obvious Polish loanword (Фасмер 1986, 1: 291; Брокгауз and Ефрон 1892, VA: 919), but for Armenian, the source of borrowing is Russian.

217. **L:** **տուզ** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 578) [tuz] (Pol. *tuz*, Eng. *ace*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 24; Ալզերեան 1868, 8; Ալզերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 29).

AT: as playing card in Armenian, *տուզ* [tuz] is has the synonyms *մեկնոց* [meknots^h] and even *աս* [as]. However, we can also find the figurative meaning of ‘influential man in some industry’ (Սուրիսյան 2009, 1120; Աղայան 1976, 2: 1463).

PM: *tuz*, as mentioned by Linde, has been in use in Polish as in German as playing cards, *Daus*, which is the same as the *as* in French cards (Linde 1812, 3: 690; cf. Brückner 1927, 1: 7, 1927, 2: 585). It also means ‘a person in a high position or who is excellent in some field’ (*Słownik PWN*).

R: the noun is a Polish loanword in Russian (*мыз* [tuz]) (Фасмер 1987, 4: 115) from where it was borrowed by the Armenian.

218. **L:** **քամեմ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 798) [k^hamen] (Pol. *kamień*, Eng. *stone*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 933; Ալգերեան 1868, 686; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 825).

AT: in MAD's explanations, the translation is *կշռաքար* ([kʃrak^har] 'weight, scales') with a mistaken Polish diacritical mark, for example, *kamiem*, which must be *kamień*. The word consists of *կշիռ* ([kʃir] 'weight, heaviness') and *քար* ([k^har] 'stone') (Rivola 1633, 387; Մեղրեցի 1698, 329). Additionally, the base of derivative form of *կշիռ* [kʃer] was also known as 'bar, bolt, latch, hasp or an iron or wooden lever for lifting weights' (Մեղրեցի 1698, 165). In Armenia, the noun *քար* [k^har] (as 'stone') still also has the meaning of *կշռաքար* ([kʃrak^har] 'scales') (Սուրբիսայան 2009, 1196; Մալխասեանց 1945, 4: 558) but in an archaic form. It seems to be a fairly similar construction to balance. *կշիռ* ([kʃir] 'weight') is from Akkadian/Assyrian *gišrinnu(m)* ('lever, scales') as a Sumerian loanword – *gušur*, *gušra* (lever) (Ջահուկյան 2010, 413; Անանեան 1976, 2: 611) and *քար* (k^har] 'stone') is a Proto-Indo-European stem **kar-* ('stone', 'hard'), which we can compare with Sanskrit *karkara-* ('hard, tough'), Persian *χâr*, *χârâ* ('very hard stone, flint, rock'), Greek *κάρκαρος* ('hard, rough'), Welsh *carn* ('pile (of stone)'), etc (Ջահուկյան 2010, 778; Անանեան 1979, 4: 558–559; cf. Olsen 1999, 176). In the context of the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court Protocol the meaning of weight/scales is the right translation; however, the word also has another, more common, meaning – 'stone'.

PM: *kamień* ([kamen] 'stone') has been used in Polish since at least the 14th century (Bąk 1976, 10: 40). It is Proto-Slavic *kamy*, **kamene*, from Proto-Indo-European **h2ek-men-*, Sanskrit *ásman* – 'stone, rock'). Boryś explains that it came from Proto-Indo-European **ǵk-mon*, *ǵk-men* ('rock, stone'), which is considered to be derivatives with the suffix **-men-* from Proto-Indo-European **ǵk* ('sharp') (Boryś 2008, 220; Derksen 2008, 220). Although "the root-final palatovelar was depalatalized before the resonant of the suffix" (Derksen 2008, 220) and there are many unclear points in the etymology. The noun *kamień* in Polish had, among others, also the meaning of a unit of measure ('weight or length') (Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 233; cf. Brückner 1927, 1: 215–233).

R: in the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court protocol, we evidently have the case of measures of *weight*: “[...] կէս **քամէն** [**k^hamɛn**] չամիչ. [...] Ի (20) **քամէն** [**k^hamɛn**] տաքդէղն [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (67) 128) (‘half of քամէն of raisins, 20 քամէն of pepper’). Harkavets explains even more precisely that the unit of wight expressed by *kamień* (passed to Kipchak rather from Armenian as *kamen* [kamen]) – 24, 30, 32, 36 (Гаркавец 2010, 652) was 72 pounds (Brückner 1927, 1: 215). Bozhko proposes Ukrainian *камінь* [kamin’] (Мельничук 1985, 2: 358) as the source of the loanword (Բոժկո 2010, 112), which is not certain. In Ruthenian we also have *камінь* [kamin’] (Желехівський 1886, 1: 332). It could be assumed that the phonetic shape of the noun does not match the transliteration of the Polish Armenian dialect. The word is a Slavic noun (Boryś 2008, 220; Derksen 2008, 220; Brückner 1927, 1: 215; Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 233; Мельничук 1985, 2: 359; Фасмер 1986, 2: 173–174 etc.) and for geographical and chronological reasons, I accept Polish as the source of the borrowing.

219. **L:** **քարտ** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 591) [k^hart] (Pol. *karta*, Eng. *card*, *charter*, *chart*, *ticket*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 137, 148–149, 993; Ալգերեան 1868, 111, 124, 721; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 123, 138, 869).

AT: the noun *քարտ* [k^hart] has been in use in Armenian as ‘playing card, standard size and form sheet of paper or cardboard (e.g. membership card), map (old)’ (Աղայան 1976, 2: 1562; Ժիրք 1980, 4: 726; Սուքիասյան 2009, 1201; Հայրապետյան 2011, 591) or modern ‘SIM card’, ‘credit card’, etc.

PM: *kartka* [kartka], *karta* [karta] (probably from German *Karte*) in Polish means a ‘sheet of paper’ (Brückner 1927, 1: 221; Urbańczyk 1960–1962, 3: 247) but now also ‘membership card, SIM card, credit card’, etc.

R: in Russian, *карта* [karta] is most likely a Polish loanword (Фасмер 1986, 2: 203; Словарь Крылова), which later came into Armenian.

220. **L:** **քիրի** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 812) [k^hiri] (Pol. *kir*, Eng. *pall*, *shroud*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 665–666, 869; Ալգերեան 1868, 514, 650; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 613, 780).

AT: there is no precise Armenian equivalent of *kir* [kir], so the proposal of MAD *ւլ մահուդ* ([sev mahud] ‘black broadcloth’) seems to be the most exact translation. *Սև* [sev] is the derivative of *սեւ* [seav] which is an Iranian loanword from **siyāv* – ‘black’, ‘ink’ (cf. Avestan *siyāva*-, Middle Persian *siyav/syā*, Modern Persian *siyāh*, Sanskrit *cyāvā* – ‘dark’, ‘raven’), etc. (Չառուկյան 2010, 674; Աճառեան 1979, 4: 195; cf. Olsen 1999, 906). However, *մահուդ* [mahud] is an unverified word. S. Malkhaseants tries to explain the etymology of *մահուդ* [mahud] as an eastern Turkish loanword from *mahud*, which is impossible to appreciate (Մալխասեանց 1944, 3: 242) and which meant ‘stipulated, well-known’, etc. in Ottoman Turkish (cf. osmani.ahya.net).

PM: Linde explains *kir* or *kier* as ‘paltry cloth’ (Linde 1808, 1, 2: 1000). According to Brückner, *kir* is a ‘black mourning cloth’, etc. (Brückner 1927, 1: 230–231) and it comes from German *Kerntuch* (‘core cloth’) as a short form of *Kern* (‘core’) (cf. Brückner 1927, 1: 230–231; Гаркавец 2010, 693).

R: the noun *kir* is also recorded in Kipchak as a Polish loanword with the meaning of ‘black piece of mourning’ (Гаркавец 2010, 693). I found *քիրի* [k^hiri] once in the Armenian Court Protocol in the case of a somebody who entered into a business deal with a person who failed to keep his promise (Գրիգորյան 1963, (243) 211).

221. **L:** **ֆանտ** (Հայրապետյան 2011, 613) [fant] (Pol. *fant*, Eng. *pledge*, *forfeit*, *prize*) (cf. Ասմանգուլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 365, 707, 731–732; Ալգերեան 1868, 312, 542, 562; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 647, 672).

AT: *ֆանտ* [fant] is very rarely used in Armenian. The explanations are a bit vague, but they still apply to party games (Ժիրք 1980, 4: 813; Աղայան 1976, 2: 1602; Հայրապետյան 2011, 613) and are very close to Russian explanations (Словарь Ушакова; Евгеньева 1984, 4: 551).

PM: coming from German *Pfand* (‘pledge’) (Sobol 1995, 324), Polish *fant* [fant] simply meant ‘pledge’ since at least the 17th century (Brückner 1927, 1: 118; Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 355). Gradually, it gained other meanings: ‘the win in raffle, subject given as collateral for breaking the rules of a social game’, etc. (Sobol 1995, 324).

R: the Russian *фант* [fant] is rather a Polish loanword (Фасмер 1987, 4: 185; Словарь Ушакова; Евгеньева 1984, 4: 551), which could have passed into Armenian through Russian.

222. **L:** **Ֆորմայ** (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 832) [formaj] (Pol. *forma*, Eng. *form*) (cf. Ասմանգոռլյան and Հովհաննիսյան 1984, 366; Ալգերեան 1868, 313; Ալգերեան and Պրէնտեան 1821, 1: 364).

AT: the translation *կապար* [kavarar] is the correct noun in Armenian. Despite the suggestion of MAD about Polish origin of the noun, for Eastern Armenian, A. Hayrapetyan suggests Russian as the source of the word (*форма* [forma]) where it came from Latin *forma* (Հայրապետյան 2011, 446), Ժիրք proposes a directly Latin origin from *forma* with only the meaning of *ձևակախանութիւն* ([dzɛvakanutʰjun] ‘formality’) – the derivative from *ձև* ([dzɛv] ‘shape, form’) (Ժիրք 1980, 4: 824), but for the Armenians from Poland Polish was rather the unique path for the borrowing.

PM: since at least the 14th century, it means ‘external shape, form’ (Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 366) and is a Latin loanword (Brückner 1927, 1: 125).

R: at the beginning of the 18th century, *форма* [forma] passed into Russian from Polish (Фасмер 1987, 4: 203; Мельничук 1982, 1: 497). It had already

been in use in Ukrainian since the 17th century (Мельничук 2012, 6: 120) (in that period of time it was rather Ruthenian *форма* [forma] (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 1029)). Thus, before those dates, in the 16th century, for Polish Armenians only Polish could have been the source of the borrowing. The fragment of the protocol from the Kamianets-Podilskyi Court clearly reports about the ‘form’ as a jewelry tool: “Չոր կանգնեցան Դ (4) ոսկերիչքն եւ առին զայն սզարքաներն եւ **զֆորման [zforman]**. զի այն **շիլցաներն [tʃʰiltsʰa]**²⁴⁶ ի յայն **ֆորմային [formajin]** վերայ բանաց է. զոր Եագուլան բերել էր դատստանին” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (556) 332–333).

²⁴⁶ In the following fragment, *շիլցա* [dʒiltsʰa] / *շիլցա* [tʃʰiltsʰa] is misinterpreted by Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 669. The noun *շիլցա* [tʃʰiltsʰa] (Գրիգորյան 1963, (556) 332–333) / *շիլցա* [dʒiltsʰa] (Գրիգորյան 1963, (552) 33 (e.g. “[...] վասն այն **շիլցաներուն [dʒiltsʰaneron]** համար [...] Եագուլայինն է սեպիական այն **շիլցաներն [dʒiltsʰanern]** [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (552) 331); “[...] զֆորման. որոյ վերայ Եագուլան զայն **շիլցաներն [dʒiltsʰanern]** բանել է: [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (556) 332–333); “[...] Ա (1) **շիլցա [dʒiltsʰa]** ոսկեջրած [...]” (Գրիգորյան 1963, (283) 228–229)) is explained in plural as jewelry tools (Ղազարյան and Ավետիսյան 2009, 669 (Գրիգորյան 1963, (552) 331). In fact, the noun comes from Ruthenian *чильця* ([tʃʰiltsʰja]) and means *diadem* (Желехівський and Недільський 1886, 2: 1071) as a kind of female headband (Мельничук 2012, 6: 320). The word exists also as *чильця* [tʃʰilʹtsʰja] or *чільце* [tʃʰilʹtsʰe] (Онацький 1967, 16: 2057; Матейко 1996, 128) The noun’s origin is the Proto-Slavic **čelō* ([tʃʰelo] forehead) (Derksen 2008, 80). In Kirchak there are also *čilcā*, *čilcā*, *čilce*, *cilcā* (Гаркавец 2010, 385) (probably through Armenian).

The word *շիլցա* [dʒiltsʰa] must not be confused with the *dzielca* [dʒieltsʰa] / *dzilca* [dʒiltsʰa] – ‘a man who shares something, in particular, the executor of a will; broker, conciliator especially in the division of property’ (cf. SPXVI; Urbańczyk 1956–1959, 2: 285), which is rather from *dělitii* from Church Slavic *dělitь* – *divide* (cf. Derksen 2008, 102) and bears an accidental resemblance with *շիլցա* [dʒiltsʰa].

Instead of Conclusions

In my book, I extracted the following words according to the division in chapters. Here are the words originating or probably originating from the Polish language that were borrowed directly or indirectly from Polish. In addition, I would like to add that each of the words in the following table has also been subjected to a semantic and etymological correction, and the source of the borrowing has been corrected with great accuracy.

Table 2. Analyzed loanwords [n – noun, v – verb]

Loanword	Translation
Legal loanwords	
1. աբելացիա [apelats ^h ia]	appeal [n]
2. աբելովադ, աբելովատ առնել [apelovat, apelovad arnel]	appeal [v]
3. արլելու [aplel(u)]	unclear explanations [probably v]
4. արենդա [arenda]	rent, lease [n]
5. բամեղնիյ [pametnij]	court fee (to start the hearing) [n]
6. բլենի բողենդ [pleni potent]	plenipotentiary, attorney, proctor, mandatory [n]
7. բոմոչնա [pomot ^h na] / բոմոցնա [pomots ^h na]	court fees, court costs, law costs [n]
8. բունա [bunt]	rebellion [n]
9. բրինցիբալ [prints ^h ipal]	principal, master, chief [n]
10. բրիվիլեայ [privileaj] / բրիվիլեկոս [privilekos] / բրիվիլեկաց [privilekats ^h]	privilege [n]
11. գազնայ [kaznaj]	jail [n]
12. գաբիս [zapis]	promissory note, loan note [n]
13. զադան [zadan]	deposit, down payment, advance, earnest (money) [n]
14. ինվենդար [inventar]	property, inventory [n]
15. իսդիկովադ (առնել) [istigovat (arnel)]	file a lawsuit [v]
16. լեգավի [legavi]	a dog like the English pointer [n]

17. լիստրադոր [l(j)ustrator]	inspector, controller, auditor [n]
18. կիլեյ [gilej]	complaint, security letter [n]
19. կվալդ [gvalt]	violation, turmoil [n]
20. կվալդովատ առնել [gvaltovat arnel]	make an uproar [v]
21. հրանիցա [hranits ^h a]	frontier, border, boundary [n]
22. հրիւնայ [hrivnaj]	grzywna ([gzyvna] a monetary unit), cash penalty [n]
23. մահարիչնիք [maharit ^h nik ^h] / մահրիչնիք [mahrit ^h nik ^h]	(eye)witness [n]
24. մետրիկա [metrika]	metrics, certificate, specification, public register [n]
25. մինութայ [minut ^h aj]	statement, copy of judgment [n]
26. մոցնիյ (մոցովանըյ) [mots ^h nij (mots ^h ovanəj)]	by the power of the court, authorized, eligible [n, but could be used as adjective]
27. նագլատ [naklad]	cost [n]
28. սղեբբայ [stepk ^h (k)a(j)]	isolation ward / separate cell for arrested people [n]
29. սվեդիյ [svetij]	saint [n]
30. ումոցովանըյ [umots ^h ovanəj]	proxy, plenipotentiary [n, but could be used as adjective]
31. ուսդանեա [ustanea]	break [n]
32. ուսդանեա առնուլ [ustanea arnul]	discontinue, terminate [n]
33. ուվեազանեայ [uveazaneaj]	imprisonment, confinement, incarceration [n]
34. ռեգլամենտ [reglament]	order, regulations [n]
35. սաչովադ առնուլ [sat ^h ovat arnul] / օսաչովադ առնել [osat ^h ovat arnel]	value, evaluate, appreciate, estimate, give a mark [v]
36. սդադուդ [statut]	statute [n]
37. սեքրեթար [sɛk ^h rɛt ^h ar (sɛgrɛt ^h ar?)] / սեգրըդար [sekrɛtar]	secretary, adviso(e)r, amanuensis / penman [n]
38. սումա(յ) [suma(j)]	sum [n]
39. սօտուշ, ստաուշ [soduf]	the person from whom the discussed item (thing) was bought, plaintiff, a person who has a court case [n]
40. տիլեցիա [dilets ^h ia]	delay [n]
41. տօզլատ [doklad]	makeweight [n]
42. փրօքուրադոր [p ^h rok ^h urator]	public prosecutor, law enforcement officer, a spokesman for the law [n]
43. քօմորնիք [k ^h omornik ^h]	bailiff [n]
44. քօմօրայ [k ^h omoraj]	chamber [n]
45. օբեքուն [opek ^h (k)un]	protector, guardian [n]

Musical art	
46. բանդուրա [bandura]	bandura [n]
47. տ(թ)ելեմբաս [t ^h elembas]	drummer [n]
48. լյուտնյա [ljutnja]	lute [n]
49. կրակովյակ [krakovjak]	krakowiak or cracovian (Polish national dance / rhythm from Cracow) [n]
50. մազուրկա [mazurka]	mazurka [n]
51. պոլոնեզ [polonez]	polonaise [n]
52. ցիմբալ [ts ^h imbal]	cymbal [n]
Clothes, fabrics, garments	
53. առամաշքա [adamaʃk ^h a]	damask [n]
54. բլախօթ [plaxod/plaxot]	sheet, canvas, cloth – large cotton handkerchief [n]
55. զբօնքա, զփօնքա [zp ^h (p)onk ^h a] or սփօնքա [sp ^h onk ^h a]	cufflink [n]
56. կուրտկա [kurtka]	jacket [n]
57. կրավեց [kravets ^h]	tailor [n]
58. կօշքար [goʃk ^h ar], կօշկար [goʃkar]	shoemaker [n]
59. հաշքա [hatʃ ^h k ^h a] / հաշքա [həʃk ^h a]	cufflink [n]
60. հարուս [harus]	arras [n]
61. նահաւիցա [nahavitsa]	stitch, pantaloon, pants [n]
62. շպիլկա [ʃpilka]	pin, stiletto heel, stiletto [n]
63. չուխա [tʃ ^h uxa]	broadcloth as (coarse) heavy cloth [n]
64. պանչոխա [pantʃ ^h oxa / bantʃ ^h oxa]	stocking [n]
65. ռենկավիչկա [renkavitʃ ^h ka]	glove [n]
66. տ/թորբա [torba]	bag [n]
67. քաֆդան [k ^h aftan], խաֆտ(թ)ան [χaftan]	caftan/kaftan [n]
68. քօլփաք [k ^h olp ^h ak ^h]	skullcap, cap, hubcap [n]
69. ֆարտուկ [fartuk]	apron [n]
Farming, agriculture	
70. արադ անելու [arat anelu]	plough [v]
71. բասքա [pask ^h a] / բասիքա [pasik ^h a]	apiary [n]
72. եալովիցամըյ [(j)əalovits ^h aməj]	heifer [n]
73. լոպատա [lopata / lobata] (for some Western Armenians)	shovel, spade [n]
74. կոսիտ անելու [kosit anelu]	mow [v]
75. ձաք [dzap / dzap ^h]	(castrated or old) goat or sheep [n]
76. միրոջնիք [mirodʒnik ^h]	mill's assistant, sub-master who takes flour for grinding (miller?) [n]

77. մորգ [morg]	morgen [n]
78. մուժիք [muzik ^h]	man, simple peasant, boor [n]
79. պաստուխ [pastux]	shepherd [n]
80. սղրդայ [stərta(j)]	stack, rick [n]
81. սնոպ [snop]	sheaf [n]
82. քօբա [k ^h opa] / քօբիցա [k ^h opits ^h a]	a heap [n]
Household items	
83. բանկա [banka]	jar [n]
84. քրիսդավքայ [pristavkhaj]	lettuce bowl [n]
85. բէշքայ [bet ^h khaj / pet ^h kaj]	barrel [n]
86. բոլպոռոկ [polbot ^h ok]	barrel, cask, keg, also as a unit of measurement of half of the barrel [n]
87. դաբչուն [tapɟ ^h un]	couch, davenport [n]
88. լանցուխ [lants ^h ux]	chain, manacle [n]
89. լավիցա [lavits ^h a]	bench [n]
90. կիյ [kij]	cue, stick [n]
91. կովաղա [kovadla]	anvil [n]
92. մօզձիր [mozdzir]	mortar (and pestle) [n]
93. շաֆա [ʃafa]	cupboard, locker wardrobe [n]
94. ուպրուս [ubrus], օբրուս [obrus]	tablecloth [n]
95. չարա [t ^h ara], ճառայ [tʃaraj]	pot, pitcher [n]
96. պիլա [pila]	saw [n]
96. պյալա [pjala]	piyāla, piyal'e, phial [n]
98. պոտնեա [bodnea]	suitcase, case, valise, large wooden bowl, kneading-trough <i>or</i> barrel with a lockable lid [n]
99. սղօլ [stol]	table [n]
100. սնոր [snor]	cord, rope [n]
101. սոֆա [sofa]	sofa, couch [n]
102. տրուշլաք [druʃlak ^h]	strainer, colander [n]
103. ֆոլգա [folga]	foil [n]
Accommodation, elements of architecture, buildings, and decorations	
104. բիվնիցա [pivnits ^h a]	cellar [n]
105. բլյախա [bljaxa]	plate, badge [n]
106. գանոկ [ganok / kanog]	porch [n]
107. գունա [guna]	quilt, blanket or sheepskin coat (men's outer garment worn in Poland by highlanders) [n]
108. դախ [dax]	roof [n]
109. կուխնյա [kuxnja]	kitchen, cuisine [n]
110. մաղազին [makazin]	shop, warehouse [n]

111. շքիթալ [ʃpithal], սքիտալ [spidal]	hospital [n]
112. սուֆիտ [sufit]	ceiling [n]
113. սքլեք [skhlep(p ^h)]	store, shop [n]
114. քօրչմա [k ^h ortʃ ^h ma], քօրչմման [k ^h ortʃ ^h mman], ք(ք)ոչմա [k(k ^h)rtʃ ^h ma]	inn [n]
115. քուխնայ [k ^h uxnaj]	kitchen [n]
116. Ֆրամուգա [framuga]	jambeau, jamb [n]
People	
117. բաննա [panna]	miss [n]
118. գալիքա [kalika / kalik ^h a]	cripple [n]
119. գծօնծ [kʒondz (kʒonts)] / գժենց [kʒents ^h]	priest, clergyman [n]
120. գրիժագ [kriʒak]	crusader [n]
121. գօլենցքիյ [kolents ^h k ^h ij] / գօլենցքիյ [kolents ^h k ^h ij]	collection [n]
122. լուբկա [lupka / lubga]	beloved, dear [n]
123. խարունժիյ [xarunʒij]	ensign [n]
124. կաբզան [kabzan]	kabzan, the mocking name of Polish Armenians [n]
125. հեթման [het ^h man]	hetman [n]
126. հուձուլ [hudzul]	hutsul [n]
127. ձէխմիսր [dzeɣmistr]	the master craftsman, senior of guild [n]
128. մագնատ [magnat]	magnate [n]
129. մամա [mama]	mother, mummy, mom [n]
130. նեմեց [nemets ^h]	German [n]
131. նեմիչ [nemit ^h]	the equivalents of Pole [n]
132. շաֆար [ʃafar]	minister, steward, somebody as court clerk [n]
133. շլախեղնիյ [ʃlaxetnij]	nobleman, noble [n]
134. շլախտա [ʃljaxta] / շլախտիչ [ʃljaxtit ^h]	aristocracy/nobleman [n]
135. շպակ [ʃpak]	starling, resourceful man, the contemptuous name of a soldier [n]
136. շուլեր [ʃuler]	cardsharper [n]
137. ուրեատնիք [ureadnik ^h]	official, clerk [n]
138. ռոտմիստր [rotmistr]	(cavalry) captain, rittmeister [n]
139 ստարուստա [starusta], սդարօսդայ [starosta(j)]	starosta, somebody as the mayor [n]
140. վայվոդայ [vajvotaj] / վոյվոտայ [vojvodaj]	voivode (a military commander, non-military governor or official of a territorial voivodeship, etc.) [n]
141. վոյթ [voj ^h]	village head, voyt, village mayor, commune head [n]

142. քաբուլցին [k ^h ap(p ^h)uts ^h in], քափուլցին [k ^h ap ^h (p)ut ^h in]	Capuchin [n]
143. օսադցա [osadts ^h a]	founder of the settlement, colony [n]
144. Ֆարմաս(զ)ոն [farmas(z)on]	pharmason, freemason [n]
145. Ֆրանս [frant]	dandy, macaroni, coxcomb [n]
Eating, drinking	
146. բիւէ [pivɛ]	beer (spree?) [n]
147. բրընձա [brɛndza]	bryndza, brinza (type of cheese) [n]
148. բուլկա [bulka]	loaf, (bread) roll [n]
149. բուխանկա [buɣanka]	loaf [n]
150. ժենտիցա [zɛntits ^h a]	a kind of sheep milk whey [n]
151. կապուստա, գաբուստա [kapusta]	cabbage [n]
152. կիշկա [kiʃka]	(a kind of) sausage, kishka/kishke [n]
153. կռուպա [krupa]	groat, barley [n]
154. հարբուզ [harbuz]	watermelon [n]
155. շինկա [ʃinka]	ham [n]
156. պոնչիկ [pontʃik]	donut [n]
157. պովիդլո [povidlo]	jam, marmalade, plum jam, fruit paste [n]
158. ռակ [rak]	crayfish, crawfish [n]
159. սկվարկա [skvarka]	pork rind, crackling(s) [n]
160. սմալեց [smalets ^h]	lard, pork fat [n]
161. ստրուցլիկ [struts ^h lik]	poppy seed roll [n]
162. վիշնա [viʃna]	cherry (tree) [n]
163. փիվա [p ^h iva]	beer [n]
Animal world, nature	
164. կռուկ [kruk]	raven [n]
165. կրոլիկ [krolik]	rabbit, bunny [n]
166. նոսադրյ [nosatəj], նոսադէյ [nosatɛj]	glanders (balkiness, vice?) [n]
167. նորա [nora]	den <i>or</i> source, wellspring (for the Kuty dialect?) [n]
168. պլուտա [pluta]	rainy weather, rafting (rain?) [n]
169. պուռհաչ [puhat ^h]	eagle-owl, madge-owlet [n]
170. ջորոկ (ջորուկ?) [dʒobok (dʒobuk?)]	beak [n]
171. սդրուս [strus]	ostrich [n]
172. սքալա [sk ^h ala]	rock, stone [n]
173. սոսնա [sosna]	pine [n]
Traditions, religion	
174. բրովոստէն [provoden] / բրովոստ [provoda]	leader [n]

175. գարնավալ [karnaval]	carnival [n]
176. եամմարք [jarmark ^h]	fair [n]
177. լասկա [laska]	grace, mercy, favour [n]
178. լուլա [lula]	pipe [n]
179. կվարտալնիկ [kvartalnik]	quarterly [n]
180. պաչորկա [patʰorka]	bead [n]
State and attributes of statehood	
181. գերբ [gerb]	coat of arms [n]
182. դայլառ [t ^(th) ajlar] / դայլար [t ^(th) ajlar]	thaler [n]
183. կարտեչ [kartetʰ]	canister shot, grape-shot [n]
184. կիվեր [g(k)iver]	shako [n]
185. հագովնիցայ [hakovnits ^h aj]	arquebus, culverin [n]
186. հրոշ [hroʃ]	grosh (similar to penny.) [n]
187. մոնիդայ [monitaj]	money (coin?) [n]
188. շապլա [ʃabla]	saber/sabre [n]
189. շտիկ [ʃtik]	blade [n]
190. ռայդցա [rajdts ^h a]	councilman, counsellor, councillor [n]
191. սեյմ [sejm]	Sejm/Seym [n]
192. չերվոնեց [tʰervonets ^h]	chervonets [n]
193. տեքրեդ [dek ^h ret]	decree, edict [n]
194. տեքուդադ [deputat]	allowance, deputy [n]
195. ռաթուշ [rat ^h uʃ], ռաթուշ [rat ^h uʃ], ռատուշա [ratuʃa]	court, town hall / guildhall, prison [n]
196. քրօսքա [k ^h rosk ^h a] / քրեսքա [k ^h resk ^h a]	pistol [n]
197. օպոզ [oboz]	camp [n]
Uncategorized	
198. ժիլա [zila]	vein [n]
199. լուզա [luza]	pocket [n]
200. լոդ [lot]	lot/loth [n]
201. լօբօդ [lok ^h ot(d)]	ell, elbow [n]
202. կազել [kazel / gazel]	order, punish etc [v]
203. կուլակ [kulak]	fist [n]
204. մախինա [maxina]	machine [n]
205. շթուքայ [ʃ th uk ^h aj]	piece, item, unit [n]
206. շտուկա [ʃtuka]	art [n]
207. շ(ի)րկա [ʃiarka]	sulfur/sulphur [n]
208. պլամա [plama]	stain [n]
209. պոլոնիզմ [polonizm]	polonizm [n]

210. պոլոնիստիկա [polonistika]	Polish studies, polonistics [n]
211. ռաթայ [rat ^h aj]	instal(l)ment [n]
212. սգալքա [skalk ^h a]	the constituent elements of women's frontal jewelry, something similar to the cylinder-shaped pendants (saxifrage (plant)?) [n]
213. սիրը [sirəj]	gray/grey [adjective]
214. սվոյեց [svojets ^h]	probably ornamented necklace on hand, bracelet [n]
215. վալ [val]	dam, weir, embankment [n]
216. վենզել [venzel]	monogram [n]
217. տուզ [tuz]	ace [n]
218. քամէն [k ^h amen]	stone [n]
219. քարտ [k ^h art]	card, charter, chart, ticket [n]
220. քիրի [k ^h iri]	pall, shroud [n]
221. ֆանտ [fant]	pledge, forfeit, prize [n]
222. ֆորմայ [formaj]	form [n]

The analysis of Polish loanwords in Armenian does not have the character of unified conclusions.

Certainly, the majority of the vocabulary require further in-depth analysis and explanations of their uses. At this stage, it can be concluded that the loanwords cover almost every area of life – from everyday communication to professional language, that is, specialized vocabulary. This demonstrates that through linguistic processes we also see deep processes of assimilation. This is also evidenced by the fact that a number of words – especially those of administrative, legal, and religious significance – have their equivalents in the Armenian language, which were known to Armenians living in the territory of Poland. They borrowed Polish professional terminology. It can therefore be concluded that Polish Armenians made a clear distinction between their everyday life and their professional or administrative life. It can be presumed that the reason for such linguistic “behavior” was that they realized that their specialist/professional language – language for special purposes, must be part of the Polish language and Polish mentality because their life and existence were also part of their Polishness. The specificity of Armenian total assimilation is also distinguished by the fact that the Polish language did not accept anything from Armenian for several reasons:

- the first wave of immigrants, and probably the most numerous, did not speak Armenian but Kipchak;
- few Armenian-speaking Armenians lived or live in Poland, so their language did not have much influence (even on a local level) on Polish;
- phonetically, the Armenian language is very difficult for Polish speakers (all the more so since some Armenians speak Eastern Armenian and others Western Armenian).

Unfortunately, there are sometimes gaps, oversights, and even errors in the research carried out so far in the field of loanwords in the Armenian language from Polish (including the Polish Armenian dialect). This situation seems to be the result of poor knowledge of the Polish language, on one hand, and a lack of research interest in the Polish language in Armenia and the Armenian language in Poland, on the other. These problems explain why so far very little research has been carried out on the relations between the Armenian and Polish languages.

In the future, at least the following issues should be explored in more detail:

- whether loanwords really come from Polish or rather from other nearby Slavic languages or Romanian, etc.;
- whether these are direct borrowings from the Polish language or through the Polish language;
- what influence diacritic markers have on changes of the meanings of Polish loanwords in the Armenian language;
- what impact these loanwords have on the changing of the mentality and life of Armenians, especially in Poland.

It is also worth focusing on one more phenomenon, which I have called “linguistic absorption.” In other words, how the “absorption” of the Polish language and the Polish linguistic worldview of the Armenian language and the Armenian linguistic worldview contributed (if at all) to the Polonization of Polish Armenians.

The whole matter of Polish loanwords in the Armenian language remains an area only partially explored; the same is true for the socio-political and economic impact of Armenians living in Poland during the period between the 14th and the 18th centuries. Neither the Armenians nor the Poles have said the last word on this issue.

References

- Adam, Alexander. 1804. *A Compendious Dictionary of the Latin Tongue*. Edinburgh: Cadell.
- AGBU Europe, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian. “The Armenian language as an endangered language in Europe. A contribution to the European Roadmap for Linguistic Diversity.” Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://agbueurope.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/17/2015/12/Contribution-to-the-NPLD-Roadmap-for-Language-Diversity-Armenian-AGBU-Europe-and-C.-Gulbenkian.pdf>.
- Akta grodzkie i ziemskie z czasów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z archiwum tak zwanego bernardyńskiego we Lwowie w skutek fundacyi śp. Aleksandra hr. Stadnickiego*. 1887, t. XII. Lwów: Galicyjski Wydział Krajowy.
- Albertrand, Antoni. 1790. *Wiersz o malarstwie: pieśni V*. Warszawa: Drukarnia M. Grölla.
- Arct, Michał. 1899. *Słowniczek wyrazów obcych*. Warszawa: Michał Arct.
- Arct, Michał. 1916. *Słownik ilustrowany języka polskiego*, t. 1–3. Warszawa: Michał Arct.
- “Armenian Alphabet.” My languages. Accessed April 13, 2024. http://mylanguages.org/armenian_alphabet.php.
- Armenian E-Bible. Classical Armenian [1895 Bagratuni] – English Concordance [KJV]. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://arak29.org/bible/book/index.htm>.
- Armenian Population by Country. 2024. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/armenian-population-by-country>.
- “Armenia seeks to boost population.” BBC NEWS. Accessed April 13, 2024. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/6382703.stm>.
- Atkinson, John. 1822. *A Vocabulary of Latin Nouns and Adnouns, Verbs and Adverbs*. London: Author.
- Aucher, Paschal. 1817. *Dictionnaire abrégé: Arménien-Français*, v. 2. Venise: Academie Arménienne
- Aucher, Paschal. 1819. *A Grammar, Armenian and English*. Venice: Armenian Academy.

- Azarian, Aristaces. 1848. *Nuovo dizionario ellenico-italiano-armeno-turco*. Vienna: Tipografia De, PP. Mechitaristi.
- Bagasheva-Koleva, Mariya. 2013. "Remarks on lexicalization of diminutives in Bulgarian, Russian and other Slavic languages" (conference: "Езици на паметта в литературния текст" – Международна научна конференция, организирана от Факултета по Славянски филологии, СУ "Св.Климент Охридски" at Факултет по Славянски филологии, СУ "Св.Климент Охридски", София 2013. Accessed April 13, 2024. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286744170_REMARKS_ON_LEXICALIZATION_OF_DIMINUTIVES_IN_BULGARIAN_RUSSIAN_AND_OTHER_SLAVIC_LANGUAGES.
- Balzer, Oswald Marian. 1909. *Sądownictwo ormiańskie w średniowiecznym Lwowie*. Lwów: Towarzystwo dla Popierania Nauki Polskiej.
- Balzer, Oswald Marian. 1910. *Statut ormiański w zatwierdzeniu Zygmunta I z r. 1519*. Lwów: Towarzystwo dla Popierania Nauki Polskiej.
- Bańko, Mirosław. 2019. "Jeszcze o roli przyrostka -k- w adaptacji zapożyczeń w polszczyźnie." In *Język polski* 99 (volume edited by Piotr Źmigrodzki): 32–43.
- Barsel'yan, Hovhannes 1973. *Hayeren ullagrakan-ullaxosakan, terminabanakan bařaran* [Armenian Orthographic-Orthoepic Terminological Dictionary] [in Armenian]. Yerevan: Luys.
- Bartoszewicz, Agnieszka. 2008. "Miasto czy wieś? Małe miasta polskie w późnym średniowieczu." *Przegląd Historyczny* 99 (1): 121–136.
- Bartoszewicz, Joachim Stefan. 1923. *Podręczny słownik polityczny*. Warszawa: nakładem księgarni Perzyński, Niklewicz i S-ka.
- Bąk, Stanisław, Maria Renata Mayenowa, and Franciszek Peplowski. 1969. *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*. Vol. 4. Wrocław: PAN, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Bąk, Stanisław, Maria Renata Mayenowa, and Franciszek Peplowski. 1972. *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*. Vol. 6. Wrocław: PAN, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Bąk, Stanisław, Maria Renata Mayenowa, and Franciszek Peplowski. 1976. *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*. Vol. 10. Wrocław: PAN, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Bąk, Stanisław, Maria Renata Mayenowa, and Franciszek Peplowski. 1982. *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*. Vol. 14. Wrocław: PAN. Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Bernat, Rafał, and Piotr Biegasiewicz. 2013. "Geneza podatku dochodowego w Europie w średniowieczu i okresie nowożytnym." *Zeszyty Naukowe Ostrołęckiego Towarzystwa Naukowego* 27: 571–581.

- Bezjian, Nigol. "Travels with Basturma." *The Armenian Weekly*, August 17, 2009. Accessed April 15, 2024. <https://armenianweekly.com/2009/08/17/bezjian-travels-with-basturma>.
- Biedrońska-Słota, Beata. 2015. "Orient na dworze Jana III Sobieskiego." Muzeum Pałacu Króla Jana III w Wilanowie. Accessed 2016. http://www.konkursmoda.wilanow-palac.pl/ubiory_na_dworze_krola_jana_iii/index.php?header_id=3&menu_id=118&lang=PL.
- Bielowski, August. 1864. *Jana Kanaparza Żywot Ś. Wojciecha*. Pomniki dziejów Polski. Vol. 1. Lwów: nakład. własny.
- Biuro Analiz i Dokumentacji (BAD), Zespół Informacji i Statystyk. November 2012. *Terminy rozpoczęcia oraz zakończenia kadencji Sejmu i Senatu od 1989 r. Analiza aktów prawnych*. Warszawa: Kancelaria Senatu. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://www.senat.gov.pl/gfx/senat/pl/senatopracowania/26/plik/ot-608.pdf>.
- Bogucki, Ambroży. 2003. "Jeszcze o pochodzeniu wyrazu 'szlachta'." In *Biskupi, lennicy, żeglarze. Gdańskie studia z dziejów średniowiecza*, t. 9, edited by Błażej Śliwiński, 457–471. Gdąnsk: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur.
- Bornińska, Justyna. 2015. "Rodzaje i kolory tkanin w XVII wieku." In *Ubiory na dworze króla Jana III*, edited by M. Janisz. [? – online?] Accessed April 9, 2020. http://www.konkursmoda.wilanow-palac.pl/ubiory_na_dworze_krola_jana_iii/index.php?header_id=6&lang=PL.
- Bortliczek, Małgorzata. 2013. *Od Alfabetu do Zdrobnień. Tuzin szkiców o języku*. Cieszyn: Galeria „Na Gojach”.
- Boryś, Wiesław. 2005. *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Brand, John (with the assistance of Pascal Aucher). 1825. *A dictionary. Armenian and English*. Venice: Armenian Academy.
- Brückner, Aleksander. 1927. *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, t. 1–2. Kraków: Krakowska Spółka Wydawnicza.
- Brzeczowski, Tadeusz. 1982. "Podatki zwyczajne w Polsce w XV wieku." *Acta Universitatis Nicolai Copernici, Nauki Humanistyczno-Społeczne* 128: 39–62.
- Christian, Ludwig. 1716. *Teutsch-Englisches Lexicon*. Leipzig: J. F. Gleditschen Buchhandlung.
- Ciakciak, Emmanuele. 1829. *Nuovo dizionario italiano-armeno-turco*. Venezia: Tipografia Armena di St. Lazzaro.
- Ciakciak, Emmanuele. 1837. *Dizionario Armeno-Italiano*. Vol. 1. Venezia: Tipografia Mechitaristica.

- Clifton, John M. 2009. "Do the Talysh and Tat Languages Have a Future in Azerbaijan?" In *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics University of North Dakota Session*. Accessed April 13, 2024. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321062025_Do_the_Talysh_and_Tat_Languages_Have_a_Future_in_Azerbaijan.
- Couch, William, J. 1970. *General Sikorski, Poland, and the Soviet Union, 1939-1943*. PhD diss., Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Couturat, Louis. 1901. *La logique de Leibniz. D'après des documents inédits*. Paris: F. Alcan.
- Cristea, Ovidiu. 2023. "Romania: A Brief Overview." In *Mapping Eastern Europe*, edited by Maria Alessia Rossi and Alice Isabella Sullivan. <https://mappingeasterneurope.princeton.edu/item/romania-a-brief-overview.html>.
- Czaja, Roman, and Zenon Huber Nowak. 2013. "Państwo zakonu krzyżackiego w Prusach – próba charakterystyki." In *Zakon Krzyżacki w Prusach i Inflantach*, edited by Roman Czaja, Andrzej Radziwiński, 11–28. Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK w Toruniu.
- Czapla, Anna. 2016. "Ukraińskie wyrazy ekspresywne w języku mieszkańców Sławatycz." *TEKA Komisji Polsko-Ukraińskich Związków Kulturowych* 11: 18–24.
- Czarnecka, Katarzyna. 2014. *Słowotwórstwo gwar polskich na Ukrainie*. Czasownik. Kraków: LIBRON – Filip Lohner.
- Czołowski, Aleksander. 1932. "Wystawa ormiańska we Lwowie." *Posłaniec Św. Grzegorza* 9–11: 131–135.
- Çelebi, Evliya. 2015. *Narrative of Travels in Europe, Asia, and Africa in the Seventeenth Century*, vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Çengel, Hülya Kasapoğlu. 2013. "Comparative Phonology of Historical Kipchak Turkish and Urum Language." *Gazi Türkiyat* 13: 29–43
- Dankoff, Robert. 1995. *Armenian Loanwords in Turkish*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag
- "Darkling Beetle/Mealworm Information." Center for Insect Science Education Outreach. University of Arizona (CISEOUA), 1997. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://web.archive.org/web/20040603084901/http://insected.arizona.edu/mealinfor.htm>.
- Dauzat, Albert, Jean Dubois, and Mitterand Henri. 1971. *Nouveau dictionnaire Etymologique et historique*. Paris: Larousse.
- Dębowiak, Przemysław, and Jadwiga Waniakowa. 2012. "'Kartacz' i 'kartusz' – historia i etymologia dwóch zapożyczeń." *Język Polski* 3 (92): 219–225.
- Derksen, Rick. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.

- Diakonoff, Igor. 1985. "Hurro-Urartian Borrowings in Old Armenian." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 105 (4): 597–603.
- Doïmadjian-Grigoryan, Kariné. 2015. "L'apport de la langue et de la civilisation françaises à l'évolution de l'identité linguistique arménienne: étude diachronique." *Etudes interdisciplinaires en Sciences humaines* 2: 141–150.
- Doroszewski, Witold. *Słownik języka polskiego*. <http://doroszewski.pwn.pl>.
- Dum-Tragut, Jasmine. 2009. *Armenian. Modern Eastern Armenian*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Eker, Süer. 2009. "Kipchak Turkic as a part of the Balkans and Eastern Europe history-geography." In *Lucrările simpozionului internațional. Cartea. România. Europa*, edited by Julieta Rotaru, 531–549. București: Editura Biblioteca Bucureștilor.
- "Ekşi sözlük." Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://eksisozluk2023.com>.
- Encyclopædia Britannica*, vol. 2. 1875. 9th ed. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black.
- Encyklopedia PWN*. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://encyklopedia.pwn.pl>.
- Evans, Helen C. 2018. *Armenia: Art, Religion, and Trade in the Middle Ages*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Fałowski, Adam. 2011. "Język ukraiński." In *Słowiańskie języki literackie. Rys historyczny*, edited by Elżbieta Szczepańska, Barbara Oczkowska, Tomasz Kwoka, 127–144. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Ferriere, Astrid. 2016. "Histoire des boutons de manchette." *Mariages.net*. December 30, 2016. <https://www.mariages.net/articles/histoire-des-boutons-de-manchette--c6194>.
- Fryer, John. 1698. *A New Account of East-India and Persia, in Eight Letters. Being Nine Years Travels Begun 1672. And Finished 1681*. London: printed by R. R. for Ri. Chiswell, at the Rose and Crown in St. Paul's Church-Yard.
- Gaertner, Henryk. 1934. *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Część III: 1. Słowotwórstwo*. Warszawa–Lwów: Książnica–Atlas.
- Ghazarian, Jacob. 2000. *The Armenian Kingdom in Cilicia During the Crusades: The Integration of Cilician Armenians with the Latins, 1080-1393*. London: Routledge.
- Ghilea, Marian C., Nicolae Macovei, Gheorghe Salahura, Matei Hutopilă, and Vasile Bireș, eds. *Dicționar român-huțul*. <https://sites.google.com/site/hutzul/dictionarhuțul>.
- Gieysztor, Aleksander. 1971. "Urząd wojewodziński we wczesnych państwach słowiańskich w IX–XI w." *Archeologia Polski* 16 (1/2): 317–325.
- "Glanders." Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). October 31, 2017, Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://www.cdc.gov/glanders/index.html>.

- Gloger, Zygmunt. “Ustrój polskich miast w Średniowieczu. Autonomia i wilkierze.” October 6, 2013. Accessed April 14, 2024. <https://docplayer.pl/35461856-Ustroj-polskich-miast-w-sredniowieczu-autonomia-i-wilkierze.html>.
- Gloger, Zygmunt. *Encyklopedia staropolska ilustrowana*, t. 1–4. Warszawa: Druk P. Laskauera i W. Babickiego.
- Glosbe. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://glosbe.com>.
- Gofin.pl. Accessed April 13, 2024. www.gofin.pl.
- Göksel, Aslı, and Celia Kerslake. 2005. *Turkish: a comprehensive grammar*. London–New York: Routledge.
- Gołębiowski, Łukasz. 1861. *Ubiory w Polsce od najdawniejszych czasów aż do chwili obecnych*. Kraków: Kazimierz Józef Turowski.
- Gospodarek, Dawid. 2012. “Szafarz sakramentu święceń kapłańskich – czy ksiądz może ‘zrobić’ księdza?” *Liturgia.pl*. February 3, 2012. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://www.liturgia.pl/Szafarz-sakramentu-swiecen-kaplanskich-czy-ksiazd-moze-zrobic-ksiedza>.
- Gray, Russel, and Quentin Atkinson. 2003. “Language-tree divergence times support the Anatolian theory of Indo-European origin.” *Nature* 426 (27): 435–439.
- Greń, Zbigniew, and Helena Krasowska. 2008. *Słownik Górali polskich na Bukowinie*. Warszawa: Instytut Sławistki PAN.
- Gromnicki, Tadeusz. 1889. *Ormianie w Polsce, ich historia, prawa i przywileje*. Warszawa: Drukarnia F. Czerwińskiego.
- “Guberniya – Russian administrative unit.” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/guberniya>.
- Güner, Galip, and Andreas Tietze. 2010. “Tarihi ve Etimolojik Türkiye Türkçesi Lugati.” *Belleten* 1: 199–211.
- Hambarcumian, Rafael. 1994. “Czas i miejsce osiedlenia się Ormian na Rusi Kijowskiej i w Polsce według Sadoka Barączca.” *Biuletyn Ormiańskiego Towarzystwa Kulturowego* 2: 1–10.
- Hammer, Peter. 2007. “Zur Entstehung des Talers, Geo.Alp.” In *Sonderband 1*, edited by Rainera Brandnera, Karol Krainer, Volkmar Mair, 53–57. Innsbruck: Universität Innsbruck.
- Hanusz, Jan. 1886. “O języku Ormian polskich.” *Rozprawy i sprawozdania z posiedzeń wydziału filologicznego Akademii Umiejętności* XI: 350–481.
- Hanusz, Jan. 1888. *Głosownia gwary ormiańskiej w Kutach*. Kraków: Drukarnia UJ.
- Hanusz, Jan. 1889. “O języku Ormian polskich.” *Rozprawy i sprawozdania z posiedzeń wydziału filologicznego Akademii Umiejętności* XII: 214–296.

- Hejnowicz, Ludwik. 1933. "Z dziejów Ormian poznańskich." *Posłaniec Św. Grzegorza* 1–2: 11–13.
- Hejnowicz, Ludwik. 1990. "Z dziejów Ormian poznańskich." *Kronika Miasta Poznania: kwartalnik poświęcony problematyce współczesnego Poznania: Antologia* 3/4: 199–202.
- Hornby, Albert Sydney, ed. 2005. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hrytsak, Yaroslav. 2000. "Lviv: A Multicultural History through the Centuries." In *Lviv: A City in the Crosscurrents of Culture*, vol. 24, edited by John Czaplicka, 47–73. Harvard: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.
- Huseynova, Gulsum Israfil. 2014. "Ethnographic Lexicon of Language of Azerbaijan." *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research* 22 (4): 617–620.
- Instruktarz celny r. 1643 r. „Volumina Legum”, t. 4 (od Seymu Wiślickiego roku pańskiego 1347 aż do ostatniego Seymu)*. 1859–1860. Petersburg: nakład i druk Ohryzko Jozafat.
- Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine* (hosted by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies). Accessed April 13, 2024. <http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com>.
- Institut Badań Literackich PAN. *Pracownia Słownika Polszczyzny XVI wieku*. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://spxvi.edu.pl>.
- İpek, Ali. 2009. "Sultan Alp Arslan'in Ani Ermenilerine Karşı Tutumu." *EKEV Akademi Dergisi* 13 (39): 371–380.
- ISMA Online Encyclopedia*, Accessed April 13, 2024. <http://translator.am/am/index.html>.
- Janiszewska-Jakubiak Dorota. 2018. "Kuty nad Czeremoszem." *Dzieje.pl – Portal Historyczny*. February 22, 2018. Accessed September 6, 2020. <https://dzieje.pl/ochrona-zabytkow/kuty-nad-czeremoszem>.
- Jasińska, Katarzyna, and Dariusz Piwowarczyk. 2019. "Magister, mistrz, majster – o drogach przenikania wyrazów łacińskich do polszczyzny." *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego* LXXV: 45–57.
- Jurczak, Robert. "Prof. Michał Kopczyński: Polska bardzo wiele w swej historii zawdzięcza imigrantom." *Wiadomosci.wp.pl*. December 30, 2015. Accessed April 13, 2024. <http://www.wiadomosci.wp.pl/prof-michal-kopczynski-polska-bardzo-wiele-w-swej-historii-zawdziecza-imigrantom-6027694144328833a>.
- Kaczyńska, Elżbieta, and Kazimierz Piesowicz. 1977. *Wykłady z powszechnej historii gospodarczej (od schyłku średniowiecza do I wojny światowej)*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

- Kanar, Mehmet. "Osmanlı Türkçesi Sözlüğü." Accessed April 13, 2024. http://dosyalar.semazen.net/e_kitap/osmanli_turkcesi_sozlugu.pdf.
- Kapović, Mate. 2017. *The Indo-European Languages*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Kaproń-Charzyńska, Iwona. 2007. "O nowych odczasownikowych i odrzeczownikowych nazwach subiektów." *Polonica* XVIII: 10.
- Karakurt, Deniz. 2017. *Sözlük Etimoloji (Türk Lehçe ve Şiveleri, Moğolca Lehçe ve Şiveleri)*. Zeytinburnu–İstanbul: Birinci Baskı.
- Karłowicz, Jan, Adam Krasiński, and Władysław Niedźwiedzki. 1902. *Słownik Języka Polskiego*, t. 2. Warszawa: Dukarnia „Gazety Handlowej”
- Kelimeler.gen.tr.
- Klemensiewicz, Zenon. 2002. *Historia języka polskiego*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Kluge, Friedrich. 1891. *Etymological dictionary of the German language*. London: Bell.
- Kluk, Krzysztof. 1777. *O roślinach, ich utrzymaniu, rozmnożeniu i zażyciu*, tom I. Warszawa: wyd. Drukarnia Pijarów.
- Kochanowski, Jan Karol. 1908. *Szkice i drobiazgi*. Warszawa: wyd. Księgarnia E. Wende i sp.
- Kolberg, Oskar. 1884. *Lud jego zwyczaję sposób życia mowa podania przysłowia, obrzędy, gusła, zabawy, pieśni, muzyka i tańce*. Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności.
- Kopaliński, Władysław. 1987. *Słownik mitów i tradycji kultury*. Warszawa: PIW.
- Kopaliński, Władysław. 1990. *Słownik wyrazów obcych i zwrotów obcojęzycznych*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Korkmaz, Zeynep. "Oğuz Türkçesinin Tarihi Gelişme Süreçleri ve Divanu Lûgat-it-Türk." Çukurova Üniversitesi Türkoloji Araştırmaları Merkezi. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://turkoloji.cu.edu.tr/ESKI%20TURK%20DILI/5.php>.
- Kościów, Zbigniew. 2011. *Kultura muzyczna Ormian polskich*. Wołomin: Wydawnictwo Polskie.
- Kouyoumdjian, Mesrob. 1970. *A Comprehensive Dictionary Armenian-English*. Beirut: Atlas Press.
- Kowalczyk-Heyman, Elżbieta. 2009. "Początki Kolna." *Rocznik Mazowiecki* 21: 262–270.
- Kraelitz-Greifenhorst, Fridrich. 1911. "Armenische Lehnwörter im Türkischen." *Հանդես արևոտայ* 4(5): 257–268
- Krasnowolski, Antoni, and Niedźwiedzki Władysław. 1920. *Słownik Staropolski*. Warszawa: M. Arcta

- Król-Mazur, Renata (a). 2016. “Życie towarzyskie Ormian lwowskich od połowy XIX wieku do 1939 roku.” *Res Historica* 42: 183–219
- Król-Mazur, Renata. 2016b. “Przemiany społeczności ormiańskiej w Polsce pod wpływem unii ze Stolicą Apostolską.” *Krakowskie pismo kresowe* 8: 15–64
- Kroll, Piotr. 2013 “Szlachta polska wobec Turcji w XVII i XVIII w.” *Pasaż Wiedzy. Muzeum Palacu Króla Jana III w Wilanowie*. September 6, 2013. Accessed April 13, 2024. https://www.wilanow-palac.pl/szlachta_polska_wobec_turcji_w_xvii_i_xviii_w.html.
- Krucka, Barbara. 2002. “Polsko-rosyjskie kontrasty w zakresie derywacji rzeczownikowej.” *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Kształcenie Polonistyczne Cudzoziemców* 12: 43–68.
- Kubbealti Lugati. Accessed April 13, 2024. <http://lugatim.com>.
- Kuczer, Jarosław. 2006. “‘Kapitał cywilizacyjny’ szlacheckości na Śląsku.” *Pro Libris. Lubuskie Pismo Literacko-Kulturalne* 4: 97–105.
- Kuczer, Jarosław. 2007. *Szlachta w życiu społeczno-gospodarczym księstwa głogowskiego w epoce habsburskiej 1526-1740*. Zielona Góra: Uniwersytet Zielonogórski.
- Kurmann, Joseph A., Jeremija L. Rasic, and Manfred Kroger. 1992. *Encyclopedia of Fermented Fresh Milk Products*. New York: An AVI Book.
- Kurtbilal, Niyar. 2019. “1944 Sürgünü Sonrası özbek Türkçesinden Kırım Tatar Türkçesine Geçen Kelimeler Üzerine. Bir İnceleme.” *Türk Dünyası* 47: 195–227.
- Kutalmış, Mehmet. 2004. “On the Armeno-Kipchak.” *Karadeniz Araştırmaları* 2: 35–42.
- Kutrzeba, Stanisław. 1903. *Starostowie, ich początki i rozwój do końca XIV w.* Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności.
- Kutrzeba, Stanisław. 1927. *Dawne Polskie. Prawo Sądowe w zarysie*. Lwów–Warszawa–Kraków: Zakład narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Kwapien, Ewelina. 2016. “Miany znaczeniowe wybranych czasowników mówienia zanikających w dobie nowopolskiej.” *Poznańskie Spotkania Językoznawcze* 32: 183–208.
- Kwaśniewicz, Włodzimierz. 1981. *1000 słów o broni białej i uzbrojeniu ochronnym*. Warszawa: Ministerstwo Obrony Narodowej.
- Kyiv Dictionary*. Accessed April 13, 2024. https://www.kyivdictionary.com/en/?q=hooks&from_lang=en&to_lang=uk.
- Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. 1921. *Nouveaux Essais sur l'entendement humain*. Paris: E. Flammarion.

- Murrati, Alexandre. 2020. "Tout savoir sur les boutons de manchette." *Oh dis le moi*. May 20, 2020. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://ohdislemoi.com/en/journal/tout-savoir-sur-les-boutons-de-manchette-b17.html>.
- "Mychitar Gosz." *Encyklopedia PWN*. Accessed April 13, 2024. <http://www.encyklopedia.pwn.pl/haslo/Mychitar-Gosz;3944840.html>.
- Nadel-Golobic, Eleonora. 1979. "Armenians and Jews in Medieval Lvov: The Role in Oriental Trade, 1400–1600." *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique* 20: 345–388.
- Nawrot, Radosław. 2015. "Poznań pełen uchodźców w XVI wieku." *Poznan.wyborcza.pl*. September 12, 2015. Accessed September 29, 2019. Accessed April 13, 2024. <http://poznan.wyborcza.pl/poznan/1,36001,18796494,poznan-pelen-uchodzcow-w-xiv-wieku.html>.
- Nicholson, Oliver. 2018. *The Oxford Dictionary of Late Antiquity*, vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nieczuja-Ostrowski, Paweł. 2011. *Ormianie w Polsce. Przeszłość i teraźniejszość*. Toruń: Adam Marszałek.
- Nieczuja-Ostrowski, Paweł. 2012. "Migracje ludności ormiańskiej w przeszłości i współcześnie." In *Current Issues of Politics and Society*, edited by Tatiana Tökölyová and Arkadiusz Modrzejewski. Tbilisi: Europe Our House Press.
- Nişanyan, Sevan. *Nişanyan Sözlük. Çağdaş Türkçenin Etimolojisi*. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://www.nisanyansozluk.com>.
- Nitsch, Kazimierz, et al., eds. 1953–2002. *Słownik staropolski*, t. 1–2. Wrocław, Kraków, Warszawa: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, PWN.
- Numen – the latin lexicon. Accessed April 14, 2024. <https://latinlexicon.org>.
- Oczko, Anna. 2010. *Zapóżycczenia południowosłowiańskie w języku rumuńskim w XVI i XVII wieku*. PhD diss., Kraków: UJ. Accessed April 13, 2024. https://ruj.uj.edu.pl/xmlui/bitstream/handle/item/41490/oczko_zapozyczenia_poludniowoslowianskie_w_jezyku_rumunskim_2010.pdf.
- Olsen, Birgit Anette. 1999. *The noun in Biblical Armenian: origin and word formation – with special emphasis on the Indo European heritage*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- "Oriental languages at the digital age." CALFA. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://calfa.fr>.
- Osmanlıca-Türkçe Sözlük*. Accessed July 1, 2020. https://dizge24.org/tr/belgeler/osmanlica-turkce_sozluk.pdf.
- Ottoman Turkish dictionary*. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://osmani.ahya.net/english-turkish-dictionary-56077.html>.

- Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. 1996. *New Essays on Human Understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Luther, Kenneth Alun. "Alp Arslān." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Accessed April 13, 2024. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/alp-arslan-saljuq-sultan>.
- Linde, Samuel. 1807–1814. *Słownik języka polskiego*, t. 1–6. Warszawa: Drukarnia XX. Piiarów.
- Lot, Ferdinand. 1931. "A quelle époque a-t-on cesse de parler latin?" *Bulletin du Cange* 6: 97–159.
- Łotocki, Łukasz. 2005. *Mniejszość ormiańska w Polsce. Tożsamość. Ocena społeczeństwa polskiego. Relacje z nowymi imigrantami*. Warszawa: Instytut Polityki Społecznej.
- Łoziński, Władysław. 1902. *Patrycjat i mieszczaństwo lwowskie w XVI i XVII wieku*. Lwów: Księgarnia H. Altenberga.
- Lubelczyk, Andrzej, 1544. *Baptismus Armenorum*. Kraków: Helena Unglerowa.
- Łuc, Izabela. 2017. "Pogranicze w odetnicznych nazwiskach mieszkańców południowego Śląska XIX wieku." *Polonica* 37: 115–136. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://polonica.ijp.pan.pl/index.php/polonica/article/view/119/66>.
- Machnicka, Violetta. 1999. "Uwagi o słownictwie *Kronik* Bolesława Prusa." *Acta Universitatis Lodzianensis, Folia Linguistica* 39: 53–62
- Machul-Telus, Beata. 2008. "Mniejszość ormiańska w Warszawie." *Studia Mazowieckie* 4 (10): 73–86. Accessed April 13, 2024. <http://docplayer.pl/5256830-Mniejszosc-ormianska-w-warszawie-1.html>.
- Maciejowski, Wacław Aleksander. 1846. *Pierwotne dzieje Polski i Litwy*. Warszawa: wyd. Komisja Rządowa Sprawiedliwości.
- Magakian, Grair. 2019a. "Armenians in Poland and Oriental Trade (selected issues)." *WEI International Academic Conference Proceedings 2019*: 30–47.
- Magakian, Grair. 2019b. "Przegląd kilku polskich zapożyczeń w gwarze Ormian z Kut." *Our Europe. Ethnography – Ethnology – Anthropology of Culture* 8: 13–26.
- Magakian, Grair. 2021. "Polskie zapożyczenia (quasi)politycznych terminów języku Ormian polskich (wybrane zagadnienia)." In *Homo politicus*, edited by Oleg Leszczak, 119–146. Kielce: UJK.
- Magakian, Grair. 2022. "Niektóre terminy związane z żywieniem w języku Ormian polskich (wybrane zagadnienia)." In *Wschód – Zachód*, edited by Danuty Gierczyńskiej and Idalii Smoczyk-Jackowiak, 110–130. Słupsk: Akademia Pomorska w Słupsku.
- Małowist, Marian. 1993. *Europa i jej ekspansje XIV-XVI w.* Warszawa: PWN.
- Mańkowski, Tadeusz. 1934. *Sztuka Ormian Lwowskich*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.

- Mańkowski, Tadeusz. 1934. *Sztuka Ormian Polskich i archiwum katedry*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.
- Mańkowski, Tadeusz. 1935. *Sztuka islamu w Polsce w XVII i XVIII wieku*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.
- Mańkowski, Tadeusz. 1959. *Orient w polskiej kulturze artystycznej*, Wrocław–Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Marciniak, Tomasz. 2005. “Integracja imigrantów ormiańskich w Polsce poprzez kulturę.” Instytut Socjologii UMK, Zakład Badań Kultury. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://docplayer.pl/15037642-Integracja-imigrantow-ormianskich-w-polsce-poprzez-kulture-wprowadzenie.html>.
- Martin, Richard C. 2004. *Encyclopedia of Islam and the Muslim World*. New York: Macmillan Reference USA™ & Thomson Gale.
- Martirosyan, Hrach K. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Martirosyan, Hrach K. 2013. “The place of Armenian in the Indo-European language family: the relationship with Greek and Indo-Iranian.” *Journal of Language Relationship* 10: 85–137.
- Martirosyan, Hrach K. 2014. “Origins and historical development of the Armenian language.” Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://ling.hse.ru/data/2014/09/01/1313574129/Hrach%20Martirosyan%20-%20Handout.pdf>.
- Martirosyan, Hrach K. 2019. “Armenian dialects: archaisms and innovations.” *Армянский гуманитарный вестник*, 164–258. Ереван: Школа демократии.
- Martirosyan, Hrach. 2019. “The Armenian dialects.” In *The Languages and Linguistics of Western Asia: An Areal Perspective*, edited by Geoffrey Haig and Geoffrey Khan, 46–105. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Martirosyan, Hrach. 2020. “All You Need to Know about Armenian Language.” *All You Need to Know about Armenian Language*. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://aspirantum.com/blog/all-you-need-to-know-about-armenian-language>.
- Matasović, Ranko. 2009. *A Grammatical Sketch of Classical Armenian*. Zagreb. Accessed April 13, 2024. <http://mudrac.ffzg.unizg.hr/~rmatasov/ARMENIAN2.pdf>.
- Meier-Brugger, Michael. 2003. *Indo-European Linguistics*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Morgan, Jacques de. 1919. *Histoire du peuple arménien depuis les temps les plus reculés de ses annales jusqu'à nos jours*. Nancy: Berger-Levrault.

- Özçelik, Öner. *Turkish Language* (to appear in the Encyclopedia of Islam and the Islamic World, 2016). <http://www.pages.iu.edu/~oozcelik/papers/Turkish%20language%20-%20encyclopedia%20entry.pdf>.
- Papée, Fryderyk. 1894. *Historia miasta Lwowa w zarysie*, Lwów: Główny skład w Księgarni Gubrynowicza i Schmidta, Nakładem Gminy Król. Stoł. Miasta Lwowa.
- Pearsall, Judy. 1999. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pełczyński, Grzegorz. 2018. “Kabzanie Vincenza.” *Tematy i Konteksty* 8 (13): 89–103.
- Pełczyński, Grzegorz. 2020. “Then & Now: Armenians at Home on Polish Lands.” *Culture.pl*. December 4, 2020. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://culture.pl/en/article/then-now-armenians-at-home-on-polish-lands>.
- Piotrowski, Józef. 1925. *Katedra ormiańska we Lwowie w świetle restauracji i ostatnich odkryć*. Lwów: Kurja metropolitalna obrządku orm.-kat. we Lwowie.
- Pisowicz, Andrzej Stanisław. 2000a. “Ormianie polscy. Problem świadomości narodowej a kwestia języka.” In *Język a tożsamość narodowa. Slavica*, edited by Maria Bobrownicka, 135–142. Kraków: Universitas.
- Pisowicz, Andrzej Stanisław. 2000b. “Polish names of Armenians. Ormiańczyk ... Kabzan.” *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 5: 91–95.
- Pisowicz, Andrzej Stanisław. 1999. “Jakimi językami mówili polscy Ormianie?” In *Ormianie polscy. Odrębność i asymilacja*, edited by Beata Biedrońska-Słotowa, 25–26. Kraków: Muzeum Narodowe.
- Pisowicz, Andrzej Stanisław. 2016. “Opowieści ormiańskie z miasteczka Kuty w tłumaczeniu na język polski wraz z komentarzami.” *Krakowskie Pismo Kresowe* 8: 269–292.
- Plungian, Vladimir. 2019. “Notes on Eastern Armenian verbal paradigms.” In *Aspects of Linguistic Variation*, edited by Daniël Van Olmen, Tanja Mortelmans, Frank Brisard, 233–246. Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Polackówna, Helena. 1913. *Szlachta na Siwierz Biskupim w latach 1442–1790*. Lwów: Towarzystwa Heraldycznego we Lwowie, z I. Związkowej Drukarni.
- Polak, Abraham Nahum. 2015. *Chazaria. Dzieje królestwa żydowskiego w Europie*. Translated by Krzysztof Dawid Majus. Przemyśl: Południowo-Wschodni Instytut Naukowy w Przemyślu.
- Popliński, Antoni, and Józef Łukaszewicz. 1842. *Orędownik Naukowy: pismo czasowe poświęcone literaturze, historii, krytyce i nowinom literackim*. Poznań: Drukarnia Redakcyi.

- Pospiszyl, Anna. 2004. "Nazwy naczyń z drewnianych klepek." *Prace Językoznawcze* 6: 119–131.
- "Prawo składu." *Encyklopedia PWN*. Accessed April 13, 2024. <http://www.encyklopedia.pwn.pl/haslo/prawo-skladu;3961906.html>.
- Ptolemy, Claudius. 1525. *Atlas*. Imprint: Argentoragi: Iohannes Griengreus, communibus Iohannes Koberger impensis excudebat.
- Redhouse, James W. 1890. *A Turkish and English Lexicon*. Printed for the American Mission by Boyajian A. H.: Constantinople.
- Rejter, Artur. 2006. *Leksyka ekspresywna w historii języka polskiego. Kulturowo-komunikacyjne konteksty potoczności*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Rey, Alain. ed. 1988. *Petit Robert 2. Dictionnaire universel des noms propres*. Paris: Le Robert.
- Rivola, Francisco. 1633. *Dictionarium armeno-latinum*. Lutetiae Parisiorum: Impensis Societatis Typographicae Librorum Officii Ecclesiastici.
- Rolle, Antoni Józef. 1978. *Nowe opowiadania historyczne*. Lwów: Gubrynowicza i Schmidta.
- Rouquier, Jérémy. 2019. "Étude diachronique du gascon béarnais au sein des textes officiels. Quelle(s) variation(s) par rapport au gascon ?" In *Actes des Rencontres lyonnaises des jeunes chercheurs en linguistique historique*, edited by Timothée Premat and Ariane Pinche, 40–47. Lyon: Diachronies contemporaines.
- Royal Irish Academy. 2003. *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from Celtic Sources* (DMLCS). Accessed April 13, 2024. http://journals.eecs.qub.ac.uk/DMLCS/frameaset_letter_F.html.
- Rydzkowska-Kozak, Joanna. 2013. "Historia polskich zbiorów rękopisów ormiańskich." In *Stan badań nad wielokulturowym dziedzictwem dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, vol. 6, edited by Wojciech Walczak and Karol Łopatecki, 17–41. Białystok: Instytut Badań nad Dziedzictwem Kulturowym Europy.
- Sakhno, Sergueï. 2016. "Славянские уменьшительные суффиксы в диахронии: спорные случаи и словообразовательные параллели с другими индоевропейскими языками." In *Slavic diminutive suffixes in diachrony and synchrony*, edited by I. Stramlić, 434–443. Maribor: University of Maribor.
- Salan, Musa. 2016. *Codex Cumanicus ve Ermeni Harfli Kıpçak Türkçesinde Fiil Yapımı*. PhD diss., Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Sargsyan, Tatevik E. 2018. "Minas Bżyszgian i jego relacja o Ormianach Lwowa." *Lehahayer* 5: 159–193.

- Schneider, Antoni. 1871. *Encyklopedia do krajoznawstwa Galicyi*, t. 1. Lwów: Drukarnia Narodowa Ossolińskich.
- Sikorska-Kulesza, Jolanta. 1995. *Deklasacja drobnej szlachty na Litwie i Białorusi w XIX wieku*. Pruszków: wyd. Ajaks.
- Skorupka, Stanisław, Halina Auderska, and Zofia Łempicka. 1969. *Mały słownik języka polskiego*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Słownik języka polskiego* (sjp.pl). Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://sjp.pl>.
- Słownik języka polskiego*. PWN (SJP PWN). Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://sjp.pwn.pl>.
- Sobol, Elżbieta. 1995. *Słownik wyrazów obcych*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Stachowski, Stanisław. 2010. "Polonizacja języka ormiańsko-kipczackiego." *LingVaria* V (2): 213–227.
- Starostin, Sergei, Anna Dybo and Oleg Mudrak. 2003. *An Etymological Dictionary of Altaic Languages*. Leiden: Brill Academic Pub.
- "Statut ormiański." Polish History Museum. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://muzhp.pl/pl/e/1528/statut-ormianski>; <https://muzhp.pl/en/calendar/statut-ormianski-en>.
- Stopka, Krzysztof. 2000. *Ormianie w Polsce dawniej i dzisiaj*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Stopka, Krzysztof. 2010a. "Interakcje etniczne w mieście staropolskim. Kamieniec Podolski w ujęciu źródeł ormiańskich od XV do połowy XVII wieku." *Prace Komisji Wschodnioeuropejskiej* XI: 85–124.
- Stopka, Krzysztof. 2010b. "Ormiani." In *Pod wspólnym niebem. Narody dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, edited by Michał Kopczyński and Wojciech Tygielski, 115–131. Warszawa: Muzeum Historii Polski.
- Stopka, Krzysztof. 2010c. "The Religious Culture of Polish Armenians (Church-Public Structures and Relations)." *Acta Poloniae Historica* 101: 163–205.
- Stopka, Krzysztof. 2016. *Armenia Christiana: Armenian Religious Identity and the Churches of Constantinople and Rome (4th–15th century)*. Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press.
- Stopka, Krzysztof. 2017a. *Ormianie polscy – siedem wieków istnienia*. Warszawa: Kancelaria Senatu.
- Stopka, Krzysztof. 2017b. "Tożsamość Ormian galicyjskich." *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Historyczne* 144 (2): 335–355.
- Subtelny, Orest. 2009. *Ukraine: a history*. 4th ed. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press.

- Sulimierski, Filip, Bronisław Chlebowski, and Władysław Walewski. 1883. *Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich*, t. 4. Warszawa: Władysława Walewskiego.
- Szarwiło, Bogusław. 2012. "68 rocznica rzezi Polaków w Kutach nad Czeremoszem." Wolyn.org, May 2, 2012. Accessed August 22, 2019. <https://wolyn.org/index.php/wolyn-wola-o-prawde/413-68-rocznica-rzezi-polakow-w-kutach-nad-czeremoszem.html>.
- "Szpakami karmiony." Narodowe Centrum Kultury. Accessed April 14, 2024. https://nck.pl/projekty-kulturalne/projekty/ojczysty-dodaj-do-ulubionych/ciekawostki-jezykowe/SZPAKAMI_KARMIONY,cltt,S.ajax.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger, and Harold W. Bailey. 2024. "Armenia and Iran iv. Iranian influences in Armenian Language." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Accessed April 15, 2024, <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/armenia-iv>.
- Szober, Stanisław. 1923. *Gramatyka języka polskiego*. Zeszyt 2: *Nauka o znaczeniu i budowie wyrazów*. Lwów–Warszawa: wyd. Książnica Polska.
- Szongott, Kristóf. 2016. *Genealogia familiilor armene din Transilvania*. București: Editura Ararat.
- Szymczak, Mieczysław. 1978. *Słownik języka polskiego*, t. 1. Warszawa: PWN.
- Tamminen, Tanja. 2004. "The Vlachs in the Republic of Macedonia. A Success Story or a Minority on Road to Extinction?" In *The Forgotten Minorities of Eastern Europe*, edited by Arno Tanner, 201–228. Helsinki: East-Wast Book, Helsinki.
- Trésor de la Langue Française informatisé* (TLFI). Université de Lorraine, <http://atilf.atilf.fr>.
- Trochimczyk, Maja. "Krakowiak or Cracovienne." *Polish dances*, April 29, 2001. Accessed December 24, 2019. https://web.archive.org/web/20080420133302/https://www.usc.edu/dept/polish_music/dance/krakowiak.html.
- Tryjarski, Edward. 2017. "Names for monetary units, measuring, and weights in Armeno-Kipchak texts." In *Armeno-Kipchak Studies*, edited by Marek Mejer and Agata Bareja-Starzyńska, 487–508. Warszawa: Pan, Dom Wydawniczy Elipsa.
- Turek, Waclaw Przemysław. 2002a. "Zmiany wyrazów arabskich zapożyczonych do polszczyzny za pośrednictwem innych języków." *Język Polski* 2: 96–99.
- Turek, Waclaw Przemysław. 2002b. *Słownik zapożyczeń pochodzenia arabskiego w polszczyźnie*. Karków: Turnau, Irena. 1987. "Źródła z lat 1572–1728 do ubioru polskich Ormian." *Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej* 35 (4): 601–610.
- The Lawcode (Datastanagirk') of Mxit'ar Goš*. 2000. Translated with commentary and indices by Robert W. Thomson. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.

- Theodorowicz, Leon. 1927. "Data osiedlenia się Ormian na Rusi i w Polsce." *Posłaniec Św. Grzegorza, pismo poświęcone sprawom Archidiecezji Lwowskiej obrządku ormiańskiego* 4: 10–12.
- UNESCO, World Heritage Centre. 2024. "Archaeological Site of Ani." Accessed April 14, 2024. <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1518>.
- Urbańczyk, Stanisław, et al., eds. 1960–2002. *Słownik staropolski*, t. 3–11. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk, Łódź: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, PWN.
- Ustawa z dnia 17 marca 1921 r. – Konstytucja Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej, Dz.U. 1921 nr 44 poz. 267.
- Villotte, Jacobus. 1714. *Dictionarium novum latino-armenium ex praecipuis armeniae lingvae scriptoribus concinnatum*. Romae: Typis Sac. Congreg. de Propaganda Fide.
- Vincenz, Stanisław. 2013. "O Huculach dla Encyklopedii Ukraińskiej." *Karpaccy.pl*, March 6, 2013. Accessed April 13, 2024. <http://karpaccy.pl/o-huculach-dla-encyklopedii-ukraińskiej-plaj-43>.
- Volumen Secundum Ab Anno 1550. Ad Annum 1609*. 1733. Warszawa: Acta Reipublicae Continens, Collegium Scholarum Piarum.
- Voss, von Huberta. 2007. *Portraits of Hope: Armenians in the Contemporary World*. Translated by Alasdair Lean. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Wielki słownik ortograficzny PWN (WSOPWN)*. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://sjp.pwn.pl/slowniki/Wielki-s%C5%82ownik-ortograficzny-PWN.html>.
- Wild, Susan Ellis. 2006. *Law Dictionary*. New York: Wiley Publishing.
- Windfuhr, Gernot, and John Perry. 2009. "Persian and Tajik." In *The Iranian Languages*, edited by Gernot Windfuhr, 416–544. New York: Routledge.
- Zachariasiewicz, Franciszek Xawery. 1842. *Wiadomość o Ormianach w Polsce*. Lwów: Zakładu Naukowego im. Ossolińskich.
- Zajączkowski, Ananiasz. 1937. "O zapożyczeniach wschodnich w języku polskim, cz. 2." *Poradnik Językowy* 8 (4): 33–39.
- Zajączkowski, Ananiasz. 1949. "Związki językowe połowiecko-słowiańskie." *Sprawozdania z posiedzeń Wydziału I Językoznawstwa i Historii Literatury* XLI: 87–94.
- Zdanowicz, Aleksander. 1861. *Słownik języka polskiego*, cz. 1. Wilno: Maurycy Orgelbrand.
- Zeuthen, Peter. 2007. *Handbook of Fermented Meat and Poultry*. Ames: Blackwell Publishing.
- Zgólkowa, Halina. 1994–2005. *Praktyczny słownik współczesnej polszczyzny*, t. 1–50. Poznań: Kurpisz.

- “Актова книга Кам’янець-Подільського вірменського вйтівського суду (10 березня 1572 р. – 23 вересня 1624 р.) по 8 (АктКП).” Центральний державний історичний архів України, М. Київ. Accessed April 13, 2024. https://cdiak.archives.gov.ua/spysok_fondiv/0039/0001/0008/.
- Божко, Олександр. 1993. “Українізми в мові вірменських актових записів XVI–XVII ст. з м. Кам’янець-Подільського.” *Східний світ* 1: 83–86
- Брокгауз, Фридрих, and Ефрон Илья. 1894. *Энциклопедический словарь Брокгауза и Ефрона*, т. ХІА. Санкт-Петербург: Семеновская Типолитография (И. Ефрона).
- Брокгауз, Фридрих, and Ефрон Илья. 1896. *Энциклопедический словарь Брокгауза и Ефрона*, т. ХVІІІ. Санкт-Петербург: Семеновская Типолитография (И. Ефрона).
- Гамкрелідзе, Тамаз, and Иванов Вячеслав. 1984. *Индоевропейский язык и индоевропейцы*, т. 1, 2. Тбилиси: Тбилисского университета.
- Гаркавец, Александр. 2017. *Кыпчакское письменное наследие*, т. I, II. Алматы: Баур.
- Гаркавец, Александр. 2010. *Кыпчакское письменное наследие*, т. III. Алматы: Баур-Касеан.
- Гаркавец, Александр. 1993. *Вірмено-кипчацькі рукописи в Україні, Вірменії, Росії. Каталог*. Київ: Українознавство.
- Голубовский, Петр. 1884. *Печенеги, торки и половцы до нашествия татар. История южно-русских степей IX—XIII вв.* Киев: Университетская типография И. И. Завадского.
- Дашкевич, Ярослав, and Эдуард Триярский. 1973. “Армяно-кыпчакская надпись из Львова (1609 г.) и вопросы изучения средневековых памятников армянской эпиграфики.” *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 35(2): 123–135.
- Драгоманов, Михайло. 1870. “Малороссия в ее словесности.” *Вестник Европы* июнь: 754–801.
- Дуда, Игор. 2008. *Спомнеш моє слово. Лемківський словник*. Тернопілля: Астон.
- Евгеньева, Анастасия. 1981–1984. *Словарь русского языка*, т. 1–4. Москва: Русский язык.
- Ефремова, Татьяна. *Новый словарь русского языка. Толково-словообразовательный*. Accessed April 13, 2024. https://classes.ru/all-russian/russian-dictionary-Vasmer-term-7673.htm#МЕТРИКА_значение.
- Желехівський, Євгеній, and Недільський Софрон. 1886. *Малоруско-німецький словар*, т. 2. Львів: Товариство ім. Шевченка.

- Желехівський, Євгеній. 1886. *Малоруско-німецький словар*, т. 1. Львів: Товариство ім. Шевченка.
- “Значение слова «луза».” Kartaslov.ru. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://kartaslov.ru/значение-слова/луза>.
- Калачов, Николай. 1846. *Текст Русской правды на основании четырех списковъ разныхъ редакцій*. Москва: тип. Августа Семена.
- Караванський, Святосла. 2014. *Практичний словник синонімів української мови*. Львів БаК.
- Карпюк, Аляксей. 1992. *Белая Дама: Аповесці*. Мінск: Мастацкая літаратура.
- Кримський, Агатангел. 1930. *Тюрки, їх мови та літератури. I Тюркські мови*. Вип. 2. Київ: Вид-во УАН.
- Крылов, Григорий. 2005. *Этимологический словарь русского языка*. Санкт-Петербург: Полиграфуслуги.
- Ларин, Александр. 2014. “Люстрация как основание ограничения избирательного права.” *Теория и практика общественного развития* 4: 246–249.
- Логинов, Святослав. 2009. “Пышка, пончик, оладья (пристрастное кулинарно-филологическое исследование).” *Наука и жизнь*, September 2007. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://www.nkj.ru/archive/articles/11571>.
- Мартынаў, Віктар, et al. 1978. *Этымалагічны слоўнік беларускай мовы*, т. 1. Мінск: Навука і тэхніка.
- Матейко, Катерина. 1996. *Український народний одяг. Етнографічний словник*. Київ: Наукова думка.
- Мельничук, Олександр, et al. 1982–2012. *Етимологічний словник української мови*, т. 1–6. Київ: Наукова думка.
- Ожегов, Сергей. 2012. *Толковый словарь русского языка*. Москва: Мир и Образование.
- Онацький, Євген. 1960. *Українська мала енциклопедія*, 7 кн. Буенос-Айрес: Накладом Адміністрації УАПЦ в Аргентині.
- Онацький, Євген. 1967. *Українська мала енциклопедія*, 16 кн. Буенос-Айрес: Накладом Адміністрації УАПЦ в Аргентині.
- Петрушевич, Антоній. 1853. “Краткая историческая роспись русскимъ церквамъ и монастырямъ, въ городѣ Львовѣ.” *Галицкій историческій сборникъ* 1: 3–17.
- Погосян, Норайр. 2017. Русские заимствования в армянских письменных источниках XVI–XVIII вв. In *Письменные памятники армянского наследия*, edited by Донара Мкртчян, 169–178. Санкт-Петербург: Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет.

- “Привилей.” Портал правовой помощи. Accessed April 14, 2024. <http://pravoteka.ru/encyclopedia11766>.
- Происхождение фамилии Немич (ПфН). Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://istorya-familii.ru/story.php?name=Немич>.
- Рымашевская, Эмилия. 1990. *Немецко-русский и русско-немецкий словарь*. Москва: Русский язык.
- Словник лемківської говірки*. Словари и энциклопедии на Академикe (СизнА). Accessed April 13, 2024. https://ukrainian_lemko.academic.ru/.
- Словник української мови (Сум)*. *Академічний тлумачний словник (1970—1980)*. 2023. Accessed April 13, 2024. <http://sum.in.ua>.
- Свиридова, М. 2014. *Этимологический словарь современного русского языка*. Москва: Аделант .
- Соловьев, Александар. 1936. Застава Стефана Душана над Скопьем године 1339, In *Гласник СНД XV-XVI*, 345–348. Скопье.
- Соловьев, Александр. 1947. “Великая, Малая и Белая Русь.” *Вопросы истории* 7: 24–38.
- “Толковый словарь Даля” (ТСД). Gufo.me. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://gufo.me/dict/dal>.
- “Толковый словарь Ефремовой” (ТСЕ). Gufo.me. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://gufo.me/dict/efremova>
- “Толковый словарь Ушакова” (ТСУ). Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://ushakovdictionary.ru/>.
- Трубачёва, Олег. 1987. *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд*. Москва: Наука.
- Тунян, Валери. 2015. *Армянский вопрос: мифотворческий аспект*. Ереван: Егу.
- Успенский, Гавриил. 1818. *Опыт повествования о древностях русских*, ч. 2. Харьков: университетская типография Харькова.
- Фасмер, Макс. 1986–1987. *Этимологический словарь русского языка*, т. 1-4. Москва: Прогресс.
- Шанский, Николай, Иванов Валерий, and Шанская Тамара. 1971. *Краткий этимологический словарь русского языка*. Москва: Просвещение.
- Энциклопедический словарь Брокгауза и Ефрона*, т. IXA (18). 1893. Санкт-Петербург: Семеновская Типолитография (И. А. Ефрона).
- “Этимологический онлайн-словарь русского языка Крылова Г.” Lexicography. Accessed April 13, 2024 . <https://lexicography.online/etymology/krylov>.

“Этимологический онлайн-словарь русского языка Шанского Н.” Lexicography. Accessed April 13, 2024 . <https://lexicography.online/etymology/shansky>.

- Արաջյան, Աննա, Դիրբարյան, Նարինե, and Յուզբաշյան Անահիտ. 2017. *Հայոց լեզվի պատմություն*. Երևան: ԵՊՀ հրատ.
- Արրահամյան, Արամ. 2017. “«Այսօրվա լեզվաբանության» տեսակները.” *Առավոտ*, December 22, 2017. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://www.aravot.am/2017/12/22/927766>.
- Ալիշան, Ղևոնդ. 1896. *Կամենից, Տարեգիրք Հայոց Լեհաստանի եւ Ռումինիոյ*. Վենետիկ: Մխիթարյան Միաբանություն.
- Ալիսնեան, Ներսես. 1936. *Միմեռն դպրի Լեհացոյ Ուղեգրություն: Նկարագիր ուղևորության ի Եվրոպե ի Կ.Պոլիս, ի Հռոմ, ի Մոսկու եւ յերուսաղեմ յամսն 1608-1619*. Վիեննա: Մխիթարեան տպարան.
- Ահարոնյան, Ավետիս. 1926. *Քրիստոսփոք Միքայելեան*. Բոստոն: Hairenik Press.
- Աղայան, Էդվարդ, Ղափանցյան, Գրիգոր, and Մելքունյան Ռաֆայել. 1954–1958. *Ռուս-հայերեն բառարան*, հ. 1–4. Երևան: ՀՍՍՌ ԳԱ.
- Աղայան, Էդվարդ. 1976. *Արդի հայերենի բացատրական բառարան*, հ. 1–2. Երևան: հրատ. Հայաստան.
- Անատեան, Հրաչեայ. 1902. *Թուրքերեն փոխառեալ բառերը Պոլսի հայ ժողովրդական լեզուին մէջ համեմատութեամբ Վանի, Ղարաբաղի եւ Նոր-Նախիջևանի բարբառներուն*. Մոսկուա-Վաղարշապատ: Լազարեան Ճեմարան Արեւելեան Լեզուաց.
- Անատեան, Հրաչեայ. 1913. *Հայերեն գաւառական բառարան*. Թիֆլիս: Լազարեան Ճեմարան Արեւելեան Լեզուաց.
- Անատեան, Հրաչեայ. 1971–1979. *Հայերեն արմատական բառարան*, հ. 1–4. Երևան: Երևանի Համալսարանի Հրատարակչություն.
- Անառնյան, Հրաչեայ. 1940. *Հայոց լեզվի պատմություն*, Ի մաս. Երևան: Եպի.
- Անառնյան, Հրաչեայ. 1951. *Հայոց լեզվի պատմություն*, II մաս. Երևան: Հայպետհրատ.
- Անառնյան, Հրաչեայ. 1940. *Հայոց լեզվի պատմություն*, I մաս. Երևան: Երևանի պետական համալսարանի հրատ.
- Անառնյան, Հրաչեայ. 1953. *Քննություն Առտիպի բարբառի*. Երևան ՀՍՍՌ ԳԱ հրատարակչություն.
- Անառնյան, Հրաչեայ. 1984. *Հայոց գրերը*. Երևան: Երևանի Պետական Համալսարանի հրատարակչություն.

- Այվազյան, Հովհաննես. 2002. *Քրիստոնյա Հայաստան հանրագիտարան*. Երևան: Հայկական հանրագիտարանի գլխավոր խմբագրություն.
- Անդրեասյան, Էդիկ. 2016. “Շուկեր՝ պավոնական բառ է, նշանակում է խաբերա եւ գրվում է մեկ լ-ով.” *Հրատարակ*, July 29, 2016. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://hraparak.am/post/591f999fe3d84d0d37fc7b8c>.
- Ասատրյան Գառնիկ 1990. “Արդյոք կա՞ն հայկական փոխառություններ նոր պարսկերենում.” *Պատմա-քանասիրական հանդես* 3: 139–144.
- Ասմանզուլյան, Հասմիկ, and Հովհաննիսյան Մարիամ . 1984. *Անգլերեն-հայերեն բառարան*. Երևան: Հայաստան հրատ.
- Արախանեանց, Ալեստիք. 1880. “Հողային խնդիրը Անդրկովկասում.” *Մուրճ* 7: 935–944.
- Արուսյան Սերգեյ. 1935. “Առաջարկության կարգով” *Խորհրդային Հայաստան*. July 6, 1935. Accessed April 13, 2024. [https://tert.nla.am/archive/HGG%20TERT/xor.Hayastan/1935/1935\(154\).pdf](https://tert.nla.am/archive/HGG%20TERT/xor.Hayastan/1935/1935(154).pdf).
- Ալգերեան, Յարութիւն, and Պրէնտեան Յովհանն. 1821. *Բառարան Անգղիարէն եւ Հայերէն*, հ. 1. Վենետիկ: Միսիթարեան Հրատարակութիւն.
- Ալգերեան, Յարութիւն. 1868. *Բառարան Անգղիարէն եւ Հայերէն*. Վենետիկ: Միսիթարեանց Տպարան.
- Ալեստիքեան, Գաբրիէլ, Սիւրմէլեան, Իսաչատուր, and Ալգերեան Սկրտիչ. 1836–1837. *Նոր բառգիրք հայկազեան լեզուի*, հ. 1–2. Վենետիկ: Տպարան ի Սրբոյն Ղազարու.
- “Առջանց խանութներում հազուստ գնելիս...” Skolkoseriy.ru. December 12, 2019. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://skolkoseriy.ru/hy/yubki/terminologiya-mody-modnyi-slovar-terminy-mody-s-illyustraciyami-podarki.html>.
- “Բանակային-քաղաքացիական տերմինների համառոտ բացատրական բառարան” (ԲԲՏՀԲԲ). Ակումբ. հայաստառ քննարկումներ. December 28, 2013. Accessed April 13, 2024 . <https://www.akumb.am/showthread.php/63409-Բանակային>.
- Բաբախանյան, Առաքել (Լէո.) 1904. *Հայկական տպագրութիւն: Հայերն նոր պատմութեան մէջ: Պատմական-գրական տեսութիւն: Առաջին հատոր: XVI–XVII դ. Թիֆլիս*: Տպարան Հերմէս.
- Բարսեղյան, Հովհաննես. 1973. *Հայերեն ուղղագրական-ուղղահիտասական-տերմինաբանական բառարան*. Երևան: Լույս.
- “Բնական կաշվի արտադրության տեխնոլոգիայի հիմունքները: Բնական կաշվի վերամշակում և տեսակներ.” Neurologystatus. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://neurologystatus.ru/hy/fundamentals-of-the-technology-of-production-of-natural-leather-processing-and-types-of-leather.html>.

- Բժշկեանց, Մինաս. 1830. *Ճանապարհորդութիւն ի Լեհաստան*. Վենետիկ: Ս. Ղազար.
- Բոժկո, Օլեքսանդր. 2010. “Ուկրաինարանությունները Կամյանեց-Պոդիլսկ քաղաքի XVI–XVII դարերի հայկական դատարանի վավերագրերի լեզվում.” *Պատմա-քանասիրական հանդես* 2: 110–115.
- Գալստյան, Սերգեյ. 1997. “Ժամանակակից հայերենի վերջածանցների համաժամանակյա դասակարգման մի քանի հարցեր.” *Բանբեր Երևանի համալսարանի* 2 (92): 77–82
- Գայայեան, Յովհաննէս Թովմաս. 1938. *Բառարան գանձարան հայերէն լեզուի*. Գահիրէ: Տպագրութիւն Գալֆա.
- Գասպարյան, Նորիկ. 2016. “Լեյբորիստական կուսակցությունը շարունակում է խոսել ընտրակեղծիքների մասին”. *AliqMedia*. November 18, 2016. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://www.aliq.ge/լեյբորիստական-կուսակցությունը-շարունակում-է-խոսել-ընտրակեղծիքների-մասին>.
- Գէորգեան, Կոմիտաս. 1989. *Երաժշտական բառարան*. Փարիզ: Association d'action artistique Armenienne.
- Գրիգորյան, Սուսաննա, and Պարոնյան Նաիրա. 2015. Եվրոպական փոխառությունները ըստ միջինհայերենյան տարբեր աղբյուրների. In *Զատուկյանական ընթերցումներ*, edited by Վիկտոր Կատվալյան, 27–33. Երևան: ՀՀ ԳԱԱ Հր. Աճառյանի անվան լեզվի ինստիտուտ.
- Գրիգորյան, Սուսաննա. 2017. Լեհական փոխառությունները միջին հայերենում. In *Հայագիտական Հանդես*, 2/36, edited by Ռուբեն Միրզախանյան, 55–62. Երևան: Խ.Արովյանի անվան հայկական պետական մանկավարժական համալսարան.
- Գրիգորյան, Վարդան. 1963. *Կամենեց-Պոդոլսկ քաղաքի հայկական դատարանի արձանագրությունները*. Երևան: ՀՍՍՌ ԳԱ հրատ.
- Գրիգորյան, Վարդան. 1974. “Սոցիալական հարաբերությունները Պոդոլսկի հայկական գաղութներում.” *Պատմա-քանասիրական հանդես* 3: 35–50.
- “Գրիչ՝ Միսքո սրկ. Մուրատ օղլու: Ստացո՛ղ՝ բան Վարդան, բաննա Զօֆիեա. 2403.” 1626. *Ժողովածոյ (հայատառ ղիչաղերէն)*. Accessed April 13, 2024. <http://www.matenadaran.am/ftp/VIIIvolume.htm>.
- “Գիմորդն ուզում էր "Լալիյացիա" անել.” Առավոտ, June 18, 2010. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://www.aravot.am/2010/06/18/349369/?s=>.
- Գարպայան, Վահրամ. 1978. *Դասական պարի տերմինների բառարան*. Երևան: Լույս.

- “Դուք կարող եք մայրության արձակուրդ գնալ 30 շաբաթից ուշ: Դեկրետ.” Woman-channel. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://woman-channel.ru/hy/manicure/mozhno-poiti-dekret-pozzhe-30-nedel-dekretnyi-otpusk-bolnichnyi-list.html>.
- Երեմեան, Միմէն. 1902. *Կենսագրություն Հ. Ալիշանի*, Վենետիկ: Ս. Ղազար հրատ.
- Էլոյան, Սեդա. 2002. *Արդի հայերենի նորարարությունների բառարան*. Երևան: Նաիրի.
- Էփրիկեան, Սուքիաս. 1903. *Պատկերագրող բնաշխարհիկ բառարան*, հ. I. Վենետիկ: Ս. Ղազար հրատ.
- Թահմազ, Իսաչատուր, *Պոնտահայերենի Ջենիգի ենթաբարբառ*. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://dokumen.tips/documents/-568cacca1a28ab186da8f903.html?page=151>.
- Թոխաթեցի Մինաս. 1921. *Ողբ ի վերայ Օլախաց երկրի հայերուն, Ազգային մատենադարան*, ՂԲ, Վիեննա: „Հինգ պանդուխտ տաղասացներ”, Մխիթարյան տպարան. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://digilib.aua.am/book/275/280/5016/?lang=en>.
- Իսահակյան, Ավետիք. 1975. Աղվեսն ու նապստակը, հ. 3. In *Երկերի ժողովածու*. Երևան: Հայաստան հրատ.
- Իսաչատրեան, Լալիկ. 2016. *Գրաբարի ուսումնական բառարան*. Վենետիկ, Սուրբ Ղազար: Մխիթարեան հրատարակչատուն.
- Իսաչատրյան, Գուրգեն. 2015. Հովհաննես Կամենացու «Պատմություն պատերազմին խոթինու» երկի լեզվաոճական որոշ առանձնահատկություններ. In *Վանասձորի պետական համալսարանի գիտական տեղեկագիր*, պրակ Ա, edited by Գուրգեն Իսաչատրյան, 16–31. Երևան: Վանասձորի Հ. Թումանյանի անվան պետական համալսարան.
- Խնդրունի, Տիգրան, and Մարդիրոս Գուշագճեան. 1970. *Հայերեն-Անգլերեն Արդի Բառարան*. Պէրյուք: Հրատարակչատուն Կ. Տոնիկեան եւ Որդիք.
- Կամենացի, Յովհաննէս. 1964. *Պատմություն պատերազմին Խոթինու*. Երևան: Հայկական ՄՍՌ Գիտությունների ակադեմիա.
- Կարապետեան, Պետրոս. 1912. *Մեծ բառարան օսմաներէնէ հայերէն*. Կ. Պոլիս: Տպագրութիւն Արշակ Կարօեան.
- “Կաշվե իրեր – եկեք խոսենք պայմանների մասին: Բնական կաշվի տեսակները.” Neurologystatus. November 15, 2013. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://neurologystatus.ru/hy/leather-products-lets-talk-about-terms-types-of-genuine-leather.html>.
- Կիրակոսյան, Հասմիկ. 2017. Մարդու մարմնի մաս նշանակող բառանվանումներով կազմված տեղանունները իրանական լեզուներում. In Լեզու և լեզվաբանություն,

- 2/17, edited by Վազգեն Համբարձումյան, 15–26. Երևան: ՀՀ ԳԱԱ Հ.Աճառյանի անվան լեզվի ինստիտուտ.
- Կոմիտաս վարդ., and Աբեղեան Մանուկ. 1905. Թագուորագովք (հարսանեկան երգեր). In *Հագար ու մի խաղ. Ժողովրդական երգարան. II յիսնեակ*, edited by Կոմիտաս վարդ. and Աբեղեան Մանուկ, 65–67. Վաղարշապատ: Տպարան Սայր Աթոռոյ Ս. Էջմիածնի.
- Հակոբյան, Գոհար. 2018. “Սմբատ Գոգյան. «Ոմանք ներկայանում են աշխարհահռչակ գիտնական, մինչդեռ սովորական շուկեր են».” *Առավոտ*. July 19, 2018. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://www.aravot.am/2018/07/19/971135>.
- Համբարձումյան, Ռաֆայել. 1984. “Լեհահայ գաղթավայրերի սկզբնավորումը, ներգաղթի ժամանակն ու փուլերը՝ ըստ Սադոկ Բարոնչի.” *Բանբեր Երևանի համալսարանի* 3 (54): 145–153.
- Համբարձումյան, Վազգեն. 1997. “Հայերեն աղջիկ բառի ստուգաբանությունը.” *Պատմա-բանասի-րական հանդես* 2: 149–152.
- Համբարձումյան, Վազգեն. 2015. *Ակնարկներ հայ բառարանագրության պատմության (X-XVIII դդ.)*. Երևան: ՀՀ ԳԱԱ Գիտություն հրատ.
- Համբարձումյան, Վիկտոր. 1976. *Հայկական սովետական հանրագիտարան*, հ. 2. Երևան: Հայ սովետական հանրագիտարան հրատարակչություն.
- Հայրապետյան, Աշոտ. 2011. *Օտար բառերի բառարան*. Երևան: Հեղինակային հրատարակչություն.
- Ղազարյան Ռուբեն, and Ավետիսյան Հենրիկ. 2009. *Միջին հայերենի բառարան*. Երևան: ԵՊՀ.
- Ղազարյան, Մելանյա. 2001. Լատիներենից կատարված փոխառությունները միջին հայերենում. In *Կանյօեղ. Գիտական հոդվածների ժողովածու*, հ. 5, edited by Լիլիթ Արզումանյան, 88–95. Երևան: Ասողիկ.
- Ղազարյան, Ռուբեն. 1992. “Փոխառությունները միջին գրական հայերենում (ընդհանուր ակնարկ).” *Բանբեր Երևանի համալսարանի* 2 (77): 14–25.
- Ղազարյան, Ռուբեն. 1993. “Արաբական և եվրոպական փոխառությունների տատարարձության առանձնահատկությունները միջին հայերենում.” *Բանբեր Երևանի համալսարանի* 2 (80): 168–171.
- Ղազարյան, Մերոբ. 2006. *Հայոց լեզվի համառոտ պատմություն*. Երևան: ԵՊՀ.
- Ղարիբյան, Արարատ et al. 1969–1980. *Ժամանակակից հայոց լեզվի բացատրական բառարան* (Ժիլբբ), հ. 1–4. Երևան: ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ.
- Ղարիբյան, Արարատ. 1977. *Ռուս-հայերեն բառարան*. Երևան: Հայաստան.
- Ղարսյան, Աննա. 2017. *Արդի հայերենի իրավաբանական տերմինները*. PhD diss., Երևան: ՀՀ ԳԱԱ Հր. Աճառյանի անվան լեզվի ինստիտուտ.

- Ճերենեան, Գնէլ, Տօնիկեան, Փարամազ, and Տէր Խաչատուրեան Արտաշէս. 1992. *Հայոց լեզուի նոր բառարան*, հ. 1. Պէյրուօ: Կ. Տօնիկեան եւ Որդիք.
- Մազմանյան, Պատվական. 2005. “Քրիստափոր Միքայելյան.” *Կանթեղ. Գիտական հոդվածների ժողովածու* 3: 220–227.
- Մալխասեանց, Ստեփան. 1944–1945. *Հայերէն բացատրական բառարան*, հ. 1–4. Երևան: ՀՍՍՌ Պետական Հրատարակչութիւն.
- Մանանդյան, Հակոբ. 1930. *Կշիռները յեվ չափերը հնագույն հայ աղբյուրներում*. Յերեվան: Հրատ. Մելքոնյան ֆոնդի.
- Մանանդյան, Հակոբ. 1952. *Զննական Տեսություն Հայ Ժողովրդի Պատմության*. Երևան: ՀՍՍՌ ԳԱ, Հայպետհրատ, 1952.
- Մելիք, Ալեքսանդր. 1930 (նոր տիպ 2016). *Գրականի միջազգային հանրագիտակ*. Նիւ Եօրք, Փարիզ.
- Մելիք-Վրթանեայան Կոնստատին, and Մարիամ Տոնյան. 1989. *Երաժշտական բացատրական բառարան*, Երևան: Խորհրդային գրող.
- Մեղրեցի, Երեմիա. 1698. *Բառգիրք Հայոց*. Յալիկօռնայ: հրատ. տպագր. Սարգիս Եվդոկիացու Սահեթճու.
- Մելթիխանյան, Փառանձեմ. 1996. *Նոր բառերի բացատրական բառարան*. Երևան: Փյունիկ.
- Միքայելյան, Վարդգես. 1986. “Տավրիկյան հայերը և ռուս-սլավոնական աշխարհը.” *Լրաբեր հասարակական գիտությունների* 2: 51–74.
- Սկրտչյան, Գարիկ. 2015. *Բարբառագիտության հիմունքներ (դասախոսություններ): Ուսումնասնողական ձեռնարկ*. Երևան: Դասո Պրինտ.
- Սկրտչյան, Գարիկ. 2015. *Լեհաստի բարբառի ընդհանուր բնութագիրը և նրա վերացման պատճառները, Հայ գիտական բարբառագիտության 100-ամյակի գիտաժողովի նյութեր*. Իջևան: ԵՊՀ: 54–69.
- Սկրտչյան Էդուարդ and Լալիկ Խաչատրյան. 2016. *Հայոց լեզվի պատմության դասընթաց. Գրային ժամանակաշրջան*. Երևան: Չանգակ.
- Մնացականյան, Փիրուզ. 2019. “Յագլովեց քաղաքի հայկական դատարանի 1648–1669 թթ. արձանագրությունների մատյանը. նորահայտ մի աղբյուր Լեհաստանից.” *Բանբեր Մատենադարանի* 27: 309–320.
- Յայանաուրք*. 1706. Կոստանդնուպոլիս: տպ. Գրիգորի դպրի որդոյ Սկրտչի.
- “Յայտարարություններ.” 1873. *Մշակ* nb 43, November 11, 1873.
- Յարութիւնեանց, Մարտիրոս. 1912. *Բացատրական բառգիրք – Օտարազգի բառերի եւ օտարազգի բառերի ու դարձածքների*. Ալեքսանդրապոլ: Տպարան Յ. Սանդեանցի.

- Յովհաննիսեանց, Խաչատուր. 1895. “Քանի մը քաղվածք.” *Հանդես ամսօրյա* Յուլիս: 203–207.
- Շիրվանյան, Սերգեյ, and Վաղարշակ Մաղոյան, 2010. *Լեհերեն-հայերեն բառարան*. Երևան: Հայաստան.
- Շիրվանզադե, Ալեքսանդր. 2024. *Վարդան Աիրումյան*. May 5, 2020. Accessed April 13, 2024. <https://www.litres.ru/alek-sandr-shirvanzade/vardan-ahrowmyan/chitat-onlayn/page-2/>.
- Շիրվանզադե, Ալեքսանդր. 1959. “Պատվի համար.” In *Երկերի ժողովածու*, h. 3. Երևան: Հայպետհրատ.
- Շտիկյան, Սուրեն. 1970. “Ղևոնդ Ալիշան (Ծննդյան 150-ամյակի առթիվ).” *Պատմա-բանասիրական հանդես* 2: 13–26.
- Ուրիշեան, Վարդգես. 1998. *Մեր արմատները նոր լոյսի տակ*, h. 1. Fresno: Meshag Printing & Publishing.
- Պալատեցի (Տեր-Յովհաննեսեան), Գեորգ. 1826. *Բառարան Պարսկերէն ըստ կարգի հայկական այբուբենից*. Կ. Պոլիս: տպ. Պողոս Արապյանի.
- Պալիենցի, Ներսես. 1956. Ժամանակագրական հատվածները (XIV դ.). In *Մանր ժամանակագրություններ XIII-XVIII դդ.*, h. 2, edited by Վազգեն Հակոբյան, 173–208. Երևան: ՀՍՍՌ ԳԱ.
- Պետրոսեան, Հայր Սատաթեայ Վարդապետ. 1875. *Նոր Բառգիրք Հայ-անգլիարէն*. Վենետիկ: Մխիթարեանց Տպարան.
- Պետրոսյան Լևոն 1968. “Հայ ժողովրդական փոխադրամիջոցներն ըստ մատենագրության.” *Լրաբեր Հասարակական Գիտությունների* 9: 36–48.
- Պողոսյան, Նորայր. 2014. *Նորահայտ բառեր վաղաշխարհաբարբարյան աղբյուրներում: 16-18-րդ դդ.* Երևան: ԵՊՀ.
- Ջահուկյան Գևորգ. 1987. *Հայոց լեզվի պատմություն, նախագրային շրջան*. Երևան: ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ.
- Ջահուկյան Գևորգ. 1995. “Հին հայերենի վերջածանցների ծագումը.” *Պատմա-բանասիրական հանդես* 1: 137–150.
- Ջահուկյան, Գևորգ. 1994. “Հին հայերենի վերջածանցների ծագումը.” *Պատմա-բանասիրական հանդես* 1–2: 53–66.
- Ջահուկյան, Գևորգ. 2010. *Հայերեն ստուգաբանական բառարան*. Երևան: Աստղիկ հրատ.
- Սարգսյան, Աշոտ. *Արցախյան բարբառ* (Աբ). Accessed April 13, 2024. http://ashotsargsian.blogspot.com/p/blog-page_6.html.
- Սարգսյան, Արտեմ. 1991. *Արեւմտահայերենի բառարան*. Երևան: Արեւիկ .

- Սարգսյան, Արտեմ. 2001–2012. *Հայոց լեզվի բարբառային բառարան*, հ. 1–7. Երևան: ՀՀ ԳԱԱ.
- Սաքապետոյեան, Ռուբեն. 2011. *Արեւմտահայերէն-արեւելահայերէն նոր բառարան*. Երևան: Տիգրան Մեծ.
- Սուքիասյան, Աշոտ. 1967. *Հայոց լեզվի հոմանիշների բառարան*. Երևան: ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ.
- Սուքիասյան, Աշոտ. 2009. *Հայոց լեզվի հոմանիշների բացատրական բառարան*. Երևան ԵՊՀ.
- Սրապեան, Իսահակ Վ. (միաբան Անտոնեան). 1903. “Ակնարկ մը լեհահայոց վրայ.” *Հանդէս ամսօրեայ* 10: 300–305.
- Վանեցի Ա., 1951. *Տարեգրությունը (XVIII դ.)*, “Նյութեր հայ ժողովրդի պատմության”: Գիրք 3, Մանր ժամանակագրություններ XIII–XVIII դդ., հ. 1, կազմ.՝ Վազգեն Հակոբյան, Երևան: ՀՍՍՌ ԳԱ: 350–382.
- Վարդանյան, Ռուդիկ. 1968. “Օրավարը որպես հողի մակերեսի չափման միավոր.” *Պատմա-բանասիրական հանդես* 2: 191–196.
- Վարդանյան, Ռուդիկ. 2003. *Պատմական տերմինների համառոտ բառարան*. Երևան: Տաթև գիտակրթական համալիր.
- Տէր-Ղազարեան, Ա. 1908. *Հանրամատչելի բառարան օտարազգի բառերի և գործածութեան մէջ մտած մտքերի ու դարձածքների*. Թիֆլիս: Տպարան ԷՊՕԽԱ.
- Ցոլակյան, Վ. 2004. “Հայ-իտալական առևտրատնտեսական հարաբերությունների պատմությունից (1919–1920 թթ.)” *Բանբեր Երևանի համալսարանի* 2 (113): 177–183.
- Փալանդուզյան, Հրաչուհի. *Գործածական բառացանկ: Օտարամուտ բառերի հայերեն համարժեքները*. Accessed July 6, 2020. <http://www.magaghat.am/archives/26075>.
- Փորքչեյան, Խաչատուր. 1959. “Երբ և որտեղից են հայերը գաղթել Չերքեզիա.” *Պատմա-բանասիրական հանդես* 2–3: 232–246.
- Օվյան, Վազգեն. *Լեռնակերտ*. Բ. Accessed April 13, 2024. http://vazgenovyan.blogspot.com/p/blog-page_4763.html.
- Օրմանեան Մաղաքիա ա. ե., Տ. 1910. “Մեսրոպ Ա. Արտագեցի: Տ. Կոստանդին Ե. Սսեցի: Տ. Պօղոս Ա. Սսեցի.” *Լուսնայ» գրական հանդէս* 1: 13–14.

Index of Personal Names

Roman alphabet

A

Adam, Alexander 118, 269
Albertrandi, Antoni 139, 269
Alp Arslan (Muhammad bin Dawud Chaghri) 15
Arct, Michał 39, 51, 53, 54, 56, 97, 110, 120, 124, 206, 230, 269
Atkinson, John 118, 269
Atkinson, Quentin 24, 274
Aucher, Paschal 233, 269, 271
Auderska, Halina 283
Azarian, Aristaces 194, 270

B

Bagasheva-Koleva, Mariya 48, 270
Bailey, Harold W. 225, 284
Balzer, Oswald Marian 19, 20, 71, 72, 270
Bańko, Mirosław 48, 270
Bartoszewicz, Agnieszka 20, 270
Bartoszewicz, Joachim Stefan 39, 41, 43, 156, 157, 165, 170, 172, 178, 179, 181, 217, 226, 229, 234, 270
Bąk, Stanisław 59, 76, 228, 229, 253, 270
Bernat, Rafał 170, 181, 270
Bezjian, Nigol 194, 271
Biedrońska-Słota, Beata 104, 271, 281

Biegasiewicz, Piotr 170, 181, 270
Bielowski, August 215, 271
Bireş, Vasile 273
Bogucki, Ambroży 171, 271
Bornińska, Justyna 87, 271
Bortliczek, Małgorzata 48, 271
Boryś, Wiesław 40, 42, 44, 45, 46, 54, 56, 57, 59, 62, 64, 65, 66, 69, 70, 79, 80, 89, 91, 94, 96, 98, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 117, 118, 119, 121, 122, 123, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131, 132, 133, 136, 137, 141, 142, 143, 145, 148, 150, 151, 152, 154, 156, 158, 159, 160, 164, 166, 167, 171, 176, 177, 180, 182, 184, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 194, 197, 198, 199, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 211, 212, 216, 217, 221, 222, 223, 225, 227, 231, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 242, 244, 249, 251, 252, 253, 254, 271
Brand, John 233, 271
Brisard, Frank 281
Brückner, Aleksander 37, 38, 50, 52, 53, 55, 57, 58, 64, 70, 72, 78, 80, 82, 84, 86, 89, 91, 98, 99, 100, 103, 104, 105, 108, 109, 113, 118, 119, 120, 121, 125, 126, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 138, 139, 143, 144, 145, 146, 149, 150, 151, 153, 155, 156, 157, 160, 161, 162, 169, 172,

- 173, 174, 175, 178, 179, 183, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 198, 201, 202, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 211, 213, 214, 215, 218, 220, 221, 222, 224, 225, 226, 227, 233, 236, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 245, 246, 247, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 271
- Brzeczowski, Tadeusz 181, 271
- C**
- Chlebowski, Bronisław 115, 283
- Christian, Ludwig 157, 271
- Ciakciak, Emmanuele 190, 195, 271
- Claudius, Ptolemy 15, 282
- Clifton, John 101, 272
- Couch, William 23, 272
- Couturat, Louis 22, 272
- Czaja, Roman 157, 272
- Czapla, Anna 135, 272
- Czarnecka, Katarzyna 156, 272
- Czołowski, Aleksander 20, 272
- Çelebi, Evliya 158, 272
- Çengel Kasapoğlu, Hülya 16, 17, 272
- D**
- Dankoff, Robert 157, 272
- Dauzat, Albert 104, 134, 137, 166, 272
- Dębowiak, Przemysław 219, 272
- Derksen, Rick 38, 40, 45, 46, 47, 54, 57, 64, 65, 66, 69, 96, 102, 105, 108, 109, 111, 112, 116, 117, 128, 129, 132, 136, 141, 159, 176, 180, 184, 187, 191, 192, 201, 204, 212, 223, 227, 233, 236, 240, 247, 249, 252, 253, 254, 257, 272
- Diakonoff, Igor 24, 273
- Doïmadjian-Grigoryan, Kariné 44, 229, 273
- Doroszewski, Witold 39, 42, 51, 53, 56, 69, 76, 124, 132, 134, 135, 159, 164, 176, 184, 185, 186, 193, 215, 224, 230, 273
- Dubois, Jean 272
- Dum-Tragut, Jasmine 23, 273
- Dybo, Anna 241, 283
- E**
- Eker, Süer 16, 273
- Evans, Helen 15, 273
- F**
- Fałowski, Adam 105, 131, 273
- Ferriere, Astrid 90, 273
- Fryer, John 22, 273
- G**
- Gaertner, Henryk 113, 273
- Ghazarian, Jacob 17, 273
- Ghilea, Marian 163, 273
- Gieysztor, Aleksander 181, 273
- Gloger, Zygmunt 33, 51, 76, 106, 107, 124, 125, 143, 185, 193, 198, 210, 214, 218, 220, 232, 274
- Göksel, Aslı 232, 274
- Gołębiowski, Łukasz 87, 88, 274
- Gospodarek, Dawid 170, 274
- Gosz, Mychitar 18, 280
- Gray, Russell 24, 274
- Greń, Zbigniew 37, 48, 64, 101, 205, 274
- Gromnicki, Tadeusz 20, 274
- Güner, Galip 191, 274

H

Hambarcumian, Rafael 13, 14, 274

Hammer, Peter 218, 274

Hanusz, Jan 23, 27, 29, 35, 36, 38, 81, 83, 91, 92, 93, 99, 100, 102, 103, 04, 111, 117, 118, 119, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134, 137, 143, 144, 145, 149, 151, 152, 155, 156, 159, 160, 161, 162, 166, 184, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 203, 204, 205, 206, 208, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 232, 236, 241, 243, 244, 251, 274

Hejnowicz, Ludwik 80, 275

Hrytsak, Yaroslav 12, 275

Huseynova, Gulsum 101, 275

Hutopilã, Matei 273

I

İpek, Ali 15, 275

J

Janiszewska-Jakubiak, Dorota 23, 275

Jasińska, Katarzyna 164, 275

Jurszo, Robert 18, 19, 275

K

Kaczyńska, Elżbieta 21, 22, 275

Kantar, Mehmet 162, 276

Kapović, Mate 23, 276

Kaproń-Charzyńska Iwona 73, 276

Karakurt, Deniz 125, 276

Karłowicz, Jan 51, 67, 83, 116, 237, 276

Kerslake, Celia 232, 274

Klemensiewicz, Zenon 46, 215, 276

Kluge, Friedrich 237, 276

Kluk, Krzysztof 193, 276

Kochanowski, Jan Karol 41, 276

Kolberg, Oskar 85, 276

Kopaliński, Władysław 37, 49, 53, 71, 83, 162, 174, 210, 276

Kopczyński, Michał 275, 283

Korkmaz, Zeynep 112, 276

Kościów, Zbigniew 19, 276

Kouyoumdjian, Mesrob 153, 276

Kowalczyk-Heyman, Elżbieta 158, 276

Kraelitz-Greifenhorst, Friedrich 118, 276

Kraśniński, Adam 276

Krasnowolski, Antoni 38, 51, 52, 77, 105, 109, 135, 169, 224, 233, 276

Krasowska, Helena 37, 48, 64, 101, 205, 274

Kroger Manfred 277

Król-Mazur, Renata 16, 161, 277, 281

Kroll, Piotr 20, 277

Krucka, Barbara 73, 277

Kuczer, Jarosław 172, 277

Kurmann, Joseph 189, 277

Kurtbilal, Niyar 125, 277

Kutalmış, Mehmet 15, 277

Kutrzeba, Stanisław 178, 228, 277

Kwapien, Ewelina 51, 277

Kwaśniewicz, Włodzimierz 223, 277

Kwoka, Tomasz 273

L

Leibniz, Gottfried 277, 278

Linde, Samuel 33, 35, 36, 37, 42, 45, 46, 47, 49, 51, 52, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 64, 66, 69, 72, 73, 74, 77, 80, 82, 83, 87, 89, 90, 91, 95, 97, 100, 103, 105, 106, 109, 111, 114, 115, 116, 118, 122,

- 125, 126, 131, 134, 137, 139, 140, 141, 143, 145, 147, 149, 150, 151, 155, 157, 164, 165, 166, 167, 169, 174, 175, 176, 178, 180, 184, 185, 187, 188, 191, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 210, 211, 213, 214, 217, 218, 219, 220, 222, 223, 224, 225, 230, 233, 235, 237, 241, 242, 244, 248, 252, 255, 278
- Lot, Ferdinand 162, 278
- Lubelczyk, Andrzej 19, 278
- Ł**
- Łempicka, Zofia 283
- Łopatecki, Karol 282
- Łotocki, Łukasz 20, 278
- Łoziński, Władysław 21, 22, 278
- Łuc, Izabela 168, 278
- Łukaszewicz, Józef 88, 281
- M**
- Machnicka, Violetta 146, 278
- Machul-Telus, Beata 14, 278
- Maciejowski, Waclaw 40, 278
- Macovei, Nicolae 273
- Magakian, Grair 14, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30, 41, 43, 44, 108, 110, 112, 122, 156, 157, 165, 170, 172, 178, 179, 181, 184, 188, 189, 190, 191, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 201, 217, 226, 229, 234, 278
- Małowist, Marian 21, 278
- Mańkowski, Tadeusz 11, 12, 17, 18, 20, 88, 278
- Marciniak, Tomasz 20, 279
- Martin, Richard 18, 279
- Martirosyan, Hrach 24, 36, 160, 203, 279
- Matasović, Ranko 26, 279
- Mayenowa, Maria 270
- Meier-Brugger, Michael 23, 279
- Mitterand, Henri 272
- Morgan de, Jacques 11, 279
- Mortelmans, Tanja 281
- Mudrak, Oleg 241, 283
- N**
- Nadel-Golobič, Eleonora 19, 280
- Nawrot, Radosław 20, 280
- Nicholson, Oliver 15, 280
- Nieczuja-Ostrowski, Paweł 19, 20, 280
- Niedźwiedzki, Władysław 38, 51, 52, 77, 105, 109, 135, 169, 224, 233, 276
- Nișanyan, Sevan 83, 94, 86, 93, 99, 101, 103, 104, 105, 112, 133, 137, 142, 144, 147, 161, 162, 168, 169, 178, 179, 181, 190, 193, 194, 213, 219, 221, 233, 234, 235, 238, 241, 247, 280
- Nitsch, Kazimierz 36, 57, 86, 87, 121, 123, 132, 142, 160, 164, 228, 278
- Nowak, Zenon Hubert 157, 272
- O**
- Oczko, Anna 133, 205, 280
- Oczkova, Barbara 273
- Olmen van, Daniël 281
- Olsen, Birgit Anette 33, 37, 38, 42, 46, 49, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 76, 77, 80, 87, 89, 91, 92, 93, 97, 100, 102, 109, 113, 119, 121, 127, 129, 130, 136, 143, 144, 149, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 160, 164, 169, 170,

175, 176, 180, 182, 186, 187, 188, 195,
199, 202, 210, 211, 215, 225, 230, 231,
234, 236, 238, 242, 244, 248, 249, 253,
255, 280

Ö

Özçelik, Öner 18, 281

P

Papée, Fryderyk 11, 281

Pearsall, Judy 95, 162, 163, 281

Pełczyński, Grzegorz 20, 161, 162,
281

Perry, John 101, 285

Piesowicz, Kazimierz 21, 22, 275

Pinche, Ariane 282

Piotrowski, Józef 14, 281

Pisowicz, Andrzej Stanisław 17, 20, 36,
110, 159, 161, 162, 194, 281

Piwowarczyk, Dariusz 164, 275

Plungian, Vladimir 23, 281

Polackówna, Helena

Popliński, Antoni 88, 281

Pospiszyl, Anna 135, 282

Premat, Timothée 282

R

Radziwiński, Andrzej 272

Rasic, Jeremija 277

Redhouse, James 169, 282

Rejter, Artur 52, 282

Rey, Alain 11, 282

Rivola, Francisco 37, 40, 44, 49, 56, 67,
73, 75, 76, 87, 91, 97, 99, 102, 103,
112, 114, 118, 122, 128, 131, 133, 134,
138, 149, 159, 161, 165, 170, 172, 179,

180, 182, 187, 190, 193, 199, 209, 221,
223, 226, 229, 233, 236, 244, 245, 246,
253, 282

Rolle, Antoni 20, 21, 282

Rouquier, Jérémy 162, 282

Rydzkowska-Kozak, Joanna 11, 282

S

Sakhno, Sergueï 48, 282

Salahura, Gheorghhe 273

Salan, Musa 99, 282

Sargsyan, Tatevik E. 17, 282

Schneider, Antoni 17, 282

Schmitt, Rüdiger 225, 284

Sikorska-Kulesza, Jolanta 172, 283

Skorupka, Stanisław 116, 121, 142, 148,
174, 189, 283

Sobol, Elżbieta 18, 30, 33, 35, 36, 37,
39, 42, 49, 60, 71, 77, 82, 83, 84, 132,
138, 149, 146, 149, 153, 162, 173, 175,
185, 189, 193, 210, 214, 217, 219,
222, 224, 228, 230, 242, 245, 246,
256, 283

Stachowski, Stanisław 16, 283

Stadnicki, Aleksander 269

Starostin, Sergei 241, 283

Stopka, Krzysztof 11, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21,
22, 34, 72, 161, 167, 241, 283

Subtelny, Orest 11, 223, 283

Sulimierski, Filip 23, 115, 163, 283

Szarwiło, Bogusław 23, 284

Szczepańska, Elżbieta 273

Szober, Stanisław 113, 129, 141, 284

Szongott, Kristóf 93, 284

Szymczak, Mieczysław 138, 284

T

Tamminen, Tanja 189, 284
 Tietze, Andreas 191, 274
 Trochimczyk, Maja 84, 284
 Tryjarski, Edward 12, 124, 284
 Turek, Waclaw 84, 87, 146, 284
 Turnau, Irena 88, 284
 Theodorowicz, Leon 20, 284

U

Urbańczyk, Stanisław 38, 41, 44, 45, 46,
 47, 48, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61,
 62, 63, 64, 67, 69, 70, 71, 74, 76, 78, 79,
 80, 84, 89, 90, 94, 95, 96, 98, 102, 104,
 105, 106, 109, 110, 111, 112, 117, 119,
 120, 122, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131, 133,
 138, 143, 144, 148, 149, 151, 152, 154,
 157, 158, 159, 162, 164, 166, 167, 171,
 172, 173, 174, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180,
 182, 190, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 201,
 202, 204, 205, 207, 208, 211, 212, 214,
 217, 220, 221, 222, 224, 225, 227, 231,
 234, 236, 237, 239, 243, 244, 247, 249,
 251, 252, 253, 254, 256, 257, 285

V

Villotte, Jacobus 134, 285
 Vincenz, Stanisław 163, 285
 Voss, Huberta 15, 285
 Walczak, Wojciech 282
 Walewski, Władysław 283
 Waniakowa, Jadwiga 219, 272
 Wild, Susan 33, 37, 42, 43, 285

W

Windfuhr Gernot 101, 285

Z

Zachariasiewicz, Franciszek Xawery 13,
 285
 Zajączkowski, Ananiasz 155, 156, 223,
 285
 Zdanowicz, Aleksander 194, 285
 Zeuthen, Peter 194, 285
 Zgółkowa, Halina 35, 70, 85, 98, 99, 174,
 175, 222, 224, 285

Cyrillic alphabet**Б**

Божко, Олександр (Bozhko Oleksander) 34, 38, 45, 46, 55, 62, 65, 71, 74, 78, 97, 105, 120, 126, 131, 136, 139, 147, 152, 177, 187, 209, 218, 220, 226, 229, 230, 234, 239, 250, 254, 286

Брокгауз, Фридрих 53, 220, 252, 286

Г

Гамкредидзе, Тамаз 24, 286

Гаркавец, Александр 15, 16, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 45, 47, 50, 51, 54, 55, 57, 59, 62, 63, 64, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 84, 86, 89, 91, 94, 95, 97, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 109, 110, 120, 122, 125, 126, 127, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 142, 147, 148, 150, 152, 153, 155, 157, 158, 161, 162, 163, 164, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 175, 177, 179, 183, 189, 194, 199, 202, 203, 205, 207, 209, 212, 218, 220, 221, 222, 225, 226, 227, 229, 232, 234, 236, 237, 238, 239, 241, 246, 247, 248, 249, 251, 254, 255, 257, 286

Голубовский, Петр 223, 286

Д

Даль, Владимир 147, 240, 288

Дашкевич, Ярослав 12, 286

Драгоманов, Михайло 240, 286

Дуда, Игор 62, 286

Е

Евгеньева, Анастасия 30, 286

Ефремова, Татьяна 60, 286

Ефрон, Илья 53, 220, 252, 286 288

Ж

Желехівський, Євгеній 37, 38, 45, 46, 47, 55, 57, 62, 63, 64, 65, 69, 72, 73, 74, 77, 81, 82, 86, 89, 91, 95, 97, 101, 103, 105, 110, 111, 112, 114, 117, 118, 120, 125, 127, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 136, 138, 139, 142, 144, 145, 148, 150, 152, 155, 159, 160, 161, 163, 164, 166, 167, 170, 171, 173, 174, 176, 177, 182, 184, 187, 188, 190, 192, 193, 195, 197, 200, 201, 203, 204, 205, 208, 209, 211, 213, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 226, 229, 230, 235, 236, 240, 241, 243, 247, 249, 250, 251, 254, 257, 287

И

Иванов, Валерий 116, 288

Иванов, Вячеслав 24, 286

К

Калачов, Николай 40, 287

Караванський, Святослав 62, 287

Карпюк, Аляксей 250, 287

Кримський, Агатангел 16, 287

Крылов, Григорий 80, 90, 160, 176, 224, 254, 287, 288

Л

Ларин, Александр 53, 287

Логинов, Святослав 195, 287

М

Маргынаў, Віктар 108, 287
 Матейко, Катерина 257, 287
 Мельничук, Олександр 30, 37, 45, 57,
 64, 65, 71, 72, 82, 85, 95, 103, 111,
 115, 118, 125, 127, 130, 131, 136, 137,
 138, 142, 144, 145, 150, 155, 159, 161,
 163, 166, 188, 192, 195, 202, 207, 224,
 236, 242, 287

Н

Недільський, Софрон 38, 64, 65, 69, 74,
 132, 287

О

Ожегов, Сергей 147, 287
 Онацький, Євген 240, 257, 287

П

Петрушевич, Антоній 11, 287
 Погосян, Норайр 56, 73, 287

Р

Рымашевская, Эмилия 138, 288

С

Свиридова, Марина 196, 288
 Соловьев, Александр 160, 240, 288

Т

Триярский, Эдуард 12, 286
 Трубачёв, Олег 156, 288
 Тунян, Валерий 227, 288

У

Успенский, Гавриил 77, 288
 Ушаков, Дмитрий 174, 256, 288

Ф

Фасмер, Макс 34, 37, 42, 44, 50, 52, 55,
 57, 59, 60, 70, 74, 78, 80, 82, 83, 84,
 85, 86, 89, 91, 95, 98, 99, 101, 103,
 104, 105, 106, 111, 113, 114, 115, 116,
 117, 121, 123, 128, 130, 132, 135, 137,
 138, 139, 140, 142, 144, 147, 150, 152,
 153, 155, 156, 160, 161, 163, 165, 166,
 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177,
 178, 179, 180, 183, 185, 187, 188, 189,
 190, 191, 194, 195, 196, 198, 201, 202,
 207, 208, 211, 217, 219, 220, 221, 222,
 223, 224, 227, 230, 236, 238, 239, 240,
 241, 242, 243, 249, 250, 251, 252, 254,
 256, 257, 288

Ш

Шанская, Тамара 116, 288
 Шанский, Николай 116, 288

Armenian alphabet**Ա**

Աբաջյան, Աննա 24, 27, 57, 81, 90, 139, 218, 289

Աբրահամյան, Արամ 53, 289

Ալիշան, Ղևոնդ 43, 53, 56, 73, 124, 150, 157, 232, 289, 295

Ակիներան, Ներսես 141, 183, 207, 239, 289

Ախարոնյան, Ավետիս 81, 289

Աղայան, Էդվարդ 36, 49, 55, 59, 60, 67, 84, 86, 87, 90, 96, 97, 98, 99, 113, 121, 131, 135, 139, 142, 145, 157, 162, 165, 172, 177, 184, 185, 187, 188, 189, 195, 196, 205, 210, 211, 226, 227, 233, 236, 244, 249, 251, 252, 254, 256, 289

Անատեան, Հրաչեայ 33, 35, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 76, 77, 79, 80, 83, 89, 91, 92, 93, 97, 99, 100, 102, 104, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 117, 118, 119, 121, 122, 126, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 139, 141, 143, 144, 146, 147, 148, 149, 151, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 163, 165, 166, 269, 170, 173, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 184, 186, 187, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 199, 201, 203, 204, 207, 210, 211, 213, 214, 215, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 230, 231, 233, 234, 236, 237, 238, 239, 241, 242, 244, 246, 248, 249, 251, 253, 255, 289

Անառյան, Հրաչեայ 24, 29, 108, 112, 113, 162, 163, 164, 187, 245, 289, 290

Այվազյան, Հովհաննես 17, 290

Անդրեասյան, Էդիկ 175, 290

Ասատրյան, Գառնիկ 157, 290

Ասմանգուլյան, Հասմիկ 33, 37, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, 52, 55, 56, 58, 61, 62, 63, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 83, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 93, 96, 100, 102, 104, 106, 108, 110, 111, 112, 113, 117, 118, 119, 121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 149, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 159, 160, 164, 165, 169, 170, 172, 175, 177, 184, 185, 188, 190, 192, 193, 194, 196, 197, 199, 201, 203, 205, 206, 207, 208, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 218, 219, 221, 222, 223, 225, 228, 229, 231, 232, 233, 234, 236, 237, 238, 239, 241, 242, 243, 244, 246, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 290

Ավետիսյան, Հենրիկ 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, 51, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 63, 64, 66, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 87, 88, 89, 92, 94, 103, 104, 105, 108, 110, 113, 116, 117, 119, 122, 123, 125, 126, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 142, 146, 151, 152, 154, 155, 164, 166, 167, 169, 170, 175, 176, 178, 179, 181, 182, 183, 186, 211, 213, 217, 219, 220, 221, 222, 225, 226, 228, 229, 231, 232, 233, 237, 238, 242, 246, 247, 248, 250, 253, 255, 256, 257, 293

Արախանեանց, Ալեսիք 34, 290

Արուստյան, Սերգեյ 90, 290

- Աւգերեան, Մկրտիչ 290
 Աւգերեան, Յարութիւն 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 52, 55, 56, 58, 61, 63, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 75, 77, 79, 80, 83, 87, 89, 90, 96, 99, 100, 102, 104, 108, 110, 111, 113, 117, 118, 121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 149, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 159, 160, 169, 170, 172, 175, 177, 183, 188, 190, 192, 193, 194, 196, 198, 199, 201, 203, 205, 207, 208, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 220, 222, 223, 225, 228, 231, 232, 234, 236, 237, 238, 239, 241, 242, 243, 244, 248, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 290
 Աւետիքեան, Գարրիէլ 44, 66, 67, 153, 165, 169, 224, 290
- Բ**
 Բարախանյան, Առաքել (Լէո) 290
 Բարսեղյան, Հովհաննէս 112, 290
 Բժշկեանց, Սինաս 12, 163, 168, 291
 Բոժկո, Օլեքսանդր 38, 45, 46, 55, 62, 65, 71, 74, 78, 97, 105, 114, 120, 126, 131, 136, 139, 147, 152, 177, 187, 209, 218, 220, 223, 236, 229, 230, 234, 239, 249, 250, 254, 291
- Գ**
 Գալստյան, Սերգէյ 48, 291
 Գալստյան, Յովհաննէս 113, 170, 191, 291
 Գասպարյան, Նորիկ 34, 291
 Գէորգեան, Կոմիտաս 83, 84, 291
 Գուշագնեան, Մարդիրոս 55, 292
 Գրիգորյան, Սուսաննա 54, 55, 56, 65, 67, 68, 93, 96, 103, 113, 158, 202, 203, 209, 248, 291
 Գրիգորյան, Վարդան 29, 34, 38, 40, 41, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 54, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81, 87, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 96, 103, 105, 109, 110, 114, 116, 120, 126, 127, 131, 132, 134, 137, 147, 151, 152, 158, 164, 167, 168, 169, 171, 176, 179, 183, 186, 202, 209, 217, 221, 225, 228, 230, 232, 234, 238, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 254, 255, 257, 291
- Դ**
 Դարպասյան, Վահրամ 84, 85, 86, 291
 Դիլբարյան, Նարինէ 289
- Ե**
 Երեմեան, Սիմէոն 43, 292
- Է**
 Էլոյան, Սեդա 100, 292
 Էփրիկեան, Սուքիաս 13, 292
- Թ**
 Թահմազ, Խաչատուր 247, 292
 Թոխաթեցի, Սինաս 181, 292
- Ի**
 Իսահակյան, Ավետիք 81, 292

Խ

Խաչատրեան, Լալիկ 247, 292
 Խաչատրյան, Գուրգեն 26, 292
 Խաչատրյան, Լալիկ 350, 292
 Խնդրունի, Տիգրան 55, 292

Կ

Կամենացի, Հովհաննես 158, 292
 Կարապետեան, Պետրոս 245, 292
 Կիրակոսյան, Հասմիկ 238, 292

Ս

Սողոմոնյան, Սողոմոն (Կոմիտաս)
 148, 293

Հ

Հակոբյան, Գոհար 175, 293
 Հակոբյան, Վազգեն 181, 296
 Համբարձումյան, Ռաֆայել 14, 293
 Համբարձումյան, Վազգեն 154, 293
 Համբարձումյան, Վիկտոր 293
 Հայրապետյան, Աշոտ 29, 33, 34, 37,
 41, 49, 52, 53, 60, 69, 82, 83, 84, 85,
 86, 90, 95, 97, 98, 106, 115, 121, 128,
 139, 142, 145, 153, 165, 172, 173, 174,
 177, 183, 184, 185, 187, 188, 195, 196,
 197, 198, 201, 202, 217, 218, 219,
 220, 221, 223, 224, 226, 227, 228,
 231, 237, 241, 245, 251, 252, 254,
 256, 293
 Հովհաննիսյան, Մարիամ 33, 37, 39, 41,
 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, 52, 55, 56, 58,
 61, 62, 63, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73,
 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 83, 86, 87, 88,
 89, 90, 91, 93, 96, 100, 102, 104, 106,
 108, 110, 111, 112, 113, 117, 118, 119,

121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129,
 130, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138,
 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148,
 149, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157,
 159, 160, 164, 165, 169, 170, 172, 175,
 177, 184, 185, 188, 190, 192, 193, 194,
 196, 197, 199, 201, 203, 205, 206, 207,
 208, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 218,
 219, 221, 222, 223, 225, 228, 229, 231,
 232, 233, 234, 236, 237, 238, 239, 241,
 242, 243, 244, 246, 251, 252, 253, 254,
 255, 256, 290

Ղ

Ղազարյան, Մելանյա 229, 293
 Ղազարյան, Ռուբեն 33, 35, 36, 38,
 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, 51,
 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 63, 64, 66, 68,
 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80,
 81, 87, 88, 89, 92, 94, 103, 104, 105,
 108, 110, 113, 116, 117, 119, 122, 123,
 125, 126, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136,
 138, 142, 146, 151, 152, 154, 155, 164,
 166, 167, 169, 170, 175, 176, 178,
 179, 181, 182, 183, 186, 211, 213,
 217, 219, 220, 221, 222, 225, 226,
 228, 229, 231, 232, 237, 238, 242,
 246, 247, 248, 250, 253, 255, 256,
 257, 293
 Ղազարյան, Սերոբ 57, 293
 Ղարիբյան, Արարատ 30, 82, 196,
 293
 Ղարսյան, Աննա 33, 293
 Ղափանցյան, Գրիգոր 289
Ճ
 Ճերեմեան, Գնել 164, 248, 294

Մ

- Մադոյան, Վաղարշակ 33, 295
 Մազմանյան, Պատվական 81, 294
 Մալխասեանց, Ստեփան 35, 36, 41, 42, 44, 45, 49, 59, 67, 70, 77, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 92, 93, 95, 97, 102, 103, 104, 105, 112, 122, 131, 132, 133, 135, 142, 143, 144, 147, 153, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 170, 172, 174, 175, 179, 181, 189, 191, 194, 205, 210, 213, 215, 217, 219, 221, 224, 226, 233, 237, 238, 241, 242, 247, 253, 255, 294
 Մանանդյան, Հակոբ 15, 238, 294
 Մելիք, Ալեքսանդր 242, 294
 Մելիք-Վրթանեսյան, Կոնստատին 83, 294
 Մելքումյան, Ռաֆայել 289
 Մեղրեցի, Երեմիա 65, 73, 76, 77, 87, 100, 111, 112, 118, 136, 138, 139, 149, 179, 204, 207, 224, 226, 229, 236, 241, 244, 246, 247, 253, 294
 Մելքիսանյան, Փառանձեմ 33, 34, 294
 Միքայելյան, Վարդգես 14, 294
 Մկրտչյան, Գարիկ 24, 161, 294
 Մկրտչյան, Էդուարդ 211, 294
 Մնացականյան, Փիրուզ 46, 294

Յ

- Յարութինեանց, Մարտիրոս 160, 217, 242, 294
 Յովհաննիսեանց, Խաչատուր 54, 294
 Յուզբաշյան, Անահիտ 289

Շ

- Շեյրանյան, Սերգեյ 33, 295
 Շիրվանզադե, Ալեքսանդր 148, 295
 Շտիկյան, Սուրեն 43, 295

Ո

- Ուրիշեան, Վարդգես 118, 126, 224, 295

Պ

- Պետրոսեան, Սատաթեայ 156, 169, 295
 Պարոնյան, Նաիրա 54, 55, 56, 65, 67, 68, 93, 96, 103, 113, 158, 202, 203, 209, 248, 291
 Պետրոսյան, Լևոն 103, 295
 Պողոսյան, Նորայր 29, 43, 44, 52, 56, 72, 73, 124, 141, 148, 149, 150, 156, 157, 162, 178, 183, 206, 207, 210, 231, 232, 234, 239, 295
 Պրէնտեան, Յովհանն 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 52, 55, 56, 58, 61, 63, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 75, 77, 79, 80, 83, 87, 89, 90, 96, 99, 100, 102, 104, 108, 110, 111, 113, 117, 118, 121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 149, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 159, 160, 169, 170, 172, 175, 177, 183, 188, 190, 192, 193, 194, 196, 198, 199, 201, 203, 205, 207, 208, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 220, 222, 223, 225, 228, 231, 232, 234, 236, 237, 238, 239, 241, 242, 243, 244, 248, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 290

Չ

- Չահուկյան, Վևորգ 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70,

- 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 83, 84, 86, 87, 89, 91, 92, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 102, 103, 104, 105, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 117, 118, 119, 121, 122, 123, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 134, 136, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 146, 148, 149, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 160, 161, 163, 164, 166, 169, 170, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 184, 86, 187, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 199, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 217, 219, 222, 223, 225, 226, 230, 231, 233, 234, 236, 238, 239, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 251, 252, 253, 255, 295
- Ս**
- Կոմիտաս (Սողոմոնյան, Սողոմոն)
Սարգսյան, Աշոտ 103, 295
Սարգսյան, Արտեմ 36, 83, 99, 123, 173, 178, 190, 238, 249, 295
Սաքապետոյեան, Ռուբէն 178, 296
Սիւրմէլեան, Խաչատուր 290
- Սուքիասյան, Աշոտ 33, 35, 59, 112, 170, 233, 248, 252, 253, 254, 296
Սրապեան, Իսահակ 12, 296
- Վ**
- Վարդանյան, Ռուդիկ 115, 172, 296
- Տ**
- Տէր Խաչատուրեան, Արտաշէս 293
Տէր-Ղազարեան Ա. 41, 296
Տէր-Յովհաննէսեան (Պալատեցի), Գեորգ 66, 101, 295
Տոնյան, Մարիամ 83, 294
Տօնիկեան, Փարամազ 293
Յոլակյան, Վ. 90, 296
- Փ**
- Փալանդուզյան, Հրաչուհի 172, 191, 296
Փորքչեյան, Խաչատուր 14, 296
- Օ**
- Օվյան, Վազգեն 148, 296
Օրմանեան, Մաղաքիա 17, 296

Zapożyczenia polskie w języku ormiańskim (wybrane zagadnienia)

Streszczenie

Skutkiem wieloletnich zaniedbań w zakresie zaproponowanych przeze mnie w niniejszej książce badań jest to, że nawet we współczesnej ormiańskiej literaturze językoznawczej materia polskich zapożyczeń jest przeanalizowana czasem powierzchownie, a czasem nawet z pominięciem wielu zasad polskiej gramatyki, fonetyki, interpunkcji czy też ortografii. W wielu opracowaniach z tego zakresu możemy spotkać się z pochopnymi wnioskami, szczególnie dotyczącymi konkretnych źródeł/języków zapożyczeń.

Podstawą wyboru koncepcji teoretycznych, które posłużyły do sformułowania problemu badawczego niniejszej monografii, jest to, że wymiar semantyczny słownictwa zapożyczonego z języka polskiego w języku ormiańskim (i to nie tylko przez polskich Ormian w ich dialekcie) sprowadzam do trzech podstawowych aspektów:

- tłumaczenia (poprawne/niepoprawne) na język ormiański,
- sprecyzowanie źródła pochodzenia zapożyczeń,
- interpretacje (poprawne/niepoprawne) w języku ormiańskim.

Tak zarysowany system badań zdeterminował zastosowanie w niniejszej pracy kilku skutecznych metod badawczych:

- analiza materiałów leksykograficznych (np. ormiańskich protokołów sądowych w Polsce itd.), stanowiąca punkt wyjścia do badań literatury fachowej bezpośrednio w materii badawczej (również z analizą empiryczną materiałów słownikowych itd.);
- metody krytyki źródłowej, których zadaniem jest identyfikacja poprawnych lub błędnych dotychczas dokonanych tłumaczeń/interpretacji w źródłach ormiańskich (w tym leksykograficznych z zakresu zapożyczeń polskich).

W skrócie można zatem stwierdzić, że:

- celem niniejszego opracowania było wyeliminowanie błędów/pomyłek w postrzeganiu/zrozumieniu (bezpośrednich/pośrednich) zapożyczeń z języka polskiego, a także wyjaśnienie ich właściwej genezy/etymologii (cel ten został osiągnięty praktycznie w całości) – każdy z przeanalizowanych wyrazów poddany był również korekcie semantycznej i etymologicznej;
- przedmiotem analizy była identyfikacja zapożyczeń z języka polskiego, zwłaszcza w dialekcie Ormian polskich (ale także w języku ormiańskim w ogólności): w tym wypadku także źródła zapożyczeń zostały wskazane lub skorygowane z dość dużą dokładnością.

W rozdziałach zatytułowanych *Krótki zarys historyczny, Niektóre aspekty językowe, Kolonie ormiańskie a niektóre kwestie handlowe, Dialekt Ormian polskich* oraz *Ormiański most między Polską a Lewantem*, po krótkiej prezentacji tła historyczno-politycznej emigracji ormiańskiej w Polsce od XIV w., przedstawiłem miejsce dialektu ormiańskiego (nazywanego też dialektem artialskim) i Ormian w językowym obrazie świata ówczesnych Polaków. Jednocześnie wskazałem miejsce i znaczenie języka kipczackiego we wspólnocie ormiańskiej w Polsce z uwzględnieniem faktu, że duża część tej społeczności przez kilka stuleci mówiła tym językiem (włącznie z językiem sądów ormiańskich, Mszy Świętej, ksiąg parafialnych, korespondencji biznesowej itd.), a nie ormiańskim. Pokrótkce przedstawiłem także społeczno-ekonomiczny dorobek Ormian w Polsce w XIV–XVII wieku.

Problem badawczy wraz ze szczegółami metodologicznymi oraz najczęściej stosowane skróty i struktura analizy zostały przedstawione w osobnych rozdziałach.

Następnie podzieliłam badane polskie i ormiańskie słownictwo – ponad 220 jednostek, na grupy tematyczne:

- 45 słów prawnych,
- 7 związanych ze sztuką muzyczną,
- 17 z tkaninami i odzieżą,
- 13 w zakresie rolnictwa,
- 21 związanych z artykułami gospodarstwa domowego,
- 13 odnoszących się do mieszkania, elementów architektury, budynków, dekoracji;
- 29 dotyczących ludzi,
- 18 dotyczących jedzenia i picia,
- 10 ze świata zwierząt i przyrody,
- 7 dotyczących tradycji i religii,
- 17 słów związanych z państwem i atrybutami państwowości,
- 25 reprezentujących mieszane słownictwo, którego nie można było zaklasyfikować.

Każde z tych słów zostało również poddane korekcie semantycznej i etymologicznej.

Każdy wyraz został przeanalizowany w czterech kategoriach, z uwzględnieniem wpływów co najmniej następujących języków: kipczackiego, rusińskiego, ukraińskiego i rosyjskiego:

- **zapożyczenia** zostały zaprezentowane literami alfabetu ormiańskiego z transkrypcją zgodnie z wymową fonetyczną, która jest zbliżona do polskich dźwięków, oraz tłumaczeniami na język polski i angielski;
- **przekład ormiański** zawiera znaczenie/znaczenia najbliższe językowi i mentalności polskiej lub odpowiednikami oraz często z ich etymologią/etymologiami;

- **polskie znaczenie** z kolei zawiera polski sens zapożyczeń, a także często etymologię słowa zapożyczonego przez Ormian;
- **uwagi** to z kolei rodzaj dodatkowej analizy, która nie mieściła się w ramach powyższych kategorii, a zawiera szczególne wnioski o źródle zapożyczenia, które nie jest tak oczywiste, jak przedstawiano to w niektórych – szczególnie ormiańskich – źródłach naukowych.

Warto podkreślić, że część zaprezentowanego słownictwa wymaga dalszej pogłębionej analizy i wyjaśnienia zastosowań konkretnych słów. W szczególności chodzi o badania na dwóch płaszczyznach – językowy obraz świata Ormian w pozajęzykowej rzeczywistości Polski (z uwzględnieniem wpływów przynajmniej analizowanych zapożyczeń na zmiany w sferze mentalności i życia Ormian polskich). Tym bardziej, że już w tej chwili można stwierdzić, że zapożyczenia obejmują niemal każdą dziedzinę życia – od codziennej komunikacji po język fachowy, czyli specjalistyczne słownictwo. Rzecz w tym, że wiele słów – zwłaszcza o znaczeniu administracyjnym, prawnym i religijnym – ma również swoje odpowiedniki w języku ormiańskim, które to odpowiedniki znane były Ormianom mieszkającym na ziemiach polskich. Zapożyczyli oni jednak właśnie polską terminologię zawodową/specjalistyczną, dokonując tym samym wyraźnego rozróżnienia między życiem codziennym a zawodowym czy też administracyjnym. Można przypuszczać, że powodem takiego wyboru językowego było uświadomienie sobie, że ich język specjalistyczny/zawodowy musi być częścią polszczyzny i polskiej mentalności, ponieważ ich życie codzienne stało się już uprzednio częścią polskości.

Kwestia polskich zapożyczeń w języku ormiańskim pozostaje obszarem tylko częściowo zbadanym; tak samo rzecz się ma z gospodarczymi i społeczno-politycznymi wpływami Ormian wówczas w Polsce mieszkających na Rzeczpospolitą od XIV do XVIII wieku. Ani Ormianie, ani Polacy nie powiedzieli jeszcze ostatniego słowa w tej kwestii.

**Polish Loanwords in Armenian
(Selected Issues)**

Summary

The result of many years of neglect in the field of research which I have undertaken, is that even in contemporary Armenian linguistic literature the matter of Polish loanwords is sometimes analyzed superficially, and sometimes even with disregard for many rules of Polish grammar, phonetics, punctuation or spelling. In many studies in this field, we can come across hasty conclusions, especially regarding the specific sources/languages of loanwords.

The theoretical concepts that were used to formulate the research problem of this monograph are therefore based on the fact that I reduce the analysis of the vocabulary borrowed from Polish in Armenian (and not only by Polish Armenians in their dialect) to three basic dimensions:

- translations (correct/incorrect) into Armenian,
- specifying the source of loanwords,
- interpretations (correct/incorrect) in Armenian.

The above-outlined research system determined the use of some effective (understandably so) research methods:

- analysis of lexicographic materials (e.g. Armenian court records in Poland, etc.) which is a starting point for researching professional literature directly in the research matter (also with empirical analysis of dictionary materials, etc.);
- methods of source criticism, the task of which is to identify correct or incorrect translations/interpretations made so far in Armenian sources (including lexicographic ones in the field of Polish loanwords).

So, in short, it can be said that:

- the purpose of this study is to eliminate the errors/mistakes in the perception/understanding of Polish (direct/indirect) borrowings (loanwords) and to explain their proper origin/etymology (in practice, this purpose was achieved in its entirety) – each of the analyzed words was also subject of semantic and etymological correction;
- the subject of the analysis was the identification of Polish loanwords, especially in the dialect of Polish Armenians (but also in Armenian in general): in this case also the sources of loanwords were indicated or corrected with accuracy which seems quite high.

In the chapters entitled “Historical short outline”, “Some linguistic features”, “The Armenian colonies and some commercial features”, “The Polish Armenian dialect”, and “The Armenian bridge

between Poland and the Levant”, after a short presentation of the historical and political background of Armenian emigration in Poland from the 14th century onwards, I presented the place of the Armenian dialect (also called the Artial dialect), and Armenians in the linguistic image of the world of the Poles of that time. At the same time, I indicated the place and importance of the Kipchak language in the Armenian community in Poland, taking into account the fact that a large part of that community spoke that language for several centuries (including the language of Armenian Courts, the Holy Mass, parish books, business correspondence, etc.), and not Armenian. The book also briefly presents the socio-economic achievements of Armenians in Poland in the 14th–17th centuries. The research problem along with methodological details as well as the most frequently used abbreviations and the structure of the analysis are also presented in separate chapters.

Then I divided the studied Polish and Armenian vocabulary – over 220 units, into thematic groups:

- 45 legal words,
- 7 words related to musical art,
- 17 concerning clothes, fabrics, garments,
- 13 from the field of agriculture,
- 21 words related to household items,
- 13 for housing, architectural elements, buildings, decorations,
- 29 concerning people,
- 18 pertaining to eating and drinking,
- 10 from the animal world and nature,
- 7 concerning traditions and religion,
- 17 words related to the state and attributes of statehood,
- 25 mixed vocabulary that could not have been categorized.

Each of the above-mentioned words was also subjected to semantic and etymological correction.

Each word was analyzed in four categories, taking into account the influences of at least the above-mentioned Kipchak, Ruthenian, Ukrainian, and Russian:

- **loanwords** were presented in Armenian letters with transcription according to phonetic pronunciation, which is similar to Polish sounds, with the translations into Polish and English;
- the **Armenian translation** contains the meaning(s) closest to the Polish language and mentality with various options or equivalents and often with their etymology(-ies);
- the **Polish meaning**, in turn, contains the Polish (specified) meaning of loanwords as well as often the etymology of the word borrowed by the Armenians;

- **remarks** are a kind of additional analysis that did not find a place in the above categories and contains specific conclusions about the source of the loanwords, which is not as obvious as it was presented in some – especially Armenian – scientific sources.

It is worth emphasizing that some loanwords require further in-depth analysis and explanation of their uses. In particular, it concerns the research on two levels – the linguistic image of the Armenian world in the non-linguistic reality of Poland (taking into account the influence of at least the above-mentioned loanwords on the changes in the mentality and life of Polish Armenians). The more so that it can already be said that borrowings cover almost every area of life – from everyday communication to professional language, that is, specialized vocabulary. The thing is that a number of words – especially those of administrative, legal and religious significance – also have their equivalents in the Armenian language, which were known to Armenians living in Poland. And yet, they borrowed Polish professional/specialist terminology, making a clear distinction between daily life and professional or administrative ones. It can be assumed that the reason for such linguistic choice was the realization that their specialist/professional language must have been the part of the Polish language and mentality, because their lives and existence had already been part and parcel of Polishness.

The issue of Polish borrowings in the Armenian language remains an area only partially explored; the same is true for the socio-political and economic impact of Armenians living in Poland during the period between the 14th and the 18th centuries. Neither the Armenians nor the Poles have uttered their final word in this matter.

Copy editor and proofreading

Krystian Wojcieszuk

Cover illustration

Wikimedia.org / Polish Central Archives of Historical Records "Casimir the Great, the Polish king allows Gregory the Armenian bishop, to stay in Lviv and conduct activities there according to Armenian customs"

Cover design

Tomasz Tomczuk

Typesetting

Marek Zagniński

Initiating editor

Przemysław Pieniążek

The primary referential version of this book is its electronic (online) version.

We support open science. Publication available under Creative Commons license Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International (CC BY-SA 4.0)



<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8477-0085>

<https://doi.org/10.31261/PN.4187>

Magakian, Grair

Polish loanwords in Armenian : (selected issues) /

Grair Magakian. – First impression. – Katowice :

Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2024

ISBN 978-83-226-4352-5

(digital edition)

Publisher

Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego

ul. Bankowa 12B, 40-007 Katowice

<https://wydawnictwo.us.edu.pl>

e-mail: wydawnictwo@us.edu.pl

First impression. Printed sheets: 20.0. Publishing sheets: 20.5. PN 4187.

"[...] the monograph by Dr. Grair Magakian is a valuable linguistic work, emphasizing (in its introductory section) the active role of the historical Polish, 'borderland' Armenians in maintaining comprehensive relations between Poland and the East. The author's detailed analysis of loanwords that entered the dialect of Polish Armenians from Polish often engages in scholarly debate with Ukrainian philologists' research and frequently reveals their errors. At times, the rich material gathered by Dr. Magakian contributes to clarifying the etymology of certain oriental loanwords in Polish. A unique aspect of Dr. Magakian's book lies in his identification of English semantic equivalents for numerous Polish terms from the dictionaries [of the Polish language] edited by Witold Doroszewski and Wiesław Boryś."

*Prof. Andrzej Pisowicz
is professor emeritus at the Institute of Oriental Philology
at Jagiellonian University in Kraków*

* * *

"Magakian's writing is clear, concise, and well-researched, making it an excellent resource for anyone interested in linguistics, cultural studies, or Armenian history and culture. The book's focus on the loanwords that have found their way into the Armenian language is particularly interesting, as it analyses the cultural and historical connections between different countries and regions."

*Lusine Fljyan, D.Sc.,
Prof. Dr. at the Chair of Foreign Languages and Literature
at Eurasia International University*

