

## ON SOME ERRONEOUS LEMMATA FROM ARMENO-KIPCHAK PUBLICATIONS: I. VERBS

*Ermeni-Kıpçakçası Yayınlarında Yer Alan Hatalı Sözcükler Üzerine: I. Fiiller*

**Musa SALAN\***

*Gazi Türkiyat, Bahar 2017/20: 145-155*

**Öz:** Ermeni-Kıpçakçası sahasında, Deny'nin 1957 tarihli çalışması olan ilk yayından bu yana, metin okumayı esas alan çeşitli çalışmalar yayımlanmış ve bu yayınların söz varlığı söz konusu sahada çalışan bilim adamlarına katkı sağlamıştır. Bununla birlikte, bu kitapların hatalı verileri bilim adamlarını yanıltabilir. Fiil temelindeki hatalar şu gruplara ayrılabilir: I) yanlış okuma, hatalı deşifre, II) metin ve sözlük arasında semantik tutarsızlık, III) olağan dışı sözcükler elde etme ve IV) uygun olmayan anlamlar belirleme. Aslında, burada ele alınacak pek çok hata Garkavets'in hacimli eseri olan *Kıpçakskiy Slovar'* (2010) tekrar edilmemiş ve düzeltilmiştir; fakat bu çalışma bir sözlüktür, dolayısıyla tartışmalı verilerde okuyucuya gerekli açıklamayı sunmamaktadır. Bundan dolayı, bu çalışma Ermeni-Kıpçakçası ile ilgili yayınlarda yer alan hatalı fiiller hakkında gerekli açıklamayı vermeyi amaçlamaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Ermeni-Kıpçakçası, fiiller, yanlış çözümleme, yanlış yorumlama, sıra dışı fiiller

**Abstract:** Since the first publication in Armeno-Kipchak, i.e. Deny's work in 1957, several books focusing on text edition have been published, and their vocabularies have contributed to many scholars in the field. However, owing to some fallacious data in these books, scholars might be misled. The mistakes, in the scope of verbs, fall under the following groupings: I) misreading, incorrect deciphering, II) semantical inconsistency between text and glossary, III) deriving unusual forms, and IV) defining inappropriate meanings. In fact, most of the errors examined in the paper are not repeated but corrected in the voluminous work of Garkavets, i.e. *Kipchakskij Slovar'* (2010). However, as it is a dictionary, it does not provide readers with required explanations on the disputable data. Therefore, this paper aims at giving due explanations on the erroneous verbs appearing in Armeno-Kipchak publications.

**Keywords:** Armeno-Kipchak, verbs, misanalysis, misinterpretation, unusual verbs

Studies in the field of Armeno-Kipchak started in 1912 with the paper of Kraelitz-Greifenhorst in which he examines a psalm from Armeno-Kipchak psalter. After a long pause, the first book, *L'Armeno-Coman et les "Ephemerides" de Kamieniec 1604-1613* by French Turcologist Jean Deny, focusing on the text edition of an Armeno-Kipchak text was published in 1957. This work involves the transcription of Kamenets chronicle, its translation in French, and a glossary. Despite of being a good contribution to the field, it has some shortcomings that hinder readers' understanding of the lexemes. Deny, in

---

\* Dr., Bartın Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, Bartın/TÜRKİYE. [msalan@bartin.edu.tr](mailto:msalan@bartin.edu.tr). Gönderim Tarihi: 25.09.2016. Kabul Tarihi: 31.05.2017.

the glossary, together with lexemes appearing in the text, also gives the lexical materials of Ms. 176. Although these additional materials enhance the glossary, it does not allow the reader to see these lexemes in context because they are not used in any example sentences. Another shortcoming of the work is the lack of facsimile. The second book was published by T. I. Grunin in 1967: *Dokumenty na Polovetskom Jazyke XVI. v. (Sudebnye akty Kamenets-Podolskoj Armjanskoj obshchiny)*. He, in fact, completed his work in 1935 that is earlier than Deny's work. However, due to the interruption of WW II and the other hindrances, he managed to publish it in 1967 (see Grunin 1967: 64). This work, likewise "*Ephemerides*" *de Kamieniec*, does not possess the facsimile of the text.<sup>1</sup>In 1968, Schütz also published an edition on the Kamenets chronicle through its Venetian copy: *An Armeno-Kipchak Chronicle on the Polish-Turkish Wars in 1620-21*. Unlike the previous works, this one includes the full facsimile of the text. In the same year, Edward Tryjarski released the first two fascicules of his *Dictionnaire Armeno-Kiptchak*, and the other two fascicules were published respectively in 1969 and 1972. This dictionary depends on the Kipchak materials of Armenian-Kipchak bilingual dictionaries recorded in three manuscripts, one of which is preserved in the Wien National Library No. 3, and the other two manuscripts are preserved in the Armenian Mekhitarist Library No. 311 and No. 81. Armenian entries are excluded, but they are given when needed, which causes problems regarding the meanings of the materials, so the readers have to rely on Tryjarski's interpretations unless they can make use of the facsimile. After the second millennium, Armeno-Kipchak studies have virtually rejuvenated. Ukrainian scholar Aleksandr N. Garkavets, whose interest in the field commenced in late 70's, has published many editions, first of which is the first volume of *Kypchakskoe Pis'mennoe Nasledie* series, *I. Katalog i Teksty Pamjatnikov Armjanskim Pis'mom*, published in 2002, actually an expanded version of the catalogue published in 1993, *Vyrmeno-kipchatsky rukopisi v ukrajny, vyrmenyj, rosyj - Katalog*, but covers a large number of Armeno-Kipchak texts. After eight years, the author published a dictionary encompassing virtually all the lexicon of Armeno-Kipchak: *Kypchakskoe Pis'mennoe Nasledie Tom III - Kypchakskij Slovar'*, which is the foremost accurate source to check Armeno-Kipchak data. It, however, does not provide readers with further explanation as it is only a dictionary. Hence, there is need to stress the erroneous data (verbs) of Armeno-Kipchak texts and to elucidate their genuine forms as follows below.

The verbs in question are given below alphabetically:

*ačlan-* 'révéler?' (Tryjarski 1968-72: 51).

Putting a question mark, Tryjarski expresses his hesitation on the meaning of the word. However, what is doubtful is the word itself. He derived this invalid word by

---

<sup>1</sup> The rumour that the documents had been burnt during WW II was later revealed unsubstantial. Schütz states that he saw and examined the original text in 1967 (see 1969: 284).

metanalysis, in fact improper combining, *ialan açlanma*. It is actually the word *yalanaçlan-* as Garkavets gives (see 2010: 28).

**atala-** ‘çağrılmak, tanınmak, ad verilmek’ (Chirli 2005: 140).

This material appears only in AB, 6/10 as “(...) *haysi ki atalaptir inangalarina kendinin (...)*” (Chirli 2005: 24). A similar phrase is seen in Garkavets’s entry *atal-* (1): “(...) *haysi ki ataliptir inanga[n]larina kendinin*” (2010: 164). Compared to the latter, the former form looks like having a typo in AB, since *intensivum -A-* does not succeed a passive verb, and it cannot be *ata-la-* (with the medial-neutral *-IA-*) because then it would be a transitive verb. Thus, the genuine form of the verb should be considered not *atala-*, but *atal-*.

**eksik-** ‘(pour *eksil-* ?)’ (Deny 1957: 52).

In spite of having shared this word in his index, Deny does not conceal his hesitation, putting a question mark for the data together with the possibility of being *eksil-*. The fact that no other example of the word exists either in Armeno-Kipchak, or in Old or Middle Turkic texts strengthens this hesitation. Correspondingly, Garkavets directly considers it as a form of *eksit-*.

**halar-** ‘(causatif de *hal-* !)’ (Deny 1957: 55).

It is recorded only in Deny’s work. It is most probably a result of either misspelling or erroneous deciphering since the base verb has never been made causative with *-Ar*. Unfortunately, there is no chance, due to lack of facsimile, to verify whether it is deciphered correctly in Deny’s work. Deny might have read the data written as \**haldri* (= *խալըր*) as *halar-* (= *խալըր*). Confusion between these two spellings is very probable because Armenian letters *u* and *u* are very similar to each other especially in manuscripts.

**halgal-** ‘платить (штраф)’ (Grunin 1967: 411).

This suspicious verb form is seen only in Grunin’s glossary. While checking the examples in the text, it turns out that none of them is exactly *halgal-*, but the future forms of *hal-*, i.e. *halgay* and *halgaylar* (see Grunin 1967: 123, 147, 150). It is remarkable that, except one, the rest of the examples of these are used all together with *džurum*. If the word *džurum* is checked in Garkavets’s dictionary, *džurum hal-* ‘быть обязанным уплатить штраф’ (2010: 463) appears as an idiomatic verb. Thus, it is invalid and it needs to be considered either in *hal-* or in *džurum*.

*h̄isna-* ‘convoiter, jalouser’ (Deny 1957: 57).

It appears only in Deny.<sup>2</sup> Garkavets quotes this word exactly. He, however, states that this word appears neither in the page given by Deny nor in the manuscript (and not even in other Paris manuscripts) (2010: 855). It is not verified in early or modern Turkic languages either. Thence this word cannot be regarded as valid.

*korī-* ‘korumak, saklamak’ (Chirli 2005: 66).

Chirli unintentionally gives this word in her index. The line “(...) *yariḡi bilay yuzuḡnun seniḡ koriyirbiz yariḡni.*” (99/11-13) is translated by the author as “(...) *yüzünün nuruyla ışığı görüyoruz.*” (2005: 66). Thus, her interpretation of the word is in favor of *kör-* ‘to see’. It seems that she might have been misled owing to the spelling with *ḡ = /i/*: (*ḡorḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ* /*koriyirbiz/*). It is the fact that Old Turkic /*q/* is consistently /*h/* in Armeno-Kipchak. Therefore, if the Old Turkic *qorī-* survived in Armeno-Kipchak, it would be *ḡorī-* (or *ḡoru-*). This word should be corrected as *kor-* (= *kör-*) ‘görmek’ in the index.

*korul-* ‘être gardé, être surveillé’ (Tryjarski 1968-72: 417).

It appears only in Tryjarski’s dictionary. According to the comparison data, he must have considered this word as the Old Turkic *qorī-* ‘to protect’. The meanings given in his entry also corroborate this supposition. If the data descended from the Old Turkic *qorī-*, it would be expected as *ḡoril-*. Furthermore, there is no verb *ḡoru-* in Armeno-Kipchak, and to be able to give the meaning ‘to be protected’, there only exists *abral-*. The phrase including the verb “*saḡaymaḡsiz ya hečka korulmaḡan*” is rendered as “(...) *hečka körülmäḡän*” by Garkavets (2010: 740). Armenian entries are translated by him as follows: “не могущий быть превзойденным, несравненный, безмерный, беспредельный, сильнейший, неодолимый”. He has another example of *hečka kör-* (*iyirmen*) in the entry of *kör-*, which means “игнорирую”. Thence, this word with the meaning “to be guarded” ought to be corrected as “to be seen”.

*osa-* ‘muser, baguenauder’ (Deny 1957: 65).

It is seen only in Deny’s glossary. In spite of quoting it, Garkavets makes a reference to the entry *ös-* for *osa-*. Deny thought that it was the base form of *osan-* ~ *usan-*. However, what he exactly did is just a misanalysis of *osarlar* in the sentence “*oḡlanlar*

<sup>2</sup> Garkavets quotes it in his dictionary too (2010: 855).

*ki kendi erkine osarlar*”, which is nothing but the aorist form of *os-*. The verb *os-* is also recorded in Tryjarski (1968-72: 589) and Garkavets (2010: 1101). Thence, the word is invalid as *osa-*, and should be regarded as *ös-/os-*.

*sek-* ‘sautiller, balancer’ (Tryjarski 1968-72: 670).

Tryjarski interprets *sekan*, in the phrase “*keraksiz bolgan salingan nema uçü agaç kibik sekan*”, a form derived with the verb *sek-*. According to Garkavets, the *-An* variant of the participle *-gAn/-kAn* is seen in those texts influenced by Turkish (i.e. Ottoman) (1987: 73-74). However, this interpretation seems to be weak since there are two other participles with *-gAn* in the same phrase. Therefore, there is no reason to think this word as *sek-an*. Although Garkavets quotes *sek-* from Tryjarski, he cross-references it to *silk-*. He translates the Armenian entry *խիթաղեալ* into Russian as ‘толкаемый, стрекаемый, побуждаемый; повергнутый в ужас, в сомнения, в неверие, в отчаяние, обеспокоенный, встревоженный, расстроенный’ (Garkavets 2010: 1268) and this definition does not seem to correspond to the Kipchak equivalent. Thus, it is hard to say something on whether the doubtful material is *silkan*. Garkavets, in his previous work, indicates that the original writing is either *sekan* or *sisan*. Therefore, since this material is unclarified, it ought not to be included in *sek-* nor in *silk-*.

*sizîn-* ‘passer, traverser; se cacher?’ (Tryjarski 1968-72: 682).

On this verb, Tryjarski puts a question mark. The fact that there is no verb *siz-* in Armeno-Kipchak makes the validity of the verb suspicious. Garkavets regards this verb together with *sığîn-* without any comment (2010: 1274).

*siryalat-* ‘to make or let become open, lose, wide apart’<sup>3</sup> (Schütz 1968: 144).

It appears first in Schütz’s chronicle edition. He compares this verb with the Ottoman verb *سيرلتمك*. It can be inferred that he does not certainly know what this verb is. Garkavets gives this material as *siryalata*<sup>4</sup>, with reference to *sîrâlat-* (2010: 1272), and in the entry, he gives its meaning as ‘располагать в ряд’ (2010: 1279). The fact that *sira/sirâ* also exists in Armeno-Kipchak is in favor of Garkavets’s interpretation (see 2010: 1279). Therefore, even if the form *siryalat-* is kept, the meaning given by Schütz ought to be revised as he defines it in the text and grammatical section, i.e. ‘to set up’, or as in Garkavets’ ‘to arrange in a row’.

<sup>3</sup> However, in the text, he prefers to use ‘setting up’ in translation (see 1968: 68).

<sup>4</sup> The converb *-A* is a rare form in Armeno-Kipchak. For examples, see Schütz 1968: 113; Garkavets 1987: 191.

*sok-* ‘бить, ударить; вырезать’ (Grunin 1967: 405); *sok-* ‘frapper, battre, démolir’ (Tryjarski 1968-72: 689).

Both of the authors gave extra meanings to the verb *sok-* (Old Turkic *sök-* ‘to tear, rip’), and it might be confused with *soq-* in that way. There is no *soh-* in Armeno-Kipchak, but its reflexive form: *sohun-* ‘биться, ударяться, стукаться’ (see Garkavets 2010: 1291). Armenian entry *բալկիմ*, as an infinitive in *բալկիլ*, means ‘to untie, to unbind, to undo, to loosen, to detach, to disjoin, to disunite, to dismount, to dissolve, to demolish, to pull down’ (Kouyoumdjian 1970: 856). Thus, the meanings in Grunin, ‘бить’ and ‘ударить’, and in Tryjarski ‘frapper’ and ‘battre’ ought to be removed or replaced with parallel ones with the Old Turkic *sök-* ‘to tear, rip’.

*sokul-* ‘être frappé, battu ou démoli’ (Tryjarski 1968-72: 689).

Similar to the data above, it is required to be revised semantically. This is the passive form of the Old Turkic *sök-* ‘to tear, rip’; therefore, the meanings ‘être frappé, battu’ defined by Tryjarski should be deleted or replaced with appropriate ones.

*sovla-* ‘говорить, называть’ (Grunin 1967: 405).

This occurs only in Grunin’s work. When the text is checked, it turns out that, in the following phrase “(...) *altin sovlagan čiltsa...* (177<sup>th</sup> passage)” (1967: 187), the verb is nothing else but a variant of which is recorded as *altinsuvla-*, *altunsuvla-* in other works. The same phrase (i.e., *altinsuvlagan čiltsä*) is even given by Garkavets in the entry of *altunsuvla-* (2010: 88). Moreover, it should be noted that the verb signifying ‘to talk, to speak’ in Armeno-Kipchak is just *sözlä-*, not *sövlä-* or *söylä-*. Consequently, this word is not valid individually and it ought to be included in the entry *altinsovla-*.

*tanilat-* ‘просить засвидетельствовать, дать знать’ (Grunin 1967: 406).

This word is recorded only in Grunin’s work as a single instance. When considering that the verb *tanihlat-*, which refers to the same meaning appearing seven times in the text, the existence of *tanilat-* becomes very controversial. Then, this form must have been misspelled by either the scribe of the manuscript or Grunin, and it should be included in the entry *tanihlat-*.

*tergala-* ‘étudier, scruter’ (Tryjarski 1968-72: 753).

It is seen only in Tryjarski’s dictionary. Since its only conjugated form is *tergaliyir*, the verb might be either *tergal-* or *tergala-*. If the word is formed by medial-neutral *-IA-*

, then it should sustain the function of its base as a transitive, which corresponds to the meaning given by Tryjarski. Therefore, he is consistent in respect of form and meaning. Garkavets, however, includes this form in the entry of *tergäl-*. This ambiguity can only be cleared by the Armenian entry<sup>5</sup>, since this verb is taken from the Armenian-Kipchak dictionary.

*tiri-* ‘vivre, être bien portant’ (Tryjarski 1968-72: 761).

It occurs first in Tryjarski’s dictionary, and then Garkavets quotes it exactly, though he makes reference to *tirä-* for that (2010: 1445). Tryjarski’s entry for *tiri-* has two conjugated instances, both of which are *tiriyirmen*. As known, in Armeno-Kipchak, when any verb ending in /a/ or /e/ is followed by the present continuous tense *-(I)yIr-*, those final vowels are replaced with close variants, i.e. /i/ and /i/, respectively (Garkavets 1987: 162; Kasapoğlu Çengel 2012: 41). Thus, the only way to know whether it is *tiri-* or *tirä-* is the Armenian equivalent. Although Tryjarski does not furnish this material, it is possible to see it in Garkavets’s work: *պատրպարեմ, պատպարեմ* (2007: 841). These equivalents refer to ‘to surround, to encircle, to enclose, to shut in; to protect, to prop, to defend, to sustain; to shelter, to screen, to cover; to fortify, to restore; to return, to restore, to give back’ (Bedrossian 1875-79: 605). These meanings correspond to what Garkavets gives for *tirä-*: ‘подпирать, поддерживать, оказывать поддержку’ (2010: 1443). Thus, both form and meaning defined by Tryjarski are erroneous and they need to be revised as Garkavets does.

*tušur-* ‘выбить (палец)’ (Grunin 1967: 408).

It is recorded only in Grunin’s work. Since Armenian script lacks the characters of front rounded vowels, such as /ö/ and /ü/, Grunin prefers to indicate these original vowels in square brackets separately, e.g. *korguz-* [körgüz-] (see 1967: 398); however, he does not apply this to the verb in question, which inspires us to think that he does not consider this verb related to *tüš-*. Then, the only possible base on which he can depend is *tuš-*. There, however, is no such a verb that can be a base of this verb in Armeno-Kipchak. Moreover, the verb *tuš-* has a different meaning in Old Turkic as ‘to meet, come together’ (see Clauson 1972: 560). The same phrase including the verb is seen in the *tüšür-* entry of Garkavets’s dictionary (2010: 1530). Thus, Garkavets’s consideration on this material is obvious. What meaning he defines for the verb is ‘to knock down, bring down’. Consequently, the data of Grunin ought, at least, to be regarded as *tüšür-* and its meaning should be defined according to the form.

<sup>5</sup> Garkavets shares Armenian entry in his two works (2007: 883; 2010: 1426).

*ulašin-* ‘ulaşmak, yaklaşmak’ (Chirli 2005: 203).

Chirli interpretes the phrase “(...) Һaysi ki Һutulğaymen senin bila menjilik ottan, zera senen konu Һozusu teңrinin, Һaysi ki ulaşiniyirsen ҺuҺarıлмағına adam millafinin da koturiyirsen yazıғını dunyadan, da sana haybat menі menjilik, amen.” (161: 10-15; 162: 1-5) (2005: 51-52) as “(...) ebedi ateşten seninle kurtulacak kuluna can sađlığı vermeni diliyorum, çünkü sen günahları dünyadan uzaklaştıran ve insan neslinin kurtuluşuna ulaşan Tanrı’nın gerçek kuzususun.” (2005: 73-74). This interpretation is, as expected, far from being literal, yet it is obvious that her interpretation overlaps with the meaning given in the index as seen above. In fact, the phrase is very misleading to conceive the verb with meaning ‘to reach, approach’; however, Armeno-Kipchak lexicon does not possess such a verb that has a meaning aforementioned as other sources have *ulašin-* ‘sens passif du mot precedent (i.e. *ulaš-* ‘diviser, distribuer’)’ (Deny 1957: 78) and *üläšin-* ‘быть разделенным, распределенным между кем, назначенным в удел, поделиться’ (Garkavets 2010: 1575). On the other hand, the primary verb of Armeno-Kipchak for the meaning ‘to reach’ is *yeriš-* (see Tryjarski 1968-72: 369; Chirli 2010: 211; Garkavets 2010: 1071).

*ulaštir-* (2) ‘(faire) unir ou joindre’ (Tryjarski 1968-72: 801).

This verb is only seen in Tryjarski’s dictionary. Garkavets regards the same instances as *üläštir-* in his own work (2007: 690, 812). Hence, the authenticity of the data given by Tryjarski becomes doubtful. If Karaim is regarded as a modern criterion to validate the words in question, it is seen that, whereas Karaim possesses the verbs *üleš-*, *ülešin-*, and *üleštir-* (see KRPS: 589), it does not possess the verbs *ulaš-* or *ulaštir-*. Therefore, this fact substantiates Garkavets’s preference, and thus, this material can be viewed as invalid.

*yaman-* (Tryjarski 1968-72: 310).

It only occurs in Tryjarski’s work. Garkavets quotes this word; however, he makes reference to *man-* (2010: 1637). Tryjarski has difficulty to give a meaning for this material, though he has come closer to it through Khudabashev’s reference.<sup>6</sup> He has been misled by the form *yaman-* and looked for the meaning on that, thus he has remained inconclusive. On the other hand, Garkavets has chosen a more reasonable way to solve the word: He separates the *ya*, which is the most frequent conjunction of Armeno-Kipchak, from the data and he derives the Turkic *man-* verb, which best fits to the meanings of Armenian entry together with *suvar-*. What makes the entry “*наукал – nauka, ya manma ya suvarma*” complicated is the word *nauka* given as a

<sup>6</sup> The original Armenian entry is *наукал*, whereas Khudabashev’s is *սուրահալ*. So Tryjarski might not have found this data trustworthy.

Kipchak equivalent for the Armenian word, and its incoherence with the other two words. Besides, it is very difficult to get the meaning ‘to speak properly’ from the Armenian word, which Khudabashev gives for a variant, since *նոսրիկ* does not, but the variants beginning with *u*, such as *սոսրանիկ* ‘to pronounce words regularly: to sprinkle, to wet’ (Bedrossian 1875-79: 63) and *սոսրանիկ* ‘to irrigate, to water; to pronounce’ (Kouyoumdjian 1970: 67) own it. That’s why in Tryjarski’s reference, Ciakciak’s Armenian-Italian dictionary does not include the meaning. In short, as Garkavets thinks, the word should be viewed as *man-*, for it is complementing with *savar-* to signify ‘to irrigate, to water’.

*yanla-* ‘to kindle, to light the fire [“зажигать, разжигать огонь”]’ (Garkavets 2010: 1641).

This verb appears only in Tryjarski’s work *Armeno-Kipchak Texts in the Alchemical Treatise*. Garkavets quotes it exactly and gives a reference to *yan*. The verb takes part in the phrase “*atanor peč üstü, yanları da yapuḥ bolsar, da tıbdän otu berilsär tešiktän*”. As mentioned above, Garkavets interprets this word as a noun, not a verb. If this verb were derived with medial-neutral *-la-*, such as in *abrala-*, *ar(i)tila-*, *bularla-*, *titrala-*, it would keep its base function, i.e. being intransitive. However, the verb in question is not intransitive, but transitive. In addition, *yanları* is not a proper conjugation for a verb like *yanla-*. It, at least, would be expected as *yanlar*. Thus, this word is invalid and should be included in *yan* noun.

*yazıl-* (I) ‘yayılmak’ (Chirli 2005: 210).

The word is very common for Armeno-Kipchak texts, but not this meaning, i.e. “to spread (intr.), to get laid”, given by Chirli. However, it is possible, by checking the Turkish translation, to see that what meaning Chirli assigns for the word is actually ‘to be written’. Thus this word is invalid, and must be considered within *yazıl-* ‘to be written’.

*zımlan-* ‘sauter’ (Tryjarski 1968-72: 849).

It is seen only in Tryjarski’s dictionary. Garkavets also quotes it with a reference to *zalımlan-*. Tryjarski gives a comparison with Kyrgyz *zimla-* ‘mit beiden Füßen zugleich springen’ for the word. However, neither the Armenian entry *յիխրսուսի*<sup>7</sup> nor the other Kipchak equivalents, *bazıyırmen*, *maḥtanıyırmen*, back this meaning. Furthermore, in his *zalımlan-* entry, it is possible to see this phrase: “*bazıyırmen*,

<sup>7</sup> ‘to bully, to bridle up’ (Kouyoumdjian 1970: 554).

*mahtaniyürmen ya zalimlaniyürmen başartiyürmen ya ufat etiyürmen boyuma*" (1968-72, p. 839). Thus, this word needs to be assumed as a misspelled form of *zalimlan-*, as Garkavets did.

*zuftlan-* 'être sali ou imprégné avec de la poix' (Tryjarski 1968-72: 855).

It is only found in Tryjarski's dictionary. As the Armenian entry *անդուգալիմ*<sup>8</sup> signifies "matchless, incomparable, unparalleled, unequalled" (Bedrossian 1875-79: 31), the verb cannot semantically be linked to what Tryjarski suggests. On the other hand, Garkavets views this word as *čüftlän-* (see 2010: 408), which better agrees with the meanings of the Armenian entry. However, it is invalid and needs to be revised as *čuftlan-* together with the appropriate meanings.

#### REFERENCES

- BEDROSSIAN, M. (1875-79), *New Dictionary Armenian-English*. Venice, S. Lazarus Armenian Academy.
- (AB=) CHIRLI, N. (2005), *Algış Bitigi - Ermeni Kıpçakça Dualar Kitabı*. İstanbul, SOTA.
- CLAUSON, G. (1972), *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- DENY, J. (1957), *L'Arméno-Coman et les Ephémérides de Kamieniec (1604-1613)*. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz.
- GARKAVETS, A. N. (1987), *Кыпчакские Языки: Куманский и Армјано-Кыпчакский*. Alma-Ata, Nauka.
- GARKAVETS, A. N. (2007), *Кыпчакское Пис'менное Наследие II. Памятники духовной культуры Караймов, Куманов-Половets и Армјано-Кыпчаков*. Almaty, Kasean Baur.
- GARKAVETS, A. N. (2010), *Кыпчакское Пис'менное Наследие III. Кыпчакский Словар'*. Almaty, Kasean Baur.
- GRUNIN, T. İ. (1967), *Dokumenty na polovetskom jazyke XVI. v. (Sudebnye акты Kamenets-Podolskoj Armјanskoj obshchiny)*. Moskva, Nauka.
- KASAPOĞLU ÇENGEL, H. (2012), *Ermeni Harfli Kıpçak Türkçesi. Dil Araştırmaları*, S. 10, pp. 17-81.
- KOUYOUMDJIAN, M. G. (1970), *A Comprehensive Dictionary Armenian-English*. Beirut, Atlas Press.
- SCHÜTZ, E. (1968), *An Armeno-Kipchak Chronicle on the Polish-Turkish Wars in 1620-21*. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.
- SCHÜTZ, E. (1969), *Документы на половецком языке XVI в. (Судебные акты каменец-подольской армянской общины) [Documents from the XVI century in Polovec language (Juridical Acts of the Armenian community of Kameneć-Podolsk)]. a study [on the juridical value of the Acts] : Памятники письменности востока, vol. III by T. I. Grunin, J. Daškevič, E. V. Sevortjan. Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 283-285.*

<sup>8</sup> Its Kipchak equivalent is *zuftlanmayiyirm[ên]*.

TRYJARSKI, E. (1968-72), *Dictionnaire Arméno-Kiptchak*. Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.