Edward Tryjarski, an exquisite Polish Turkologist and Armenologist, wrote that “the choice of scientific field of study is often a result of both personal interests of the would-be scientist and a series of external circumstances – oftentimes independent of that would-be scientist” (Tryjarski 1991: v). It means that without understanding the context within which research is conducted, it cannot ever be complete. That state of affairs is particularly conspicuous in the case of Polish researchers of Armenian history and culture because their studies were entangled in the complex relations between those two countries. The history of relations between Poland and Armenia dates back to as far as the 14th century and concerns not only cultural issues but also economic and political ones. The context of the said relations were the migration of Armenian people to eastern and western European countries including Poland. Before World War II it was Lvov which was the most frequently chosen destination of Armenian expatriates. The significance of Lvov among other cities around which the Armenian diaspora was concentrated rested on the fact that it was in this city where the Armenian diaspora consolidated by establishing its cultural centers. The evidence for the above is the handsome number of the relics of Armenian writing as well as developing and maintaining the religious cult centers (cf. Galustian 1983: 28). It is worth noting that the earliest religious centre of Armenians in Poland were located in Lvov itself, being

---

1 The opinions can be encountered (though no documents confirm them) that Armenians appeared on Polish lands already in XI century (cf. Słuszkiewicz; Doluchanian 1983: 58).

2 Only from XVI century, the city associated with Armenian majority was Warsaw (cf. Stopka 2013a: 19; Stopka 2012b: 20).
concentrated around the cathedral dating back to the 14th century. Furthermore, in Lvov, from the 17th century onwards, there was an Armenian printing house operative, the importance of which for spreading the writings in Armenian cannot be overstated (Dołuchanian 1983: 59; Iszchanian 1994: 61). A few-hundred-year history of the Armenian minority in Poland resulted in a substantial amount of works pertaining to church liturgy, court cases, literature and even theatre (cf. Doluchanin 1983: 59). Worth mentioning is the first Armenian-Latin dictionary by Stepanos Roszka, 13th c. Also merit some attention the memoirs by Simeon Lehaci (Սիմեոն Լեհացի, 1584-1639) written in a mixture of Classical Armenian with Modern Armenian and Turkish (Śluszkiewicz 1934b: 40). One might speculate that Armenian culture and Armenian language and literature in particular were not of interest to those Poles not being of Armenian origin or to those not being in touch with the diaspora. It was mainly due to the inability to understand Armenian and to use the writings collected in the Armenian religious centers. It should be added that with the passage of time the access to Armenian writings became problematic for Armenians themselves. It was explained by the fact that the Armenian language was getting less understandable for the members of the diaspora (cf. Śluszkiewicz 1975: 279). Instead, they were using the Armenian alphabet to write down Polish, Latin or Armeno-Kipchak words. The very alphabet was used by many Polish Armenians prior to the 17th century (Grigorian 1983: 45; Pisowicz 2000: 135). On the other hand, in XIX century the studies pertaining to the history of Armenians were written in Polish. Yet, it did not have any bearing on the increasing interest for Armenian literature and culture on the part of those Poles who were not in touch with the diaspora.

The breakthrough in the studies of Armenian language and culture was initiated by the emergence of the first academic researchers interested in Armenian language. One of the first Polish scientists was Jan Hanusz affiliated with the

---

3 The oldest part of Lvovian cathedra was founded by Crimean Armenians and it bears much resemblance to the church in Odzun and the one from Caffa dating back to VII century (Gałustian 1983: 28).
4 In that printing house in 1618, the prayer book General Intercessions (Լարահ պատարակյակ) was printed. It was written in Armeno-Kipchak, being used in the colloquial speech, and not Liturgy Grabar (cf. Iszchanian 1994: 61-62).
5 Unfortunately, the majority of monuments of Armenian writing was lost during wars and due to some deliberate actions too (cf. Doluchanian 1983: 58).
6 A handsome number of texts in Armeno-Kipchak written with the help of Armenian alphabet was preserved in Poland (Śluszkiewicz 1975: 279; Grigorian 1983: 47).
7 The most famous are the works by Sadok Barącz, such as: Lives of Famous Armenians in Poland (Żywoty sławnych Ormian w Polsce, 1856) i A Sketch of Armenian History (Rys dziejów ormiańskich, 1869).
University of Vienna, the author of the two-volume book *O języku Ormian polskich* (*About the Languages of the Polish Armenians, 1886 and 1888*)

*Another researcher is Andrzej Gawroński related to both Jagiellonian University and the University of Lvov. He was not only the author of the studies devoted to Armenia, but also and primarily so - the initiator of the studies on the Armenian language (cf. Słuszkiewicz 1969: 175). The disciple of the prominent polyglot and the adherent of his Armenia-related studies was Eugeniusz Słuszkiewicz, who was also affiliated with Lvov and the Lvovian Armenian diaspora. The scholarly legacy of Słuszkiewicz is not too plentiful; yet, he was one of the first Polish researchers who did not limit his interest to language but shifted it to the Armenian culture – especially to literature as a translator.*

**1. History and the Portrayal of the Armenian Language**

There is nothing exceptional about the fact that Armenian diaspora in Poland was in need for understanding its own culture, which consisted of – to a limited degree – typically Armenian constituents combined with Polish, Russian and Turkish motifs. Those remnants of cultural patterns were preserved mainly in the fact that the Armenian alphabet and Classical Armenian were still in use, the latter mainly for liturgical purposes. For these reasons alone, it was mainly the Armenian language as used by Polish Armenians, that is Armeno-Kipchak language (Հայ-ղփչաղական լեզու) – and not Classical Armenian (գրաբար) – that aroused interest. Among the original studies related to comparative linguistics we have already mentioned Jan Hanusz and Andrzej Gawroński. The basis for the interest in that language was 19th-century discussions over its place among other Indo-European languages. What was conducive to the research was also the discovery that the language is after all a distinct language – along with Iranian and Indo-Aryan languages. (cf. Gawroński 1915: 452; Pisowicz 2014: 29). However, the corpus of works produced by the said researchers are limited exclusively to the debate over language of Polish Armenians with the international discussion over its history and the portrayal of Armenian language left unattended. It was only the studies by Eugeniusz Słuszkiewicz which transcended the narrow, though extremely important and interesting area of the language (or its dialects) exploration as spoken by the Armenian diaspora in Poland. Thus, we can subsume

---

8 Apart from Jan Hanusz, also Jerzy Kuryłowicz was interested in Armenian, without leaving some published output though (cf. Pisowicz 1999: 189; Stopka 2013: 33).
our research under the broader context, that is the investigation of Indo-European languages. Namely, as opposed to his predecessors, he was one of the first to pay some attention to the history of shaping of Armenian language (first of all Classical Armenian). The most significant, and unfortunately the only one, text dedicated to that issue is the one published in 1934 and bearing the title: *About the Characteristics of the Armenian Language, its Kinship with Other Languages and Stages of Development* (O charakterze języka ormiańskiego, jego pokrewieństwie z innemi językami i fazach rozwoju)⁹. One can also encounter some minor commentaries in the texts dedicated to Armenian literature – these include the works such as: *Armenian Literature* (Literatura ormiańska, 1930) and *A Sketch of the History of the Classical Armenian Literature* (Szkic dziejów literatury staroormiańskiej, 1934). On the basis of the pre-war publications one may be inclined to suppose that Słuszkiewicz was the first one to describe Armenian language in the entire Polish academic literature.

The depiction of shaping the Armenian language is loaded with grave difficulties of explaining its origins and their various theories. It especially concerns the impossibility of reconstructing that language as it was in the times preceding the introduction of script by Mestrop Mashtots (Մեսրոպ Մաշտոց, 359-440) in the 5th c. AD. Neither the remains of cuneiform script found in the proximity of Lake Van (which were edited in the language entirely distinct from Armenian), nor the inscriptions in Cilicia (in Armenian Կիլիկիա) engraved w Hittite language make things easier (Słuszkiewicz 1934: 23). The difficulty in studying Armenian also stem from the saying by Herodotus contained in *The Histories* as if apparently pro-Armenian language originated from Phrygian. Namely: “the Armenians were equipped like Phrygians, being Phrygian colonists” (Herodotus 1914: VII/73). According to Andrzej Pisowicz, the word ἀποικοί, as used by Herodotus, which word was derived from the noun ἀποικία (colony), does not specify whether he meant that proto-Armenian had some affinity with Phrygian or Armenians simply spoke that language (Pisowicz 2014: 30). In Słuszkiewicz’s opinion, it is impossible to verify those relations mainly because there are only a

---

⁹ The paper was published in „The Messenger of St. Gregory“ (“Posłaniec św. Grzegorza”) in 1934. It is a pity that Słuszkiewicz’s works appeared only within the magazine published by Armenian parish in Lvov. And because the papers were supposed to consolidate Armenian minority, they has popular-science character. Still, Słuszkiewicz’s articles were characterized by reliability quite above the standards adhered to in Armenian periodical
few excerpts extant and individual words of Phrygian origin (Słuszkiwiecz 1934: 23).10

On the other hand, there might have been two factors contributing to the emergence of the Armenian language. First of all, it may be the languages of Indo-European newcomers who appeared in the neighborhood of Ararat, Lake Van and the headwaters of Tigress and Euphrates between the 10th and the 6th cc. BC or on the turn of the 7th and the 6th cc. BC that might have influenced Armenian (Słuszkiwiecz 1934: 23). Second of all, that might be the remains of the language as described by Movses Khorenatsi (Մովսես Խորենացի, ca. 410-490), non-Indo-European society of the country Urartu (Ուրարտու) (Słuszkiwiecz 1934: 23)11. It is a pity that Słuszkiwiecz did not complement his assertions with examples or at least the references he was adducing to. It would otherwise have extended our knowledge on the origins of Armenian.

In the Polish literature concerning the studies of Armenian, the incoherence manifested in using the equivalents for the version of the language which emerged in the 5th cc. AD is highly visible. In the contemporary studies the term Old Armenian is used, and the language which is supposed to have preceded it is Proto-Armenian (cf. Pisowicz 2014: 17 and 49). On the other hand, Słuszkiwiecz in his paper related to the history of that language uses the term Old Armenian to distinguish it from the later Classical Armenian (Grabar)12. And still in the other paper (incidentally, published in the same year), he identifies the literary language as Old Armenian13. The lack of a precise explanation of what he meant by the wording “Old Armenian” implies many questions related to the connection between Proto-Armenian and the later Grabar. It is difficult to verify whether he identifies those two languages having assumed the murky and barely justifiable relation between them. Second of all, the question remains whether Proto-Armenian was a coherent language or it was subject to vernacular variation.

The distinct issue is the relations between Armenian and Indo-European languages. Because, as emphasized by the Polish researcher, in Armenian the...

---

10 At the same time he adds that there is a similarity between those languages which can result from the common ancestry of those languages (Słuszkiwiecz 1934: 23, cf. Majewicz 1989: 32).
11 In the paper cited here, Słuszkiwiecz uses the expression Ḫaldi People (in Polish Chaldowie), the mistaken name for the inhabitants of Urartu (Ուրարտու).
12 According to Alfred Majewicz, the identity of Classical Armenian i Grabar is ambiguous because the former is used to refer to the oldest and earliest stage of the development of Armenian falling on the period of establishing Armenian alphabet after XI century; whereas the latter means „the language of written monuments of Old-Armenian language” (Majewicz 1989: 32).
13 It relates to the text A Sketch of the History of Old Armenian Literature.
remains of pre-Indo-European assuming the form of purely Armenian words are few and they amount to as little as five hundred words (Słuszkiewicz 1934a: 23), one of the key phenomena corroborating the connection between Proto-Armenian and pre-Indo-European is consonant shift (or consonant mutation) involving the shift of former consonants $b$ ($բ$), $d$ ($դ$), $g$ ($գ$) into $p$ ($պ$), $t$ ($տ$), $k$ ($կ$) and $p$ ($պ$), $t$ ($տ$), $k$ ($կ$) into $h$ ($հ$) (through $p'$ ($փ$)), $t'$ ($թ$), $k'$ ($ք$) (Słuszkiewicz 1934: 24; cf Pisowicz 2014: 48). This observation is not exemplified either. The author does not provide the words illustrating the said shift, nor any references.

We cannot know for certain whether Słuszkiewicz simply followed his predecessors’ research when forming his observations or the “observations” followed from his own analyses. We can make a reasonable conjecture that the state of analyses over the origins of Proto-Armenian at the beginning of XX century did not allow for more precise observation of the problems or methodological constraints. Based on the contemporary works, one can easily realize the difficulties in answering the question of when the consonant shift might have occurred and in which language. That language then generated Classical Armenian. In Andrzej Pisowicz’s opinion, the consonant shift may have occurred in the 9th century BC because the language did not undergo any transformations as far consonants go until the 5th century BC. It should be noted that the conclusive evaluation of this issue would considerably extend our knowledge of the origins of Armenian as well as the origins of the Armenians.

Słuszkiewicz presented interesting allegations in the paper About the Characteristics of the Armenian Language, saying that none of the Indo-European languages include as many various borrowings (with respect to the variety of their linguistic origins) as Armenian (Słuszkiewicz 1934: 24). Armenian borrowed from the following languages: Persian, Syriac, Greek, Arabic, Neo-Persian, Turkish and French. It is to be underscored that despite clear reference to the paper by Heinrich Hübschmann Armenische Gramatik (1895), he made his own remarks addressing historical contexts in which the borrowings did occur or might have occurred. The influences of the said languages, despite minor exceptions, did not violate the structure of Armenian or its status as an Indo-European language.

---

14 From the secondary texts it might follow that he was based on the works by Antoine Meillet and Heinrich Hübschmann.
15 Andrzej Pisowicz added that the emergence of the shift may be associated with the effect of the substrate of Hayasa language, which was either pre-Indo-European or Indo-European resembling to quite a degree Hittite language (Pisowicz 2014: 50).
16 On the other hand, as a result of the said contacts Armenian words may be found in such languages as: Syriac, Greek, Gothic, Turkish, Georgian and perhaps even Finnish (Słuszkiewicz 1934: 25).
(Słuszkiewicz 1934: 25). Referring to the historical development of Armenian and particular stages of its evolution, Słuszkiewicz quite extraordinarily proved that these borrowings occurred as a result of cultural and political mingling. The first borrowings (or at least the first proven borrowings) come from Persian. According to Słuszkiewicz, they were to occur during the reign of the Parthian Empire (or Arsacid Empire), that is between III century BC and III century AD (Słuszkiewicz 1934: 24). It was to coincide with the influence of Middle Persian (Pahlavi language). However, the influence of Persian is much older than Słuszkiewicz thought because they date back to the 6th century AD, that is the time of the reign of The Achaemenid Empire in Armenia. It means that the extinct Old Persian might have had the influence on Proto-Armenian.

The examples provided by Słuszkiewicz are (among others) such words as: desert or uninhabited (անապատ, anapat)\(^{17}\), pupil (աշակէրտ, ashakert)\(^{18}\), arm (Բազուկ, bazuk)\(^{19}\) and happiness (պահք, bacht)\(^{20}\). Also the proper names are included: the goddess of love and fertility Anahit (Անահիտ)\(^{21}\), the city Artashat (Արտաշատ) and masculine names Ardashes i Bagrat (պաղրատ – the name occurs also in the Georgian language ბაგრატ). The second period of Persian influence on Armenian fell on the times of the reign of Sassanid Empire between the 3rd century AD and the 7th century AD. However, the borrowings in that period were far less frequent, which was mainly due to the introduction of Christianity into Armenia and the divergence from non-Christian influences – especially Zoroastrainism (cf. Słuszkiewicz 1934: 24-25). It was worth adding that relinquishing the contact with Iran strengthened the influence of Surian as a counterpoint to Christianity operating within the Greek tradition (cf. Słuszkiewicz 1930/1991: 5-6). He quotes a few borrowings from Syriac: century (քառ, dar)\(^{22}\), interpreter/transalor (պաղրատ, thargman)\(^{23}\) and hair\(^{24}\) (մազ, maz), as well as a few proper names, for instance.: Yeperen (էփրէմ) (cf. Słuszkiewicz 1934: 24).

\(^{17}\) Derived from the Middle Persian: an-ābād or an-āpāt or the negative form of the word: āpātān – inhabited (Hübschmann 1897: 97).

\(^{18}\) Derived from the Middle Persian: аšāğart (Hübschmann 1897: 100).

\(^{19}\) Derived from the Middle Persian: bāzū (Hübschmann 1897: 114).

\(^{20}\) Derived from the Middle Persian: baxt (Hübschmann 1897: 115).

\(^{21}\) According to the Armenian historian Vahan M. Kurkjian, the name Anhit was borrowed from Zarathustrianism (Kurkjian 2008: 301).

\(^{22}\) Derived from the Syriac: dārā (Hübschmann 1897: 302).

\(^{23}\) Derived from the Syriac: tǎrgmanā (Hübschmann 1897: 303).

\(^{24}\) In Armenian, the word „hair” (սաղ) is derived from the Middle Persian: vars.

\(^{25}\) Derived from the Syriac: mezze (Khan 2008: 1030, 1041), mezze (Hübschmann 1897: 310).
One of the acts of opposition against the influence of Syriac was the invention of the alphabet for Armenian and of translating the liturgical and theological writings from Greek into Armenian (Słuszkiewicz 1995: 435). It is to be underscored that the introduction of the script for the sake of spreading the Armenian literature securing the stronghold of Christianity in Armenia was a vital event. Yet, we cannot forget that combined with the contacts with representatives of other cultures and translations of theological writings, there was a flow of concepts originating in other languages which pervaded through to Armenian. And through the languages being the representatives of distinct cultures, there came new words oftentimes incongruous with the patterns endorsed by Christianity. Thus, Armenian borrowed words from Hebrew, Latin, less substantially from Arabic, French and Turkish (cf. Słuszkiewicz 1934a: 24-25).

In the 12th century there appears Middle Armenian (միջին հայերեն), also referred to as Cilician Armenian (կիլիկյան հայերեն). In that language, there occurred the second consonant shift, which results in the come-back to the original form. According to Słuszkiewicz, that was the most important dialect within Middle Armenian, derived from literary Classical Armenian and not from any distinct dialect (Słuszkiewicz 1934a: 25). In Słuszkiewicz’s opinion, we can notice it comparing the words derived from Classical Armenian with the ones derived from Middle Armenian; for example, in կրապար (krapar) mutates into գրաբար (grabar), տասն (tasn) into դասն (dasn) or պատկէր (patker) into բադգէր (badger) (Słuszkiewicz 1934a: 25). Another curiosity distinguishing Old Armenian from Middle Armenian is the substitution of the suffix, plural’ (ք) with a few other suffixes: -er (էր), -ni (նի), -wi (ւի) i -di (դի), all derived from the Caucasian languages (Słuszkiewicz 1934a: 26).

Plentiful borrowings present in different variations of Armenian made it one of the most heavily transformed language among the Indo-European ones (Słuszkiewicz 1934a: 22). It is a pity that Słuszkiewicz did not strengthen his assertion by more thorough depiction of how the process of shaping of Modern Armenian (ԱրդիՀայերէն or Աշխարհաբար) and its two dialects Western Armenian (արեւմտահայերէն) and Eastern Armenian (արևելահայերեն) proceeded. It may have resulted from the fact that Modern Armenian – having

---

26 Namely: b (բ), d (դ), g (գ) mutates into p (պ), t (տ), k (կ) and p (պ), t (տ), k (կ) into b (բ), d (դ), g (գ) (Słuszkiewicz 1934: 25).
27 Incidentally, it must added that the said gap is filled with the articles by Słuszkiewicz dedicated to the texts written in Armeno-Kipchak.
emerged in the 15\textsuperscript{th} century – is not endowed with any major linguistic changes in comparison to some previous periods. It is worth noting that as much as Modern Armenian was not marked by any significant grammatical changes, it was still involved in the process of shaping the ethnic and then the national identity of Armenians. What gives evidence to that is the purposeful process of deleting the words that seeped through to Armenian during the reign of Arabs and Turks, replacing those words with the one of purely Armenian origin derived from the early classical language (Słuszkiewicz manuscript).

2. The History of Armenian Literature and its Characteristics

In the contemporary studies of the Armenian history and culture, the works by Słuszkiewicz are often shunned. It may result from the unjust evaluation of his scientific corpus or else from the fact of associating his personage only with the studies on Armeno-Kipchak\textsuperscript{28}. In Krzysztof Stopka’s opinion, one of the contemporary Armenologists, Słuszkiewicz focused on the relations between Polish Armenians’ speech and Turkic languages (Stopka 2013: 33). The similar opinion, though the one with a lesser degree of assertiveness, is shared by Andrzej Pisowicz. In his opinion, Słuszkiewicz was mainly concentrated (almost exclusively) on the issues of the Polish Armenians’ language thereby neglecting Armenian literature (Pisowicz 1999: 192). On the other hand, in Leszek Piątkowski’s opinion (a Polish historian), Słuszkiewicz represented quite a typical agenda of Polish research on the culture of Armenians, with the majority of publications pertaining to the history of Armenian diaspora on Polish land (Piątkowski 1983: 7). The opinions uttered by Polish researchers should be complemented with the information relating to the publications of Eugeniusz Słuszkiewicz and that is because he published one paper in 1939 on the issue of Armeno-Kipchak language, bearing the title \textit{Remarques sur la Lange turque des Arméniens et sur les emprunts turcs de l’arménien}. After the war, he published a few papers related to the documents drafted by the members belonging to Armenian diaspora in Poland, the documents having been written in Armeno-Kipchak. Apart from that, he wrote a few papers related to the history of the Armenian literature and he was one of the first translators from Armenian- both from Classical and Modern Armenian. It is worth noting – among others – the

\textsuperscript{28} It must be mentioned that the works by Słuszkiewicz were mainly devoted to the culture of India and to linguistics.
translations of the excerpts from Definition of Philosophy (Սահմանք իմաստասիրութեան) David Anhaght (Դավիթ Անհաղթ, approx. 470- ca. 560) and Armenian proverbs; and furthermore, his translations of poems by Petros Duryan (Պետրոս Դուրյան, 1852-1872)\(^{29}\) and a fairy tale by Avetis Aharonian (Ավետիս Ահարոնեան, 1880-1948)\(^{30}\). That is why Edward Tryjarski is closer to the truth as far as the gravity of Szłuszkiewicz’s works is concerned, when the former says that the latter made a long-lasting contribution, familiarizing Polish readers with that challenging and elitist literature (Tryjarski 1991: vii).

History of the Armenian literature begins with the emergence of script in the 5th century AD. In that trivial statement, there is very serious issue related to the characteristics of literary works appearing in Armenia. It refers to the emergence of Classical Armenian, thus commencing “the golden age” of literary art, when the grammatical canon of that language was established and the Christian literature started being translated (cf. Słuszkiewicz 1934a: 23; Słuszkiewicz 1995: 434). The significance of that issue involves the fact that together with the emergence of the script designed for translating Christian texts, the social order and the paradigm of defining one’s own culture was simultaneously assumed, thus making it still more difficult to access the literary art of the period preceding the introduction of Christianity and Classical Armenian in Armenia. That issue proves to be quite challenging for the researcher of Armenian history because during the pagan era Armenians possessed poetry, which was preserved in the form of a few fragments on the history of Gods and heroes, in the writing of Movses Khorenatsi and Grigor Magistros (Գրիգոր Մագիստրոս, ca. 990-1058) (Słuszkiewicz 1995: 432; Słuszkiewicz 1934c: 108; Kurkjian 2008: 300)\(^{31}\). In Słuszkiewicz’s opinion, poetry in pre-Christian times operated exclusively within the oral tradition. The poetry was performed by the predecessors of later asik or ashoug (Աշուղ), the folk singers (Słuszkiewicz 1934c: 108).

History of the Armenian literature following the invention of writing by Mashots has become more definite. Periodization of history of the Armenian literature – as introduced by the Polish researcher – is associated with the rise of script. He indicated three successive periods relating to the variations of Armenian.

---

\(^{29}\) Słuszkiewicz translated some of Duryan poems, such as: My death (Իմ մահը, 1871) and She (Նե, 1871).

\(^{30}\) Fairy Tales: Gsrje’s Mill

\(^{31}\) Other remnants of pre-Christian era should be mentioned. They assume the form of :chronicles, sanctuary books, some records and administrative documents or king’s rescript written in Greek or Middle Persian (Słuszkiewicz 1934c: 108).
Speaking more precisely, Classical Armenian literature (V AD. – XII AD), Middle Armenian literature (XII AD. – XIX AD.) and Modern Armenian literature (from XIX w.). However, the periodization implemented by Słusziewicz is not coherent because in the mentioned two texts he applied the mutually contradictory divisions. Namely, Classical Armenian was divided into two periods: “golden” from the fifth c. AD to the 6th c. AD and “the period of decadence” – from the 6th c. AD to the 9th c. AD. After the latter, there comes the time of “the restauration of classicism and the beginning of folk writings” falling on XIII century. It means that there is a gap between the 9th and the 13th centuries and it is not explained in any of his texts. Leaving the question of precision aside, it is worth stressing that Słuszkiewicz in his paper demonstrated (for the first time in Polish literature on that subject) the history of Armenian literature ranging from the ancient times up to the modern times. Słuszkiewicz’s work thus transcended quite popular tendencies among Polish orientalists who focused mostly on the ancient or medieval times32.

The first period, referred to as “the golden period”, was characterized by – in the opinion of the Polish Armenologist, the fact that the then masterpieces were the unsurpassable ideals for writers to come in the following centuries (cf. Słusziewicz 1995: 433). The uniqueness of the literature which emerged between the 5th and the 6th century involved mainly the introduction of Armenian script as well as laying ground to Christian script and departing from the times preceding the adoption of the new religion. In the first case, it must be noted that the actions taken by Mashtotz and his disciple Sahak the Parthian (Սահակ Պարթև, 354–439) involving striving for separating Armenia from the Syriac influences in favor of the Greek ones (cf. Słuszkiewicz 1995: 435). Słuszkiewicz concludes that the introduction of the script and numerous translations into Armenian led to the process of being liberated from Syriac influences 33. Apart from the translations pursued by Mashots and his co-operators, Armenian writings were focused on the

32 The earliest times were described in more detail by Słusziewicz than later ones.
33 He addresses for instance the translations of such authors as: Saint Athanasius of Alexandria (Μέγας Αθανάσιος, ca. 328-373), Cyril of Jerusalem (Κύριλλος Α’ Ισραηλίτης, ca. 313 – 386), Basil of Caesarea (᾿Αγίος Βασίλειος ο Μέγας, ca. 330-379), Gregory of Nyssa (Γρηγόριος Νισσης, ca. 335-ca. 395), Gregory of Nazianzus (Γρηγόριος ο Ναζιανζηνός, ca. 329-ca. 390), John Chrysostom (Ιωάννης ο Χρυσόστομος, ca. 349-407), Dionysius Thrax (Διονύσιος ο Θράξ, 170-90 BC), the biography of Alexander the Great by Pseudokallistenes Pseudo-Callisthenes (Alexander romance, III w.). The translation of Syriac writings but translated from Greek for instance Eusebius of Caesarea (Εὐσέβιος, ca. 260-ca. 340), The Church History (Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία, Ignatius of Antioch (Ἰωάννης Αντιοχίας, ca. 45 or 50 – 90 to 117) his letters. On the other hand, Syrian authors include here:: Ephrem the Syrian (ܐܦܪܝܡ ܢ网投ܐܣܐ, ca. 306-373), XIII w. Chronicle of Michael the Syrian (Michael syrius, 1126-1199). For that see: (Słuszkiewicz 1995: 435-436).
history of Armenia, polemics with non-Christian religions, whereas they were focused on philosophy to quite a lesser degree. Słuszkiewicz enumerates the most exquisite representatives of that period: Eznik of Kolb (Եզնիկ Կողբացի, approx. 380–approx. 450) and his Against the Sects (Եղծաղանդոց), Koryun (Կորյուն, approx. 380 - approx. 450), Agathangelos (Ագաթանգեղոս, 4th or 5th c. AD), Movses Khorenatsi, David the Anhaht and Ghazar Parpetsi (Ղազար Փարպեցի, ca. 442–VI, the author of History of Armenia (Հայոց պատմության)). The emergence of poetry merits some attention, the poetry which until VII century was written by anonymous authors (cf. Słuszkiewicz 1934b: 111). At the same time, a closer attention is paid to literature than to theological and historiosophical issues. To a large extent, it resulted from the influence of Arabic culture in the ultimate period of the dominion by Persian Sassanid Empire, thereby extending the literary corpus of Armenians with new narration motifs. (Słuszkiewicz 1934c: 111). It is a pity that the Polish researcher did not continue with the thread of the relations between Arabic culture with art works by Armenians. It could have revealed the influence of Arabic thought on historical, theological issues and mainly on the development of Armenian science – mathematics and astronomy in particular. That problem might be interesting because the works of Armenian artists were dominated by Christianity and could not be simultaneously influenced by other cultural patterns. Słuszkiewicz even emphasizes that the culture was characterized by plain intolerance for non-Christian threads and that very culture might have contributed to shattering the material culture monuments and to erasing traces left by its own beliefs dating back to the times preceding the introduction of Christianity (cf. Słuszkiewicz 1934c: 108; Słuszkiewicz 1995: 433).

The uniqueness of Armenian literature, the statement of which emerges from Słuszkiewicz’s works, leaves us with the impression that typically literary and secular threads amounted to the decisive minority as compared to the corpus of works concentrated on expressing the affinity with Christianity and on the portrayal of the past of Armenians. That state of affairs was slightly changed with the rise of the successive literary period, that is Middle Armenian literature. The shift to the new manner of expressing reality and to discovering new methods of expressing it was closely linked with historical events. The most important ones turned out to be the conquest of Armenia by Seljuq, the result of which was that Armenians were forced to seek for refuges to inhabit. Consequently, they settled down in Cilicia, thus giving rise to Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia (Կիլիկիոյ
lasting from 1198 to 1375. At that time, Armenians encountered Western cultures, which led to breaking up with the tradition of producing art works in accordance with the pattern shapes in the 5th century. Furthermore, it led to using the language now incomprehensible for the majority of people (Sluszkiewicz 1995: 443). However, it does not mean that people ceased to use Classical Armenian, which was used by the prominent individuals and the writers of the Armenian church. First of all, Sluszkiewicz marks Nerses the 4th the Gracious (Սուրբ Ներսէս Դ. Կլայեցի (Շնորհալի), 1102-1173) as the main representative of the end-stage of the period of classical literature (cf Sluszkiewicz 1995: 443). While describing the works by Nerses the 4th, Sluszkiewicz demonstrates an interesting affirmation pertaining to the reasons for Nerses 4th small popularity in the West. In Sluszkiewicz’s opinion, the problem involved the stress on the phoneme of the last word and the recurrent rhythm of a poem; it seems to us a tedious monotony (Sluszkiewicz 1995: 443). Sluszkiewicz’s opinion can be regarded as related not only to the works by Nerses 4th, but to the entire Armenian literature, which is little known and not so popular in the West. However, the reason for the uniqueness of Armenian and the uniqueness of the rhythm of the poem is not the sole and the most serious one. We should rather take heed of the hegemonic domination of Persian, Arabic and Turkish culture, which all marginalized the significance of Armenian cultural output.

The transition from Classical Armenian to Middle Armenian can be noticed in the corpus of two writers; namely: Kirakos of Gandzak (Կիրակոս Գանձակեցի, ca. 1200 – 1271) i Sempad the Constable (Սմբատ Սպարապետ or Սմբատ Գունդստաբլ, 1208 – 1276). Whereas Kirakos partly resorted to Classical Armenian, Sempad departed from the old language and the so-far rules of subordinating the principles of social life to the Gospel. In this context, in the case of Sempad, breaking up with the past is so significant that, considering the common law, he intuitively sensed the political significance of Armenia being freed from the influence of Byzantine Empire (cf. Sluszkiewicz 1995: 446).

The culmination of the process of Armenian literature entering the new domains of secular art were the achievements by such artists as – among others – Kostandin of Erznka or Erznka’ci (Կոստանդին Երզնկացի, 1250 – ca. 1320).
the poet writing love poetry and Nahapet K’uch’ak (Նահապետ Քուչակ, approx. XVI-approx. 1592), one of the first non-anonymous folk singers (ashugh) (cf. Słuszkiewicz 1991: 35). Słuszkiewicz characterized his corpus as free from any artificiality and not overloaded with erudition or expressing the longing and love in a variety of shades. That poetry appeals to the hearts of listeners by dint of heart-warming images and surprising stanzas (Słuszkiewicz 1995: 447). The folk artist living on the turn of Middle Armenian literature the Modern Armenian literature was ashugh Sayat-Nova (Սայաթ-Նովա, approx. 1712-1795). It is worth adding that Słuszkiewicz devoted in 1963 a separate paper to the personage and the corpus by Savat-Nova: Sayat-Nova an Outstanding Armenian Folk Poet (Sajat-Nowa znakomity poeta ludowy ormiański)36.

The last stage of the development of Armenian literature, described by the Polish researcher, was dedicated to two issues. The first one was the activity of the order of Mechitarists in Italy and Austria. Addressing the issue of that order involved mainly the fact that its members were occupied with the preparation of archives containing the masterpieces of Armenian literature and it also involved the studies of the said works. Viennese order of Mechitarists proved to be exceptionally important. They, under the influence of German philological and historical schools, criticized the knowledge of the past of their own country and they attempted to free themselves of the visions derived from the early historical and literary writings (Słuszkiewicz manuscript). On the other hand, due to the archives preserved in that very order, Europe was allowed to have an insight into the life of Armenia and familiarize itself with the richness of its literary corpus (Słuszkiewicz 1995: 448). The second issue is the overview of the contemporary Armenian writers. Słuszkiewicz rightly focused mainly on the enumeration of a few writers writing in Eastern Armenian and having in their corpus reference to the Western literature, mainly German, Russian and British. Three writers deserve attention: Khachatur Abovian (Խաչատուր Աբովյան, approx 15.10.1809 – approx 14.04.1848) and his masterpiece Wounds of Armenia (Վերք Հայաստանի, 1841) and Smbat Shahaziz (Սմբատ Շահազիզ, 1840 – 05.01. 1907), the author

36 In that text we can find a telling description of the corpus by Sayat-Nova. Namely: „He was praising love, nature and a human being with their realm of feelings He had an disinterested attitude to all the people. As a thinker he was pondering over the man’s calling, he was portraying the individual endowed with the rich mentality being characterized mainly by a high degree of morality and a beautiful soul. In his metaphors, he was resorting only to what is beautiful and noble” (Słuszkiewicz 1991: 40).
of Levon's Grieg (Լևոնի վիշտը, 1865). The writers, referring to the motifs typical of Western romanticism, took up in their works the threads of hard and painful history of their country as well as the process of shaping the national identity in Armenia.

**Conclusions**

Apart from the persons and works listed in the present paper as well as the books dedicated to the tragic history of Armenia, Armenian culture is relatively little known in Poland. That difficulty results from both the uniqueness of Armenian, mastering of which may be a pre-condition to have an insight in the originality of that culture and the appreciation of its hidden beauty. It also results from the fact that exquisite Armenian writers operated in other countries and in other languages, which Poles do not consider related to Armenia. The telling example is the English-writing writer William Saroyan, the majority of works of whom is translated into Polish.

The demand for making Armenian culture more familiar seems to be vital and needed indeed. It is not only due to the fact that Armenians amounted to one thirds of the major minorities in Poland but also due to the fact that their culture is an essential ingredient of the world culture. For these reasons, recalling the figure and works of Eugeniusz Słuszkiewicz seems to be praiseworthy. He was, as we remember, one of the first Polish Armenologist who paid attention to the history of the Armenian language and literature. When compared with the Polish linguists, he stood out due to his studies going beyond the research on Armeno-Kipchak language used by the members of Armenian diaspora in Poland. It does not imply that he was not involved in the operations of the Lvovian diaspora. That is because his first publications appeared in the Lvovian magazine “The Messenger of St. Gregory”. Allegedly for the reason that the uniqueness of the magazine did not allow for an extended analyses of the issue or the complementation of the papers by bibliographies, neither did it allow for completing the studies threads by appropriate quotations from primary sources. However, they amounted to the significant contributions into the foundations of Polish Armenology, which cannot be dismissed or forgotten. It is worth stressing that the Armenian literature, apart from the papers by Słuszkiewicz, has not been properly edited in Poland. What is more, that lack is worsened by the paltry number of translations from Armenian, which familiarized the Polish reader with the exceptional and valuable literature.
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ԷՈՒԳԵՆԻՈՒՇ ՍԼՈՒՇԿԵՒԻՉԻ ՀԵՏԱԶՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ
ՀԱՅ ԳՐԱԿԱՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԵՒ ԼԵԶՎԻ ՄԱՍԻՆ
ԱՄՓՈՓՈՒՄ

Այս հոդվածի հիմնական նախորդ Էուգենիուշ Սլուշկեւիչի հայ գիտության նոր գիտական ձեռնարկության սկզբունկությունների և նոր հայ գրականության և լեզվի գիտականության երկրորդ ասպարեզների նպատակները և տեխնիկական կանխատեսությունները հայտնվեցին նաև ռուսերեն, դեկստրեն՝ հեռագրության, անփոփոխության և գրականության խմբագրման հետ միացած տեխնիկական ուսումնական և գրականության ճանաչման նպատակազան է։ Այս հոդվածը բաժանված է երկու մասի։ Առաջին մասը նվիրված է հայ լեզվի կազմակերպման և պատմության խնդիրներին և այլ լեզուներ, ինչպիսիք են հունարենը, ասորեն, փարսկերեն, թուրքերեն, հայաստանական և այլն համարման հատկությունները։ Երկրորդ մասը ներառում է դասական և ժամանակակից հայ գրականության պատմության և գործունեության մշակույթների նպատակազան և նոր զարգացում։
ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ ЭУГЕНИУША СЛУШКЕВИЧА
ОБ АРМЯНСКОЙ ЛИТЕРАТУРЕ И ЯЗЫКЕ

РЕЗЮМЕ

Основная задача этой статьи – представить работы Эугениуша Слушкевича, посвященные армянской культуре. Он был одним из крупнейших польских ученых, занимавшихся изучением языка и литературы Армении: он также переводил произведения армянских авторов, популяризировал армянскую культуру.

Для ясности исследования статья разделена на две части. Первая часть посвящена проблеме происхождения и истории армянского языка и его связи с другими языками, такими как греческий, сирийский, персидский, турецкий и проч. В частности, он считал, что сообщение Геродота, о фригийском происхождении армянского языка невозможно проверить, из-за скудости языкового материала.

Вторая часть включает историю классической и современной армянской литературы, а также историю и деятельность ордена мхитаристов по сохранению армянского наследия.