

Marek Stachowski
Jagiellonian University in Kraków

Marcin Paszkowski's Polish and Turkish dictionary (1615)

Abstract

Only Polish words from Marcin Paszkowski's "Dictionary" have been published up to now while their Turkish equivalents have never been edited although two scholars (Ananiasz Zajączkowski 1938 and Stanisław Stachowski 1989) intended to do so. In this article the reasons for this situation are discussed and explained, as well as a solution is suggested as to how the source can be useful.

Key Words

history of lexicography, dictionaries, Polish language, Ottoman Turkish language, transcription texts

Streszczenie

Z „Dictionarza” Marcina Paszkowskiego opublikowano dotąd jedynie wyrazy polskie. Nie dokonano natomiast redakcji ich tureckich odpowiedników, mimo iż dwóch badaczy (Ananiasz Zajączkowski 1938 i Stanisław Stachowski 1989) podjęło się tego zadania. Artykuł omawia i wyjaśnia powody takiej sytuacji oraz sugeruje sposób wykorzystania tego źródła.

Słowa kluczowe

historia leksykografii, słowniki, język polski, język osmańsko-turecki, teksty transkrybowane

1. Introductory remarks¹

Marcin Paszkowski (16th/17th c.; died after 1621) is the author of a work entitled *Dzieie tvreckie y vtárczki Kozáckie z Tátary* [= 'Turkish histories'² and Cos-

¹ I would like to thank John Considine (Edmonton) for commenting on a draft of this article and helpful advice as well as for help with English.

² The first word in the Polish title <dzieie>, i.e. modern <dzieje> can be translated both as 'history' and 'histories'. The plural form seems to be more appropriate in English because the work does not actually summarize the history of Turks but, instead, tells different stories connected with Turks and Tatars.

sack skirmishes with Tatars’] (Kraków 1615) whose Book Four (pp. 130–139) is a *Dictionárz Tvrecki* [= ‘Turkish dictionary’].

Very little is known about the life of Marcin Paszkowski (the biographical data are taken from Abrahamowicz 1980). He was descended from a poor family and writing books was his way of earning his living.

The “Turkish histories” is among his longest works. The work has four parts. Book One (pp. 1–70) is a rhyming history of a Polish nobleman Jakub Kimikowski who – captured by Tatars – was after some time and a failed attempt to escape sold to Turks and then to Arabs. Liberated from a galley by Christians he came back via Spain and Italy to Poland. Four lines of a Turkish poem and an Arabic alphabet are also given; however, the latter is incomplete and in a rather poor form since the author (or, maybe rather, a typesetter) tried to show Arabic characters with Latin type (see Fig. 1).

Book Two (pp. 71–102) contains sketches of Turkish ceremonies, including circumcision, and of schools as well as information about Turkish and Tatar forenames. Most naturally, numerous glosses can be found here. Book Three (pp. 103–129) contains some sentence patterns and terminological wordlists (Turkish military and aulic ranks; names of dishes and kinds of drinks). The Dictionary is an essential part of Book Four (pp. 130–139), and concludes with specimen dialogues (greetings in Turkish, Persian and Arabic (pp. 140–142), a discussion between a Turk and a Christian (pp. 141–142) and a dialogue between a lord and his attendant (pp. 142–143)) taken over (with some modifications) from Bartholomaeus Georgievits’ *De Turcarum ritu* (Antwerp 1544) or *De Turcarum moribus epitome* (Lyon 1553, 1578). The last part of the “Dictionary” is a list of numerals (pp. 143–146) whose source partially was that from *De Turcarum ritu* (it includes numbers 1–100 and 1000). The book closes with a Polish translation by Paszkowski of the Latin text of a discussion of the Christian and the Muslim religion (pp. 147–156). Here, three prayers are given in Turkish and (interlinearly) Polish: the Lord’s Prayer (pp. 153–154), the Ave Maria (p. 154) and the Apostles’ Creed (pp. 154–155).




Fig. 1. The Arabic alphabet as represented in Paszkowski’s “Dictionary”

Because only the Lord's Prayer is printed in Georgievits' *De Turcarum moribus epitome* Paszkowski will have had some other source, most probably another small book by the same Georgievits, entitled *Pro Fide Christiana cum Turca disputationis habitae et mysterio Sanctae Trinitatis in Alchorano invento, nunc primum Latinum sermonem verso, brevis descriptio* (published in 1548 in Vienna and simultaneously in Cracow). It has to be noted that the problem of interrelationship between specific Turkish transcription texts is not especially animatedly discussed in Turkology but see, e.g. Stein 1994.

The suggestion made by a Polish historian Bohdan Baranowski that Paszkowski cooperated with Samuel Otwinowski (1575–1650) who was the most esteemed Oriental interpreter in the Polish royal chancery, does not appear plausible to me. This is not, contrary to Abrahamowicz's (1980: 302) opinion, just because Paszkowski's vocabulary contains everyday words, far from the royal and administrative topics which one might have expected to interest Otwinowski. Rather, Paszkowski's numerous and sometimes truly embarrassing mistakes would not have been possible if Otwinowski had controlled his Turkish. Let us confine ourselves to only two examples of such mistakes: In his short but generally correct description of Turkish vowel harmony in the plural suffix *-lar ~ -ler* Paszkowski translates the form ⟨*lazar*⟩ *yazar* 'I write' instead of 'he writes', and ⟨*Eder*⟩ *eder* 'do! (pl.)' instead of 'he does' (p. 140). Otwinowski would doubtless have corrected these Polish pseudoequivalents. A somewhat odd mistake is found in Paszkowski's comment on Turkish vowel harmony: in the first sentence of his description he says that *-lar* and *-ler* build plural forms of *Arabic* words; then, in its medial part, that *adam* means in *Turkish* 'man' and *adamlar* 'men'; eventually, he concludes that this (i.e. the vowel harmony) is the essence of *Persian* (p. 139–140). Indeed, one cannot easily believe in Otwinowski's help. Rather, Paszkowski alone was responsible for compiling erroneous opinions he had found in earlier books, cf. Georgievits's formulation: "lingu[a] Persarum (quam nostri Turcicam appellāt)" (on the last page of his *De Turcarum ritu*).

2. Features of Paszkowski's "Dictionary"

The "Dictionary" contains 548 Turkish words,³ noted according to Middle Polish orthographic rules, and their Polish equivalents. A few pieces of information on the Middle Polish orthography, as used in this work, may be useful:

³ Besides 548 lexemes presented in the "Dictionary" proper (pp. 130–139) the work also contains a list of 226 numerals (pp. 143–146) which includes all numerals from 1 to 200, hundreds from 300 to 900 and thousands from 1000 to 100 000. In addition, quite a few other words are scattered in the narration as well as in the conversational part of the work. All in all Pasz-

- Piotr Statorius (1530–1591) introduced in his *Polonicae grammatices institutio* (Kraków 1568), a graphical distinction between two sorts of *a*, a labialised (⟨a⟩ = *â* = IPA [ɒ]) and a non-labialised one (⟨á⟩ = *a* = IPA [a]). Paszkowski uses these letters quite consistently in Polish words whose pronunciation was perfectly well known to him but rather chaotically in Turkish ones so that they certainly do not reflect any real phonological feature of 17th century Ottoman Turkish. Instead, they should be all read just *a* in Turkish.
- The letters ⟨ɔ⟩ and ⟨ɔ̣⟩ correspond to Turkish “palatal *ɫ*” (as in *-ler*) and “velar *ɫ*” (as in *-lar*), respectively. Again: their use is consistent only in Polish words. Turkish notations like ⟨altynlary⟩ ‘Polish red ducates’ (p. 139) is to be read *altınları*, rather than **altınlâri*. Polish ⟨y⟩ denotes a velar vowel, close to Turkish *ı*. Sometimes, it could be used, in Old Polish texts, to render *i* or *ı̇*, too. Paszkowski writes ⟨y⟩ for *i* ‘and’ in the title as well as in the main text of his work but in other words he seems to consistently use ⟨y⟩ for Polish *ı* and ⟨i⟩ for Polish *i*. However, in Turkish words one easily finds shocking combinations like ⟨Fychir⟩ *fikir* [= *fikir*] ‘thought’ (p. 131), ⟨Tylchi⟩ *tilki* [= *tilki*] ‘fox’ (p. 136), ⟨Kedy⟩ *kedı* [= *kedı*] ‘cat’ (p. 136), ⟨Synekleri⟩ *sineklery* [= *sineklery*] ‘flies (acc.)’ (p. 136), ⟨Dynfis⟩ *dnsis* [= *dinsiz*] ‘pagan’ (p. 138). I am going to ignore this difference in the Turkish words discussed here. On the other hand, however, the letter ⟨y⟩ might have been used to render *ü*, too (M. Stachowski 2012 *passim*) so that the form ⟨Iustyndá⟩ (see below) should possibly be read *üstünda* rather than *üstinda*. Generally, however, disharmonic vowel sequences are quite astonishing in a book containing a correct description of vowel harmony. Presumably, the author’s knowledge of Turkish pronunciation and morphophonology was merely passive.
- The letter ⟨ß⟩ stands for *ş* (= modern Turkish ⟨ş⟩). – The letter ⟨v⟩ is sometimes used for *u* in the Polish text as well as sporadically in Turkish words (for *u* or *ü*), e.g. ⟨Vruzgier⟩ *ürüzger* [= modern Turkish *rüzgâr*] ‘wind’ (p. 131) but ⟨Pekuruzgier⟩ *pek-ürüzger* ‘gale’ (p. 131), ⟨Vileiemek⟩ *üyle-yemek* [= modern Turkish *öğle yemeği*] ‘lunch’ (p. 135).
- The letters for *s* are as follows: (in word-initial position:) ⟨s⟩; (in non-initial positions:) ⟨ſ⟩ in italic words, and ⟨s⟩ in non-italic ones. In this edition ⟨s⟩ is used throughout in non-initial position in order to avoid incorrect impression that there apparently is a difference between notations with ⟨ſ⟩ and those with ⟨s⟩.

Paszkowski’s “Dictionary” is divided into 23 semantic groups,⁴ typographically presented in two, non-alphabetically arranged columns as, for instance,

kowski’s material comprises more than 800 words. Abrahamowicz (1980: 302) gives the number of about 700 words but he does not explain how he arrived at this result.

⁴ Paszkowski lists 16 groups in the Introduction which do not, however, match the list of groups in the main body of the “Dictionary”.

in the following fragment (p. 131), here with the headline translated into English and an English meaning added (the left column is Polish, the right one Turkish):

On man and the parts of his body

Człowiek	Adám	(‘man, human being’)
Duśá	Dziány	(‘soul’)
(...)		
Serce	Iuregh	(‘heart’)
Ciało	Ten	(‘body’)
(...)		
Głowá	Báśy	(‘head’)
Włofy	Sączłáry	(‘hair’)

Thus, Paszkowski's work could actually be used as both a Polish-Turkish and a Turkish-Polish dictionary. Before Paszkowski, only one short Turkish glossary was published in Poland – it was an appendix in an anonymous translation of Bartholomaeus Georgievits' (1506–1566) texts, entitled in Polish “Rozmowa z turczynem o wierze Krzesciyanśkiey...” [= ‘A conversation with a Turk about the Christian religion...’] (Kraków 1548). Thus, Paszkowski's work is the second oldest Turkish dictionary in the history of Polish lexicography. In addition, it also contains, as mentioned above, the first (and quite correct) Polish description of vowel harmony in Ottoman Turkish (p. 139).

A terminological remark is needed at this place. The term “dictionary”, as used here, actually also includes vocabularies ~ glossaries and wordlists. John Considine hit the nail on the head when he formulated three questions, crucial for researchers of history of lexicography: “First, how many words need to be brought together to constitute a wordlist? Second, is a highly specialized list, for instance of the titles of courtiers in the Ottoman Empire, still a wordlist for the purposes of a sketch like the present one? Third, do the listed forms need to be set off typographically, for instance, by printing each lexical item and its gloss in parallel columns?” (Considine 2012: 365). Question two is important in our context because the glossary in the anonymous “A conversation ...” mentioned above is in actual fact a short list of colloquial words – if it should not be ranked among dictionaries Paszkowski's work takes up the first place on the chronological list (on the understanding that a list of 548 words may be considered a dictionary). I have decided to call Paszkowski's “Dictionárz” a “Dictionary” in English because it seems to me somewhat too long to be simply called a wordlist and the term ‘vocabulary’ or ‘glossary’ would probably

suggest that it has explanations or, maybe, even definitions of words which is not the case, although, on the other hand, it is placed at the end of a printed book which is typical of glossaries ~ vocabularies rather than of dictionaries.⁵ I fear that only Considine's third question can be answered by giving an unambiguous definition while both the first and the second question will always be treated intuitively.

3. The relevance of Paszkowski's "Dictionary" for Turkish historical linguistics

It is a rather remarkable fact that this source has never been given a scholarly edition by Polish Turkologists. Ananiasz Zajączkowski intended to do so but he first published a general presentation of the work (Zajączkowski 1938) and then only included some words presented by Paszkowski in his monograph on Oriental words in Polish (Zajączkowski 1953). Why did he not find time to publish the whole text, since more than thirty years passed between his general presentation in 1938 and his death in 1970? Almost twenty years after Zajączkowski's death an edition of this source was prepared in French by Stanisław Stachowski (1989). However, this one was not eventually published either. Again, a strange situation, especially if one bears in mind that the same scholar published the Polish lexis excerpted from Paszkowski's work (S. Stachowski 1999). There is one reason for doing so, common to both A. Zajączkowski and S. Stachowski: After a closer examination of the source its importance for Turkish historical linguistics appears far smaller than originally thought.

Paszkowski's problem was that he had, as it seems, never had personal contact with Turkish-speaking informants and, thus, compiled his "Dictionary" on the basis of previous publications, with Georgievits standing in the first place. Worse still, he apparently did not understand Turkish. Let us present only three types of mistakes he made in his "Dictionary":

- [1] Misidentification of morphological forms, e.g. ⟨İuftyndá⟩ *üstında* ~ *üstün-da* [= modern *üstünde*] 'the heavens' [actually: 'on top of it'] (p. 130); ⟨Dzmaiá⟩ *cmaya* [= modern *cumaya*] 'Friday' [actually a dative-directive form: 'to Friday'] (p. 131); ⟨Ewlendiler⟩ *evlendiler* 'marriage' [actually: 'they married'] (p. 133).

⁵ One of the anonymous reviewers found the discussion of the notions "dictionary", "vocabulary" and "glossary" a bit simplistic. He might be right in metalexigraphical terms; however, I do not think this is a good place to discuss this matter more thoroughly if we do not want to lose sight of Paszkowski's dictionary.

- [2] The use of ⟨ph⟩ for *f* is unknown in Polish orthography. It clearly points to a West European source of such notations. Examples: ⟨Euph⟩ *ef* [= modern *ev*] 'house' (p. 134); ⟨Phi⟩⁶ *fil* 'elephant' (p. 136).
- [3] The word order in nominal phrases (so-called *izafe*) is Indo-European rather than Turkish (however, with an incorrect Turkish plural accusative – apparently considered by Paszkowski a plural nominative – in the position of an Indo-European genitive modifier or adjective), e.g. ⟨Gonlery Awtáákláry⟩ *gönleri aftalakları* [= *günleri haftalıkları*] 'days of the week' (p. 131). ⟨Íázyfy Alláhy⟩ *Yazısı Allahu* 'The Holy Book = The Bible' [lit. 'Writing(s) of the God'] (p. 132). Both phrases are absolutely unacceptable in Turkish. Sentences in the conversational part of the book were not always correctly understood either. Some of them clearly show that Paszkowski did not actually know their true meaning, e.g. ⟨Hánkifi fizen ew⟩ *Hankisi sizin* [!] *ev* 'I do not know in what direction it is' [actually: 'Which one is your house?'] (p. 141).

An additional but very important historical fact making Paszkowski's dictionary rather insignificant is that one of his predecessors was Hieronymus Megiser⁷ with his *Dictionarium Turcico-Latinum* published as a part of his *Institutionum linguae Turcicae libri quatuor* (Leipzig 1612).⁸ Moreover, only 65 years later, i.e. in 1680, Franciscus Meninski⁹ published his huge and excellent *Thesaurus* – an *opus magnum* of 17th century Ottoman Turkish, republished in Istanbul in 2000.

Nevertheless, the word material collected by Paszkowski can partially be used in Turkological studies. Here are some examples:

- [4] The *-(o)g-* ~ *-(o)v-* alternation.

Usually, Paszkowski writes ⟨g⟩ for *g*, as for instance in ⟨Oglu⟩ *oglu* '[his] son' (p. 133), ⟨Íágmur⟩ *yagmur* 'rain' (p. 131). Thus, the notation ⟨douru⟩ cannot possibly stand for **dogru* [= modern Turkish *doğru* 'just, fair, correct'] which would have presumably been *⟨dogru⟩. It should be, instead, read *dovru* 'justice' [actually, an adjective: 'just, fair, correct'] (p. 132). The combination of letters is parallel to that in ⟨kaugáfy⟩ *kavgası* '[his] quarrel' (p. 132) or ⟨káunláry⟩ *kavunları* '[his] melons'. We have, thus, found an attestation of a phonetic variant displaying the relatively rare *-g-* > *-v-* change.¹⁰ What is still more interesting is the lack of this phonetic vari-

⁶ The fact that Paszkowski uses ⟨b⟩ (= modern Turkish "velar l", i.e. [t̪]) in this word is another sign of his limited command of this language.

⁷ On Megiser's work and importance see now Considine (2008: 291–293).

⁸ The first presentation of this dictionary was made by Dilâçar (1970).

⁹ On Meninski's life and work see S. Stachowski (2000: XXIII–XXXIV).

¹⁰ Examples of modern literary Turkish words resulting from this change are, for instance, *öveç* 'ram, wether' < *ögeç* id. (M. Stachowski 2010: 135) and *üvey* 'step (related because a parent

ant in the great *Thesaurus* by Meninski who adduces only two variants: <dwǫrw> *dogru* and <dwǫry> *dogrı* (column 2177) and refers to the notation <twǫrw>; this one should be placed in column 3143 but is missing there. Thus, Paszkowski adduces a rare phonetic variant (*dovru*) that is absolutely realistic and constitutes a labial variant of <douri> *dovrı*, attested in “Vocabulario nuovo”, a text edited five times in Venice between 1567 and 1574 (see the edition by Adamović 1976), although it cannot be found in Meninski’s great standard dictionary. – Cf. the examples in [5].

[5] The $g > \gamma \sim h$ change.

The spirantization of $g (> \gamma \sim h)$ can be found in different environments except word-initially, which seems to be the only position in which g always remains unchanged. In word-medial position the consonant g remains as such or is changed into some other consonant: $> -v-$ as in [4] above, or $> -h-$ as in <Bohdái> *bohday* [= modern *buğday*] ‘wheat’ (p. 136). In the latter case the change of $g > h$ is an evolutionary stage in the lenition process $g > \gamma > h > \emptyset$. The same phenomenon can be observed in intervocalic position <Sohan> *sohan* [= modern *soğan*] ‘onion’ (p. 135), and in word-final position: <Bágh> *bay* ‘orchard’ (p. 135), <Inekiách> *inek yah* [= modern **inek yağ(ı)*] ‘butter’ (p. 135).

[6] The $a \sim i$ alternation.

This is another important phenomenon attested in these materials. Interestingly enough, only $a < i$ forms could be found in these materials but no $i < a$ forms. Examples: <Awtáákláry> *aftalakları* [pro: *haftalıkları*] ‘weeks’ [actually: ‘weekly things’] (p. 131); <Iaramgiedzie> *yaramgece* [pro: *yarımgece*] ‘midnight’ (p. 131); <Sárámfák> *saramsak* [pro: *sarımsak*] ‘garlic’ (p. 135).

[7] Palatal consonants.

Palatal pronunciation of k and g in adjacency of front (and functionally front) vowels ($e, i, â$) is seldom marked here although it is regularly observed in Turkish, but cf. <Giedzy> *g^ʷeci* [= modern <gece>, pronounced *g^ʷece*] ‘night’ (p. 131); <Giaur> *gâvur* ‘Christian’ (p. 138); <Kiedzy> *k^ʷeci* [= modern <keçi>, pronounced *k^ʷeçi*] ‘goat’ (p. 137); <Kieskin> *k^ʷeskin* ‘weapon’ [= modern <keskin>, pronounced *k^ʷeskin* ‘sharp’] (p. 139). Besides, some words with palatal m and n are attested here although no such consonants are known in Turkish. The examples are: <Mieleklár> *m^ʷeleklar* [= modern *melekler*] ‘archangel’ [actually ‘angels’] (p. 130); <Gunieß> *gün^ʷeş* [= modern *güneş*] ‘sun’ (p. 130); <Ekmiék> *ekm^ʷek* [= modern *ekmek*] ‘bread’ (p. 135); <Iniek> *in^ʷek* [= modern *inek*] ‘cow’ (p. 137). However, the palatalization

has remarried) < **ögey* (? < Proto-Turkic **ög* ‘mother’), cf. Filippo Argenti (1533): <vghié> *üge* (or *öge* ?) [pro: *ügey*] ‘step’; (Rocchi 2007: 190) [referring to Giovanni Molino (1641): <oighie> *öge* id.]; Adamović (2009: 252).

is not consistent, compare ⟨Ekmiek⟩ above with ⟨Vileiemek⟩ in section 2 above, as well as ⟨Iniek⟩ above with ⟨Inekiách⟩ in [5]. A special case is ⟨Bibier⟩ *bib'er* [= modern *biber*] 'pepper' (p. 135) with its unexpectedly palatalized *ǃ*.

[8] The plural suffix *-lar* ~ *-ler*.

Meninski (1680) recommends using the plural suffix always in one vocalic form only, namely, with the palatal vowel *-e-*. Such forms can likewise be found in some other sources from the first half of the 17th century, e.g. Pietro Ferraguto (1611)¹¹: *agaçler* 'trees' (Rocchi 2012: 31); Arcangelo Carradori (1650)¹²: *kuşler* 'birds' (Rocchi 2011a: 25). The same rule can be observed in some areas even hundred years later as is the case with Father Desiré's 1768 texts in the dialect of Diyarbakır (Majda 2013: 175). Paszkowski's examples do not prove this rule. Here, one finds both palatal-velar and velar-palatal combinations, e.g. ⟨Jemişlar⟩ *yemişlar* [= modern *yemişler*] 'fruit' [actually: 'fruits'] (p. 136); ⟨Kietenlary⟩ *k'etenlari* [= modern *ketenleri*] 'hemp' [actually: 'acc.pl.'] (p. 136); ⟨Kruşlery⟩ *kruşleri* [= modern *kuruşlari*] 'thalers' [actually: 'acc. pl.'] (p. 139); ⟨odunlery⟩ *odunleri* [= modern *odunlari*] 'firewood, logs' [actually: 'acc. pl.'] (p. 136). The situation in Paszkowski's work is not very different from some other sources, cf. for instance an anonymous handwritten "notebook" of 1611 (exactly like Pietro Ferraguto's dictionary, see above) with its forms like *adamlari* 'men' [acc. pl.] (Majda 1985: 166), *yoldaşlar* '(travelling) companions, fellows' (ibid. 236); *ederler* 'they do' (ibid. 188). Probably, the palatal variant *-ler* was original and preserved its status of a correct form in the literary Turkish whereas *-lar* was, in the beginning of the 17th century, a variant popular in colloquial speech but still not really accepted by cultivated persons.

4. Concluding remarks

One is tempted to ask whether more or less unexpected and strange words and/or phonetic variants should actually be taken seriously in view of Paszkowski's poor command of Turkish. In my opinion, this shortcoming is to some extent an advantage of his. It was exactly because of his limited knowledge of Turkish that Paszkowski was not in a position to consciously change or "improve" Turkish words for worse. He could not, for instance, intentionally avoid Anatolian dialectal pronunciation by artificially substituting Istanbul variants for Anatolian ones. Thus, cautious use of his materials can be of some importance to Turkish linguistic historians.

¹¹ For Ferraguto's life and work see Rocchi (2011b: 213).

¹² For Carradori's life and work see Rocchi (2011b: 214).

A complete edition of Paszkowski's "Dictionary" does not seem very important or especially interesting for Turkish linguistics. Rather, the word material adduced both in the "Dictionary" and the narrative parts of his "Turkish histories" should be selected by a specialist in Turkish linguistic history and published with his historical and comparative comments (the latter should have a dialectological element, but should also identify Paszkowski's printed sources wherever possible, and likewise identify forms for which there seems to be no printed source) so that rare, important or otherwise unknown words and phonetic variants do not escape our attention in the future.

References

- ABRAHAMOWICZ Zygmunt (1980). Paszkowski Marcin. In *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, Vol. 25(1), fasc. 104, 301–302. Wrocław: Polska Akademia Nauk.
- ADAMOVIĆ Milan (1976). *Vocabulario nuovo* mit seinem türkischen Teil. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 38, 43–70.
- ADAMOVIĆ Milan (2009). *Floransalı Filippo Argenti'nin notlarına göre (1533) 16. yüzyıl Türkçesi*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- CONSIDINE John (2012). Wordlists of exotic languages in seventeenth-century England. In *Ashgate critical essays on early English lexicographers*. Vol. 1: *The seventeenth century*. CONSIDINE John et al. (ed.), 365–375. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing.
- DİLÂÇAR Agop (1970). 1612'de Avrupada yayımlanan ilk Türkçe gramerinin özellikleri. *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yılığ*. *Belleten* 1970, 197–210.
- MAJDA Tadeusz (1985). *Rozwój języka tureckiego w XVII wieku (rękopis z 1611 r., ze zbiorów Biblioteki Uniwersyteckiej we Wrocławiu, sygn. M. 1529)*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- MAJDA Tadeusz (2013). *Turkish religious texts in Latin script from 18th century South-Eastern Anatolia. Transcriptions, translations, and a study of the language*. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag.
- ROCCHI Luciano (2007). *Ricerche sulla lingua osmanlı del XVI secolo. Il corpus lessicale turco del manoscritto fiorentino di Filippo Argenti (1533)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- ROCCHI Luciano (2011a). *Il dizionario turco-ottomano di Arcangelo Carradori (1650)*. Trieste: Edizione Università di Trieste.
- ROCCHI Luciano (2011b). Turkish historical lexicography. *Lexicographica* 27, 203–220.
- ROCCHI Luciano (2012). *Il "Dittionario della Lingua Turchesca" di Pietro Ferraguto (1611)*. Trieste: Edizione Università di Trieste.
- STACHOWSKI Marek (2010). Ist das slawische Schaf (**ovъca*, **ovъcb*) bis nach Transkaukasien (*hōgač*) und Anatolien (*öveč*, *ögeč*) gewandert? *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 15, 127–136.
- STACHOWSKI Marek (2012). Remarks on the phonetic value of the letters ⟨y⟩ and ⟨ü⟩ in Franciscus Meninski's Ottoman Turkish *Thesaurus* (1680). *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis* 129, 189–197.

- STACHOWSKI Stanisław (1989). *Le dictionnaire turc de Marcin Paszkowski (1615)*. Kraków [unpublished].
- STACHOWSKI Stanisław (1999). Słownictwo polskie w *Dykcjonarzu tureckim Marcina Paszkowskiego (1615)*. In *Collectanea Linguistica in honorem Casimiri Polański*. BRZEZINOWA Maria, KUREK Halina (eds.), 243–253. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- STACHOWSKI Stanisław (2000). François à Mesgnien Meninski und sein *Thesaurus Linguarum Orientalium*. In MENINSKI À MESGNIEN Franciscus. *Thesaurus Linguarum Orientalium Turcicae Arabicae Persicae*. vol. 1: *Lexicon Turcico-Arabico-Persicum* (Viennae 1680). ÖLMEZ Mehmet, STACHOWSKI Stanisław (eds.), XXIII–XXXIV. Istanbul: Simurg.
- STEIN Heidi (1994). Zur Frage der gegenseitigen Abhängigkeit türkischer Transkriptionstexte. In *XXV. Deutscher Orientalistentag. Vorträge (München 8.–13.4.1991)*. WUNSCH Cornelia (ed.), 203–214. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- ZAJĄCZKOWSKI Ananiasz (1938). Pierwsza próba opracowania języka tureckiego w literaturze staropolskiej. *Sprawozdania Towarzystwa Naukowego Warszawskiego (Wydział I)* 31, 51–66.
- ZAJĄCZKOWSKI Ananiasz (1953). *Studia orientalistyczne z dziejów słownictwa polskiego*. Wrocław: Wrocławskie Towarzystwo Naukowe.

