MIROSŁAWA PODHAJECKA
University of Opole
mira.podhajecka@wp.pl

RESEARCHING THE BEGINNINGS OF BILINGUAL POLISH-ENGLISH / ENGLISH-POLISH LEXICOGRAPHY: POLYGLOT DICTIONARIES (PART 1)*

Abstract

This paper aims to provide a survey of the early polyglot dictionaries which paired Polish with English, based on the premise that the polyglots can be considered as predecessors of bilingual dictionaries proper. Following this rationale, the authoress examines chronologically the first three of the multilingual endeavours: Ambrogio Calepino's *Dictionarium undecim linguarum …* (1590), Hieronymus Megiser's *Thesaurus polyglottus: vel, dictionarium multilingue …* (1603), and Georg Henisch's *Teütsche Sprach und Weissheit. Thesaurus linguae and sapientiae Germanicae …* (1616). The focus is primarily on the linguistic material of the polyglots, but the assumed aims and readership are also tackled briefly. As bilingual wordbooks have traditionally catered to the needs of users of one or both of the respective languages, the polyglot dictionaries are additionally looked at from the perspective of Polish-English language contact in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries.

1. Introduction

The history of bilingual dictionaries comprising Polish and English as either source or target languages goes back to 1788, when the first Polish-English vocabulary

---

appeared as part of Julian Antonowicz's *Grammatyka dla Polaków* …,[1] but the very beginnings of Polish-English / English-Polish lexicography can be dated as early as the sixteenth century. More exactly, Ambrogio Calepino's *Dictionarium decem linguarum* … (1585) paired Latin headwords with nine European languages, including Polish and English, and the ensuing edition, *Dictionarium undecim linguarum* … (1590),[2] covered as many as eleven tongues. In the course of time, four further polyglot dictionaries were published that recorded Polish and English wordlists side by side.[3]

The present paper, which complements a larger project in the history of Polish-English / English-Polish lexicography (1788–1945), aims to describe the early beginnings of this bilingual lexicographic tradition. In an attempt to contribute to what has unexpectedly grown into a vast, though largely untapped, research area (see Podhajecka 2013 for an introduction), I will examine the first three polyglot dictionaries that admitted Polish and English wordlists, discussing at some length their structure and contents. Whenever possible, the envisaged purposes and target users will also be commented upon. In this way, the paper offers some insight into the three Renaissance polyglots which, as has been assumed, can be treated successfully as historical predecessors of bilingual Polish-English / English-Polish dictionaries.

2. Polyglots with Polish and English wordlists

Up to the close of the eighteenth century, the dictionaries which paired Polish and English wordlists were few and far between: Piotrowski (2001: 183–184) speaks of four polyglots and Gruszczyński (2011: 66) adds another one to close the list. All of them have been investigated, in some cases extensively, in the literature (see e.g. Kaltz 1985; Adelung 1815; Stachowski 1969; Zwoliński 1981; Stein 1985a, b; Wendland 1992; Prędota 1996; Mańczak-Wohlfeld 2001; Prędota, Woronczak 2002; Ostromęcka-Frączak 2005). Still, as none of the researchers thus far has focused specifically on

---

[1] After Stein (1985a: 33), I differentiate between "glossary" (i.e. an alphabetical wordlist) and "vocabulary" (i.e. a topical wordlist); by recording words and phrases organized into thematic areas, Antonowicz's bilingual wordlist is a vocabulary. It is worth mentioning that Antonowicz (ca. 1750–1824), a member of the Basilian order, was a teacher of foreign languages and physics at the Basilians' school at Włodzimierz Wołyński (Cieśla 1974: 122–126; Mrozowska 1981: 65, 147).

[2] Based on Claes' (1974) bibliography, Stein (1989a: 79–80) notes an edition of Calepino's *Dictionarium undecim linguarum* … published presumably in 1580, whose only extant copy is claimed to be held at the Public Library of Belfort (cf. *Catalogue de la Bibliotèque Municipale* …, 1887: 114). However, upon closer scrutiny, it turned out that the dictionary is a copy of the 1627 edition. I am very grateful to Mr. Jean-Marc Laithier, the director of the library, for his support in clarifying the identity of the dictionary.

[3] It may be interesting to note that the early histories of Polish-German / German-Polish or Polish-Italian / Italian-Polish lexicographic traditions respectively have been represented more abundantly (see e.g. Frączek 1999; Sosnowski 2006; Budziak 2012).

the contrastive Polish-English material the dictionaries embraced, this paper is a modest attempt to fill the gap.

The polyglot dictionaries, followed by the dates of subsequent editions, have been listed chronologically below. For the sake of contemporary readers, the Latinate proper names have been additionally recreated in a modernized form.

1. Calepinus, Ambrosius [Calepino, Ambrogio][4] 1585. *Dictionarium decem linguarum* … Lugduni [Lyon]. (five Lyon editions of 1586, 1587, 1588, 1594 [Geneva], 1598)
2. Calepinus, Ambrosius [Calepino, Ambrogio] 1590. *Dictionarium undecim linguarum* … Basileae [Basel]: [Sebastian Henricpetri]. (four Basel editions of 1598, 1605, 1616, 1627)
3. Megiserus, Hieronymus [Megiser] 1603. *Thesaurus polyglottus: vel, dictionarium multilingue* … Francofurti ad Moenum [Frankfurt am Main]: Sumptibus Authoris. (the second edition of 1613)
4. Henisch, Georg 1616. *Teütsche Sprach und Weissheit. Thesaurus linguae and sapientiae Germanicae* … Augustae Vindelicorum [Augsburg]: Davidis Franci.
5. Warmer, Christophorus [Christoph] 1691. *Gazophylacium decem linguarum Europaearum* … Cassoviae [Košice]: J. Klein.
6. Pallas, Peter Simon 1786/7–1789. *Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa… / Sravnitel'nye slovari vsex" jazykov" i narečij…* [vols. 1–2]. Petropoli [St. Petersburg]: Iohannis Caroli Schnoor. (the second enlarged edition of 1790–1791 by Jankiewitsch de Miriewo; the first edition reissued in 1977–1978, Hamburg).

In the following section, I will provide a brief outline of Polish-English language contact throughout the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, before going on to look more closely at the first three polyglot dictionaries. It should be explained that, of the two Calepino's versions displayed above, only one is subject to analysis, inasmuch as the Polish and English wordlists in all the ten- and eleven-language editions are the same.[5]

3. Polish-English language contact (16th–18th centuries)

It goes without saying that bilingual resources are created to serve the needs of speakers of one or both of the languages involved. It is therefore important to ask whether the Polish-English wordlists of the polyglot dictionaries were aimed at Poles interested in learning English or, by contrast, the English wishing to learn Polish. Judging by the contemporary preponderance of the English language in Poland, one would be tempted to think that Poles were the envisaged target audience, but English as a foreign language was not popular in Poland in the past, nor was

---

[4]   In English sources, one can also find references to Calepin (e.g. Chalmers 1813: 65) and Calepine (e.g. Hayashi 1978: 15–19).
[5]   There are, however, tiny differences in spelling and punctuation which change from edition to edition (for a comparative sample, see Podhajecka forthcoming a).

Britain a regular destination place. Despite the fact that European peregrinations, from the mid-eighteenth century onwards called Grand Tour,[6] were traditionally undertaken by members of Polish nobility, relatively few Poles studied at English universities or travelled across the island of Britain to gain some practical knowledge of the country, its culture, and language (see e.g. Dąbrowski 1962; Barycz 1969).

Contrary to expectations, the traffic between Poland and Britain was quite substantial and, even more astonishingly, it was mostly one way: from Britain to Poland. This results from the fact that the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries witnessed extensive immigration of English, Scottish, and, to a lesser extent, Irish people who decided to settle on Polish soil. Among them, as Krawczyk (2002: 254) points out, were "merchants and artisans, soldiers, religious and political emigrants, professors of academies, of Jesuit colleges and of Protestant schools, students and pupils of various schools, diplomats and travellers, as well as poets and itinerant actors". Even though reasons for the influx of British immigrants must have been multifarious, many – both Protestants and Catholics – left their native land plagued by religious wars for fear of persecution, whereas others arrived in the hope of improving their economic situation and social status.[7] The existing of family links and assistance offered by the settled immigrants were often sufficient incentives; needless to say, once the migration route was established, other immigrants followed.

The British newcomers contributed to the culturally diverse Polish society which comprised Germans, Ruthenians, Lithuanians, Jews, Balts, Armenians, Tatars, and several other ethnic communities to whom Poland became a land of opportunities (Bajer 2012: 65). In fact, it should not be surprising, inasmuch as the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the sixteenth century was one of the largest and most powerful kingdoms of Europe, experiencing a period of growth and prosperity. As the social structure was composed mainly of nobility and peasantry, the lack of middle class in it meant that the immigrants could profitably engage in commerce, craft, or warfare.[8] Moreover, religious tolerance,[9] as well as the right to trade freely, purchase land, hold offices, and acquire burgher status made their life conditions relatively favourable (Bajer 2012: 74–75).[10]

---

[6]   As Pinnavaia (2013: 128) puts it, "the Grand Tour was considered a very important educational experience, especially for the younger members of ranking society. Young people could acquire the skills of observation and analysis on such travels, building up the intrepidity and initiative essential for a successful future career.".

[7]   According to Bajer (2012: 341), other factors were also decisive, including unkind climate, shortage of fertile land, strict rules of inheritance, and restrictions on who might achieve the status of a burgher or join a guild.

[8]   As observed by Bajer (2012: 64), in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, participation in trade was seen as degrading for noblemen, so members of the upper classes were prohibited from trade under penalty of losing their status. This made the commercial sector underdeveloped compared to other countries.

[9]   In January 1573, a committee of the Polish Sejm drew up the "Confederation of Warsaw" – a landmark in the history of Poland – which guaranteed religious liberty to all inhabitants, including members of the most radical sects (Rosenthal 1966: 77–78).

[10] Despite this, due to their activity and ubiquity, the British often faced resentment and even open hostility from the host community.

What do we know, then, about the communication between the British settlers and Polish speakers? Despite a vast number of both historical records and academic works describing British experiences in Poland,[11] the purely linguistic aspect of the cultural contact has not been elaborated on. Nevertheless, three facts can be established more or less reliably. Firstly, a predominant majority of the immigrants did not have any working knowledge of Polish, but spoke some other languages, notably Latin. Daniel Defoe reported, in the early eighteenth century, that "A man, who can speak Latin, may travel from one end of Poland to another as familiarly as if he was born in the country" (cited in Bajer 2012: 67). German was also resorted to, because even uneducated Poles often had some grasp of it, and Polish-German bilingualism was not, in fact, uncommon. Secondly, the inevitable language barrier was overcome by writing down "some words necessary for askeing the way, victuals, and such like" (Gordon 1859: 8). It is evident that English-Polish wordlists must have been most effective in this respect, but Latin-Polish or German-Polish glossaries and phrase-books could also do the job.[12] Thirdly, inventiveness and serendipity came into play. Patrick Gordon, for instance, noted in his diary that he had often travelled in the company of other people, some of whom had acted as interpreters (Gordon 1859: 9–11).[13]

One would anticipate that, for one reason or another, the British immigrants went to great lengths to communicate with the inhabitants of their new homeland. Even though many of them lived in close-knit (and, for the most part, self-contained) ethnic communities organized into guild-like associations called brotherhoods, which represented and protected their commercial interests, at least some of the newcomers were eventually integrated into the Polish society. The so-called Green Book of the Scottish Brotherhood at Lublin illustrates three distinct stages in the history of the brotherhood: the first part of the book is written in English, in the middle one English and Polish are used side by side, whereas the last part is in Polish only (cf. Benedyktowicz 1959: 128).[14] The book is tangible evidence which indicates that, despite efforts taken by the Scots to maintain their national identity and language, assimilation was inevitable in the long run.[15]

Looking back at the remote past provokes a number of pertinent questions which are difficult, not to say impossible, to answer. To what extent did the British and

---

[11] For the literature in English, see e.g. Steuart (1915), Biegańska (2001), Krawczyk (2002), Bajer (2010), Worthington (2012).

[12] Manuscript English-Polish wordlists might have been compiled for private use, but they never appeared in print. On the other hand, self-study handbooks with Latin and/or German circulated widely; *Wokabularz rozmaitych i potrzebnych sentencji, polskim i niemieckim młodzieńcom na pożytek teraz zebrany …* (1580), with many later imprints, can serve as a good example.

[13] Patrick Gordon (1635–1699), a Scottish soldier of fortune in the Swedish, Polish, and Russian armies, was later to become a general and friend to Tsar Peter the Great. For an outline of Gordon's diary in Polish, see Krawczyk (2010).

[14] Beatrice Baskerville (cited in Steuart 1915: 109) provides inaccurate information that the mid-part of the Green Book was written in English and German. In doing so, she asks an intriguing (though largely rhetorical) question: "Did the 'Scottish Gentlemen' forget English, or did they write in Polish just because many Poles and Germans had joined them?".

[15] My sincere thanks go to Professor Antoni Krawczyk for his helpful remarks in this respect (email of 20 March 2013).

Polish speakers engage in communication? How did they acquire and transmit information? How did they solve linguistic problems? Did they seek the assistance of dictionaries in doing so? The last question, in particular, appears essential for this lexicographic study. Regrettably, as factors underlying dictionary use (see e.g. Hartmann 2001: 80–83) are of little relevance for research carried out from the historical perspective, one can only speculate about the linguistic nature of British-Polish encounters and any use of dictionaries they might have involved.

In what follows, I will examine the first three of the polyglot dictionaries which paired Polish and English wordlists, trying to establish whether or not they could have been used to facilitate direct communication.

4. Examination of the polyglot dictionaries

4.1. Ambrogio Calepino's *Dictionarium undecim linguarum* … (1590)

Hardly in need of an introduction is the first polyglot dictionary in my list, Calepino's *Dictionarium undecim linguarum* … (1590).[16] It is one in a long line of dictionaries whose appearance was closely related to the Renaissance revival of the literature of ancient Greece and Rome. The most representative language of the antiquity was classical Latin, which in due course became the official Renaissance language of education and scholarship. Therefore, like many other educational resources of the day, Calepino's dictionary, often referred to briefly as Calepino, addressed people aspiring to enter the world of Latin learning, because "the learned man could not be better distinguished from the unlearned than by his ability to speak Latin" (Watson 1908: 5).

In contrast to a number of dictionaries available in sixteenth-century Europe, Calepino offered an exceptionally rich repertoire of the Latin vocabulary. Its scholarly focus was reflected, on the one hand, in a careful selection of learned words and, on the other one, in their more thorough and methodical lexicographic treatment (Stein 1989b: 93).[17] It should not be surprising that, with such unique features, Calepino became one of the most frequently printed dictionaries; between 1502 and 1779, as many as 211 editions appeared all over Europe.[18] This is all the more impressive that, as Hanks (2013: 512) notes, the end of the Renaissance marked a slow decline of Latin as a *lingua franca* and a growth of interest in national vernaculars.

---

[16] The original title reads as follows: *Ambrosii Calepini Dictionarivm vndecim lingvarvm, iam postremo: accurata emendiatione, at que infinitorum locorum augmentatione, collectis ex bonorvm avtorum monumentis, certis & expressis syllabarum quantitatis notis, omniumque; vocum significationibus, flosculis, loquendi formis, proverbialibus sententiis, caeterisque; ad Latini sermonis proprietatem, elegantiam, & copiam pertinentibus rebus, quanta máxima fide ac diligentia fieri potuit, ita exornatum, ut non prodierit. Respondent autem Latinis vocabulis, Hebraica, Graeca, Gallica, Italica, Germanica, Belgica, Hispanica, Polonica, Ungarica, Anglica. Onomasticum, verò: hoc est, Propriorvm nominvm, regionvm, gentivm* … Basileae.

[17] Only Hadrianus Junius' *Nomenclator omnium rerum propria nomina* … (1567) matched Calepino's status as an erudite undertaking (Hüllen 1999: 353–360).

[18] The list of the 211 editions of Calepino has been traced by Labarre (1975).

All Calepino's editions have been ultimately based on a monolingual Latin dictionary with occasional Greek glosses compiled by Ambrogio Calepino (c. 1440–1510), an Augustinian friar, and published in 1502 at Reggio (Italy). After Calepino's death, the dictionary became public property, available to all to republish. Unsurprisingly, having been revised, corrected and significantly expanded, it was later reissued by different publishers. At the same time, it lost its monolingual status, inasmuch as foreign vernaculars were added to it: Greek, German, Flemish, and French were introduced in 1545; Italian in 1545–6; Spanish in 1559; Hebrew in 1570; Polish, Hungarian, and English in 1585; whereas Portuguese and Japanese in 1595.[19] The inclusion of up to ten vernacular wordlists made the dictionary attractive to a broad international audience; suffice it to say that, despite its hefty price, it apparently sold well.

As already emphasised, the first Calepino which paired Polish and English equivalents was the ten-language edition, *Dictionarium decem linguarum …*, published in 1585 in Lyon. It was followed by the subsequent editions of 1586, 1587, 1588, 1598 (Lyon), as well as 1594 (Geneva).[20] The enlarged eleven-language edition, *Dictionarium undecim linguarum…*, came out in 1590 in Basel under the editorship of Sebastian Henricpetri. Its sister editions, which appeared at the same publishing house, were launched onto the market in 1598, 1605, 1616, and 1627. The main difference between the ten- and eleven-language editions is that, in addition to Latin, Hebrew, Greek, French, Italian, German, Spanish, Polish, Hungarian, and English, the latter included Flemish (Dutch) called "Belgica". Interestingly, the dictionaries were usually published as single or double volumes, but some appeared as a set of three volumes.

It is the original edition of Basel, *Dictionarium undecim linguarum …* (1590), which is under analysis here. With nearly 2,000 pages, printed on handsome hand-made paper, the single-volume dictionary is a truly *magnus opus*. In technical terms, it is an octavo edition, in practice being of the folio size (23 cm × 35 cm). The front matter consists of a preface in Latin, whereas the back matter comprises Conrad Gesner's *Onomasticon propriorum nominum primum …*, a collection of proper names in 316 pages. The dictionary's macrostructure encompasses around 30,000 Latin lemmas in 1,655 pages. Placed in two columns on each page, they are arranged alphabetically, but the alphabetization has been restricted to the first three letters of the alphabet. This type of ordering means that a particular lemma had to be looked for in various parts of the letter section (cf. *adjungo, adjunctio, adjunctor*; *frigus, frigeo, frigesco, frigefacio*; *mitis, mitesco, mitigo, mitigatio*; *seco, sectus, secamentum*; *zea, zelus, zelotypia, zelotypus*, etc.), so it should be referred to more properly as semi-alphabetical. All the

---

[19]   The last edition, a trilingual Latin-Portuguese-Japanese dictionary, was printed in Japan by the Jesuit mission press. It was aimed at Japanese students studying at Jesuit colleges, which were established in order to train a local clergy or, more generally, in order for Christianity to take root in Japan (for a more detailed account, see e.g. Kishimoto 2005).

[20]   That *Dictionarium undecim linguarum …* appeared for the first time in 1574, as claimed by Stankiewicz (1984: 47), has not been supported by evidence. It should be noted that Stankiewicz took that information from Estreicher's bibliographic entry, which, in turn, had been based on the Lwów catalogue compiled by Kajetan Jabłoński (cf. Estreicher 1896: 16).

lemmas are given an upper-case initial; this would become a common lexicographic practice up to the early twentieth century.

Speaking of the microstructure, the dictionary entry starts with the Latin lemma, followed by some grammatical information and a definition (or, alternatively, a string of synonyms) in Latin. The next elements are foreign equivalents included in square brackets, of which the last three are Polish, Hungarian, and English.[21] The first word in the foreign glosses is always capitalized, but the vernaculars are abbreviated fairly inconsistently: *Pol.*, *Polo.*, *Polon.*, and *Polonice* indicate glosses of Polish origin, whereas *An.*, *Ang.*, and *Angl.* stand for English.[22] The glosses are the only component of the entry printed in italics, which must have made them easy to look up. What follows are extracts from classical literature, particularly the works of renowned authors, which illustrate the meanings and usage of the Latin lemma. The sample entry below, for example, records citations from Virgil's *Aeneid* and Cicero's *De natura deorum*.

Figure 1. A sample entry from Calepino's 1590 edition (see p. 90 for the source)

In all Calepino's multilingual editions Latin was invariably the source language.[23] With such a unidirectional design, the vernacular equivalents could only be accessed via the Latin headwords, so their use was confined to receptive tasks only. In other words, the equivalents enabled the users to translate Latin texts into their native tongues, but not the other way round. A productive use would have required a vernacular-Latin macrostructure or at least an index of the vernacular equivalents.

---

[21] In Renaissance polyglots, as argued by Hüllen (1999: 109), the order of the vernaculars admitted was implicitly suggestive of their significance: the most prominent tongue always came first (or was arranged leftmost), whereas the least significant one came last (or was arranged rightmost). Seen from this angle, Polish, Hungarian, and English were Calepino's least prestigious languages.

[22] Occasionally, the foreign gloss is not given any label, and wrongly marked equivalents can also be found (e.g. the English gloss for *chiromantia* is labelled Vng., i.e. Hungarian).

[23] The terms "source language" and "target language" are not fully suitable for research on polyglot dictionaries, because the vernaculars arranged in parallel columns could often serve both as source and target languages. However, as the Latin lemma in Calepino is followed by foreign items ordered linearly, Latin can be safely treated as the source language, whereas the foreign equivalents all share the status of target languages.

    With regard to lexicographic conventions, the most conspicuous difference be-
tween the Polish and English wordlists concerns verbs. More exactly, while the Polish
canonical verb form is recorded in the first person singular (e.g. *abedo* 'wijadam,
ziadam'), which is clearly a legacy of Latin lexicography, English verbs are provided
in the infinitive (e.g. *abedo* 'to eat up all'). Since Latin lemmas take the first person
singular form, it is puzzling why some of them (e.g. *badizare, deruncinare,* or *sebare*)
have been entered in the infinitive. Interestingly, in such cases, the Polish verbs
are likewise recorded in the infinitive (*badizare* 'poskakuiac biezec', *deruncinare*
'rozsziekac, rozetrzec', *sebare* 'loiem ocziegacz').

    What is worth mentioning at this juncture is that a proportion of the Polish and
English lexical items are single-word equivalents, but syntactic structures (i.e. phrases
and clauses) are equally numerous. For reasons of consistency, throughout this pa-
per all items representing the Polish and English wordlists, regardless of the type
of internal structure they exhibit, have been called interchangeably equivalents or
glosses. Upon closer examination, Calepino's glosses turned out to be less innova-
tive than might be expected, but, due to a high level of complexity in tracing their
lineage, this aspect requires further research. Preliminary findings on the origin of
the Polish and English wordlists can be found in Podhajecka (forthcoming a).

    Both wordlists include some idiosyncratic word-forms such as Pol. *ieczinie-
niem* (for *jęczmieniem*), *oiczouiski* (for *ojcowski*), *othwarti* (for *otwarty*), *zburzeme*
(for *zburzenie*); or Eng. *ani ting* (for *anything*), *gaveth* (for *gave*), *hartles* (for *heartless*),
o noynted (for *anointed*), etc. The basic question is whether they can be accounted for
by the unsettled state of Middle Polish and Early Modern English orthography respec-
tively, or whether one should treat them as typographical errors. In fact, both cases
need to be taken into account. On the one hand, some of the spelling variants are
indeed represented in historical materials, as demonstrated by LEME or the OED
for English,[24] and *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku* (1966–) for Polish.[25] On the other
hand, many word-forms are clearly wrong; the best educated guess is that the errors
derive from the printers' partly illegible manuscripts or messy copies.

    Speaking about Calepino's Polish wordlist, of the entire inventory of Middle
Polish diacritics, only *ł* is claimed to have been introduced into print (Oesterrei-
cher 1927: 469). As no suitable character must have been available at the printing
offices of Lyon, Geneva, and Basel, a single prime came to substitute the diacritic,
e.g. *chal'upinka* (Lat. *gurgustium*)*, dol'uman* (Lat. *chimastrum*), *l'aznia* (Lat. *baline-
um / balneum*), or *miel'y* (Lat. *charopus*). Apart from that, the so-called light *á* has
been occasionally marked, as in *náczinie* (Lat. *guttulus*) or *máiáca* (Lat. *zea*), and one

---

[24] LEME is an historical database of monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual lexical and lexico-
graphical resources for English (ca. 1400–1702) edited by Ian Lancashire, a Toronto-based spe-
cialist in Renaissance literature and lexicography. The OED, now in its third edition published
under the editorship of John Simpson (from 1 November 2013, Michael Proffitt), has been the
most exhaustive historical dictionary of English, covering lexical material from the Anglo-
Saxon times to the present day.

[25] *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku* (1966–), an impressive 35-volume period dictionary of Polish,
has been richly documented with citations from sixteenth-century printed and manuscript
sources.

will also find traces of other Polish diacritics such as *ą*, as in *dáb* (Lat. *quercus*), *kákol* (Lat. *zizania*), or *tisziácem* (Lat. *chiliarchus*), or *ć*, as in *biezec`* (Lat. *badizare*), *niewstidliwosc`* (Lat. *inverecundia*), or *tl'ustosc`* (Lat. *vnctum*). On the whole, how-ever, the use of the diacritics is inconsistent and, unsurprisingly, erroneous at times, e.g. *báwel'na'* (Lat. *xylinum*), *gl'anc* (Lat. *emico*), *l'snienie* (Lat. *nitens / nitor*), *naiezams'ie* (Lat. *horreo*), or *strasl'iwie* (Lat. *horrisonus*). A sample of Calepino's Polish and English glosses has been displayed in Table 1:

Latin headword	Polish gloss	English gloss
Adjutor	*Pomocznik*	*A helper*
Balbutio	*Zaiakam szie, zaczinam sie wmowie, begloce*	*To fafle, stummer or stutter in speaking*
Chelys	*Lutnia, szlymak, zabiarka*	*A torteis or snake, a lute*
Eminens	*Ten ktori nad insze wzrosl*	*High, excellent, that sheweth the self aboue others*
Gurges	*Gl'ebokosc w wodach, krag w' wodzie*	*A gulffe, a great pitt and sw allow in a riuer where the water is swallowed vp*
Guttulus	*Naczinie male zcziasnim nossem, naliewezka*	*An eawer*
Lucifer	*Iutrzenka*	*The day starre*
Lupanar	*Zamtuz*	*A brothels house, the common-stewes of laundrie*
Misereor	*Lutoscz mam, zal mam*	*To haue pitie or compaßion*
Muria	*Bigos zribi*	*A salte licour*
Musicus	*Muzik, spiewak*	*Belonging to musick*
Mustum	*Mosze*	*New wyne, or any drink that is new and fresh*
Origanum	*Czyrwona leblotka*	[no equivalent]
Patesco	*Otwieram sie*	*To waxe patent or open*
Relego	*Precz oddaliam, odkazuie zziemie*	*To send away, to banish*
Vngulla	*Kopyto*	*The hoofe of a beast*
Vnguen	*Masc wszelyaka*	*Any fatt thing to anoynt an other thing, oynctment*
Zelotypus	*Zazdrostiwi, zawisni, wmielosczi*	*That is gelous*

Table 1. A sample of Calepino's Polish and English wordlists

Based on the above sample, it is possible to briefly characterise the compilers' strategies of explaining meaning. Sometimes only single words or phrases are provided as translation equivalents (*adjutor* 'pomocznik' / 'a helper'; *vngulla* 'kopyto' / 'the hoofe of a beast'). By contrast, a proportion of the glosses are based on the concept of synonymy, that is, they include a string of Polish and/or English near-synonyms, apparently to provide the user with a range of equivalents to choose from (*relego* 'precz oddaliam, odkazuie zziemie' / 'to send away, to banish'). Still, what seem to be near-synonyms are often lexical items explaining different meanings or senses of the Latin headword (*lucerna* 'lutnia, szlymak, zabiarka' / 'a torteis or snake, a lute').

   In other cases, the compilers employed hyperonyms accompanied by various differentiating devices, without which the user might have faced comprehension problems. For instance, the Polish gloss for Lat. *guttulus* is made up of the noun *naczinie* (literally, *vessel*) particularised by the adjective *małe* (literally, *small*) and the prepositional phrase *zcziasnim nosem* (literally, *with a thin nose*). The information that the Polish user received was clear-cut: only a vessel of specific shape and size should be called *guttulus* (hence, *naliewezka*). Taking Lat. *vnguen* as an example, the English gloss 'any fatt thing to anoynt an other thing' makes it clear that the lemma denoted more than ointment for strictly medicinal or religious use. A subordinate clause, which is used mostly for explaining nouns and adjectives, is one subtype of differentiating device (*eminens* 'ten ktori nad insze wzrosl' / 'high, excellent, that sheweth the self aboue others').

   As shown by Zgusta (1984: 147–150), translation equivalents in bilingual dictionaries take many different shapes, single-word equivalents and explanatory paraphrases being two extremes of a continuum. From this perspective, Calepino's glosses do not diverge much from the present models. Nevertheless, one might anticipate that the equivalents, expressed with different linguistic and stylistic means, resulted at best in partial correspondence, of which some cases were more acceptable than others (cf. *muria* 'bigos zribi' (literally, *a stew of fish*) / 'a salte licour'). A closer look at the sample above prompts a question whether we should speak of equivalence between the Polish and English glosses. This, however, is a research problem which cannot be established without a fully-fledged comparative analysis. It will be given due attention in another paper.

   The size of Calepino, indicative of its rich lexicographic information, was no doubt a disadvantage for those who would have liked to consult it for daily cross-linguistic problems. The dictionary was a huge, cumbersome, and, at the same time, expensive volume, so it is unlikely to have been used by those of the British immigrants in Poland who were not educated enough and/or who did not fare too well. It is particularly true of peddlers, i.e. travelling salesmen wandering across the country to sell their merchandise, who might have only carried booklets in their pockets. Obviously, Calepino could have been of some use to the learned English and Scottish people in Poland,[26] but they no doubt preferred to communicate in Latin.

---

[26]   Among the immigrants there were a number of learned men, such as James English, Alexander Forsythe or John Paterson, to mention just a few (Biegańska 2001: 5).

4.2. Hieronymus Megiser's *Thesaurus polyglottus vel, dictionarium multilingue …* (1603)

This dictionary, issued under the following title: *Thesaurus polyglottus vel, dictionarium multilingue ex qvadringentis circiter tam veteris, qvam (vel potius antiquis incogniti) orbis nationum linguis, dialectis, idiomatibus et idiotismis constans, … in gratiam studiosae juventutis* (1603), was compiled by Hieronymus Megiser (c. 1554–1618), a German linguist, tutor, lexicographer, and historian. Born at Stuttgart, Megiser had studied classical languages at Tübingen before taking up law at Padua. Prędota (1996: 251) notes that *Thesaurus polyglottus* was not the first lexicographic endeavour by Megiser, who had earlier published two other polyglot dictionaries: *Dictionarium quatorum linguarum …* (1592),[27] comprising Latin, German, Slovene, and Italian wordlists, as well as a multilingual collection of proverbs, *Paroemiologia polyglottos …* (1592). He also wrote grammatical works, including a grammar of Turkish, and was a "tireless translator" of travel books, like those by Marco Polo (Lach, van Kley 1993: 518).

The dictionary under analysis is the fruit of Megiser's interest in linguistic diversity. Sixteenth-century scholars became increasingly aware of the existence of living languages whose phonological, grammatical, and lexical structures differed markedly from those of any previously known tongues, so attempts were undertaken to identify, group, and list them (Lach 1977b: 516).[28] Such endeavours were usually limited to European vernaculars, but Megiser undertook to compile a dictionary of the world's languages. For this purpose, he collected equivalents for Latin lemmas from a wide array of languages, which he grouped into nine main families, namely "Hebraica, Graeca, Latina, Germanica, Sclavonica, Evropeae, Asiaticea, Africanea, America, vel India occidentalis". In this way, the polyglot dictionary became an innovative "linguistic atlas", which included Asian, African, and American tongues the Western world was not yet acquainted with. That they were in fact rarely provided with examples did little to overshadow Megiser's achievement.

On the other hand, *Thesaurus polyglottus* inevitably reflected linguistic knowledge typical of its times. For instance, the languages of the New World were identified with the tongues of insular South-East Asia and Japan; "Lithuanica" (i.e. Lithuanian) and "Prussica" (i.e. Prussian) were regarded as Slavic, despite both of them having been Baltic languages; and "fictitia Zingarorum" (i.e. thieves' argot called Rotwelsch) was treated on a par with such fully-fledged Germanic languages as English, German, or Danish.

The number of tongues claimed to have been documented is 445, but this figure is misleading, inasmuch as it embraces both languages and dialects, of which more than fifty were listed for Greek alone (Considine 2008: 292). What is more, the equivalents were not recorded systematically. For instance, Lat. *orca* was paired with English, but of all the Slavic languages, the lexicographer admitted only the Bohemian word for it.

---

[27] According to Stankiewicz (1984: 84–85), *Thesaurus polyglottus* is an enlarged edition of the four-language dictionary.

[28] For the earliest European attempts to list and classify the world's languages, see Lach (1977b: 509–518).

Megiser does not explain where his impressive collection of data comes from. Obviously, he was himself a polyglot speaking Latin, Greek, German, Dutch, Slovene, Turkish, and, perhaps to a lesser extent, some other European languages, but there is no proof for his sound knowledge of the multitude of tongues that *Thesaurus polyglottus* encompasses. He must have therefore relied on various textual sources (e.g. travel narratives) and dictionaries from which he excerpted foreign equivalents. It has been established that the English and German wordlists were borrowed from Calepino (Stein 1985b: 144), and so was the Polish one (Kędelska 1995: 25), the Serbo-Croatian wordlist having been based on Vrančic's *Dictionarium quinque nobilissimarum Europae linguarum …* (1595) (Stachowski 1969: 10). As to the geographically more remote tongues, there is evidence from peculiarities of spelling that Megiser took equivalents for Asian languages, like Malayan and Javanese, from Pigafetta's list.[29] Chinese and Japanese glosses came from Jesuit letter-books, whereas Asian names of spices were apparently derived from Orta's work (Lach 1977b: 517).[30] The sources of many of the other vernaculars, as it seems, still remain to be uncovered.

The dictionary, in two octavo volumes, covers 1,583 pages, of which volume one takes 832 pages, and volume 2 has 751 pages. The front matter of the first volume embraces a letter of dedication, an advertisement to the reader, tables of language families referred to, abbreviations of the vernaculars, and a few laudatory verses. What follows is the dictionary proper with Latin lemmas arranged alphabetically from *A* to *zygaena*. Looking at the sheer size – nearly 1,600 pages – we would expect a dictionary comparable in comprehensiveness to Calepino. However, with approximately 8,000–8,500 entries (Stabéj cited in Prędota 1996: 254), *Thesaurus polyglottus* is less extensive than Calepino, whose lexical coverage has been estimated at 30,000 entries.

There are also some qualitative differences between the two dictionaries. Firstly, in contrast to Calepino, Megiser's microstructure consists of the Latin lemma and foreign equivalents only. Secondly, while Calepino's entries are arranged in two columns, the foreign equivalents being listed in a linear order, Megiser's page is divided into three columns, and the equivalents are listed vertically, that is, each equivalent is entered in a single line. Thirdly, contrary to Calepino, the first word in the gloss usually begins with a lower-case letter, although this principle is not applied fully consistently. Lastly, English has been pushed to the front of the list, which is the consequence of grouping together genetically-related vernaculars, of which Megiser's branch of Germanic languages comes before Slavic ones.

---

[29] Antonio Pigafetta (ca. 1491–ca. 1534), an Italian nobleman and explorer, participated in Magellan's expedition to circumnavigate the globe. While travelling, Pigafetta collected rich data on the climate, fauna and flora, and the inhabitants of the places visited.

[30] Garcia de Orta (ca. 1535–1570) was a Portuguese physician and humanist of Jewish origin. Having received education in Spain, he briefly practised medicine in Portugal before leaving for Portuguese India, where he spent the rest of his life. *Colóquios dos simples e drogas he cousas medicinais da Índia*, published at Goa in 1563, is a rich source of information on Eastern botany, medicinals, and spices (Lach 1977a: 192–193).

Figure 2. A sample entry from Megiser's dictionary (see p. 90 for the source)

Despite the general validity of the lexicographer's approach, the arrangement of equivalents is one of the dictionary's weaknesses. The reason is that the Latin lemmas are paired with equivalents from a varying number of languages, and the configurations changing from entry to entry make the search for translation equivalents quite unpredictable. Moreover, one can come across entries in which the glosses have been ordered in an entirely haphazard manner. For example, the English equivalent of Lat. *mustella fluviatilis* comes last, following the Polish term. In other cases, like Lat. *mutatus*, *putorius*, or *tempero*, the English equivalent directly precedes the Polish one. Still, Megiser's collection of equivalents was arguably to be compared within a single entry rather than across entries.

While many Polish glosses in Megiser's dictionary are difficult to decipher (cf. Calepino's *gl'ebokosc w wodach, krag w' wodzie* / Megiser's *gl'ebo koscw wodach* for Lat. *gurges*), the quality of English orthography seems more adequate. This suggests that the printer of Megiser's dictionary might have had some, however imperfect, grasp of the English language, but whether he knew Polish is rather doubtful. Below are shown a handful of English and Polish glosses for the same Latin headwords as Calepino's, if found in Megiser's *Thesaurus polyglottus*:

Latin headword	English gloss	Polish gloss
Adjutor	*a helper*	*pomocznik*
Balbutio	*to maffle, in the mouth*	*zaiakamszie*
Chelys	*a torteis or-snake*	*szlymak, zabiarka*
Emineo	*to be apparant*	*nadinsze wnoszesie*

Latin headword	English gloss	Polish gloss
Gurges	*a gulfie*	*gl'ebo koscw wodach*
Guttus, Gutturnium	*a laver or eawer*	*naliewka*
Lucifer	*the day starre*	*iutrzenka*
Lupanar	*a brothels house, a stewes*	*zamtuz*
Misereor	*to haue pitie or compassion*	*zalmam, zlito wanie mam*
Muria	*brine*	*bigos zribi*
Musicus	*a musicien*	*spiewak*
Mustum	*new wyne*	*moszt*
Origanus	[no equivalent]	*czyrwona lebiotka*
Patesco	*to Waxe patent or open*	*otwierãsie*
Relego	*to bannisch*	*zziemie wiwolacz*
Vngulla	*the hoofe*	*kopyto*
Zelotypus	*a gelous man*	*zazdrostiwi, zawisni, wmieloszci*

Table 2. A sample of Megiser's English and Polish wordlists

As mentioned above, both the Polish and English lexical items are claimed to have been borrowed from Calepino. However, even the minuscule sample in Table 2 proves that Calepino was not the only source of Megiser's Polish and English word-lists. This is indicated by the Polish glosses for *misereor, musicus, mustum*, or *relego*, which are apparently taken from Mączyński's *Lexicon Latino-Polonicum …* (1564), the largest Latin-Polish dictionary available at that time. The monumental dictionary of sixteenth-century Polish, *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku* (1966–), will be helpful in establishing the meanings and scope of usage of particular items. For example, Mączyński's gloss for *relego* 'z ziemie wywołać' (and, hence, Megiser's 'zziemie wiwolacz'),[31] having been attested abundantly in sixteenth-century writings, was actually more adequate than Calepino's.[32]

As for the English equivalents, some are indeed taken from Calepino, whereas in other instances Megiser must have consulted various Latin-English dictionaries.

---

[31] In fact, this gloss accompanies Mączyński's contextual use, *In exilium relegare*, recorded under *Relego* in the entry for *Legatius*.

[32] It may be interesting to note that Megiser's *Thesaurus polyglottus* was not taken into account by Samuel Bogumił Linde in the compilation of his documentation dictionary of Polish, *Słownik języka polskiego* (1807–1814). Lewaszkiewicz (1990: 206) suggests that Linde did not know the polyglot dictionary; it seems a plausible hypothesis, unless the lexicographer considered Megister's Polish wordlist as a crude derivative of Calepino's.

LEME-based research shows that his equivalent for Lat. *balbutio* 'to maffle, in the mouth' is likely to have been taken from dictionaries by Elyot (1538), Huloet (1552), Baret (1574), or Cooper (1584). The potential sources of 'a musicien' (Lat. *musicus*), by contrast, encompass dictionaries by Huloet (1552), Florio (1578), Mulcaster (1582), and, in particular, Cooper (1584), who explains the lemma as 'a singing man' (cf. Cotgrave's 1611: *musician* 'a professor of Musicke'). Sometimes the glosses are copied verbatim, but more frequent are cases when they appear truncated, perhaps in an attempt to save space.

Can we assume that Megiser's dictionary was used by the British immigrants in Poland? Again, it is rather unlikely. Firstly, contrary to Calepino, the dictionary had only two editions, so it was not widely available. Secondly, the arrangement of the Polish and English equivalents, dispersed throughout the entries, was not particularly user-friendly. Lastly, the dictionary was meant to be a catalogue of the world's languages for etymological and comparative studies, not a source of Polish or English vocabulary items.

4.3. Georg Henisch's *Teütsche Sprach und Weissheit. Thesaurus linguae and sapientiae Germanicae* … (1616)

The third polyglot dictionary to pair Polish and English glosses has been given a long and informative title, of which the initial part is in German, and the remaining one in Latin.[33] Its author, Georg Henisch (1549–1618), was a learned doctor of medicine and a teacher. Although the volume was marked as *pars prima,* it was never followed by any subsequent part; with a very complex design, the dictionary apparently turned out to be too ambitious and was never completed (Stein 1989a: 61). Consequently, it remains extant in the alphabet range A–G.

The volume has approximately 1,000 pages. The front matter contains a preface and a few laudatory verses. The pages of the dictionary proper are divided into two columns which are numbered from 1 to 1802. The back matter is comprised of an index of German lemmas in four columns, of which only the leftmost and rightmost ones are numbered (from 1803 to 1875). There is no doubt that the "Treasury of the German language and wisdom" was created with a pedagogical aim, which is exhibited by the dictionary's remarkably rich linguistic material embracing single words, compounds, derivatives, phrases, collocations, idioms, and proverbs (cf. Hüllen 1990: 190). However, upon examination, it becomes clear that Henisch's meticulous treatment was confined to German as the source language and Latin as the "primary" target language. When it comes to the foreign equivalents, whose arrangement in the entry

---

[33] *Teütsche Sprach vnd Weissheit. Thesaurus linguae and sapientiae Germanicae. In quo vocabula omnia Germanica, tam rara, quam communica, cum suis Synonymis, derivatis, phrasibus, compositis, epithetis, proverbiis, anthetis, continentur, & Latine ex Optimis quibusq; autoribus redduntur, ita, ut hac nova & perfecta method quillibet cum adplenam utriusque linguae cognitionem, tum rerum prudentiam facile & cito pervenire possit. Adiectae sunt quoque dictionibus pleruq: Anglicae, Bohemicae, Gallicae, Graecae, Hebraicae, Hispanicae, Hungaricae, Italicae, Polonicae* (1616).

makes them look like "secondary" target languages,[34] they received far less attention. In other words, different lemmas are glossed with different thoroughness, and some are not provided with any foreign gloss at all.

What is unique about Henisch's dictionary is that German, not Latin, is the source language. That type of macrostructure was not very frequent at that time. Stein (1985b: 145) suggests that, in order to arrive at the German wordlist, Henisch might have inverted the order of entries borrowed from other authors. A part of a sample entry, in which the lemma *Befelch* is followed by the sublemma *Befehlen*, is displayed in Fig. 3 below.

Figure 3. A sample entry from Henisch's dictionary (see p. 90 for the source)

As can be seen above, in contrast to the entry printed across the column, the equivalents are divided into three subcolumns and their abbreviations are capitalized (ANG. for English / POL. for Polish).[35] This is admittedly a useful typographical device to help the user discern equivalents in dense print, all the more that glosses are sometimes provided not only for lemmas, but also for sublemmas. Compared to Calepino, the order of the foreign vernaculars has been modified; English has now been advanced to the first position, whereas Polish is the last vernacular in the list. It should be noted that Latin equivalents are treated in a different manner: instead of a single gloss, the lexicographer records a string of Latin synonyms, which directly follow the German lemmas and sublemmas.

---

[34] Up to ten "secondary" target languages have been taken into account: English, Flemish, Bohemian, French, Greek, Spanish, Hungarian, Italian, and Polish.

[35] The first label, usually for English, is preceded by the so-called paragraph sign (¶).

Since German is the source language, the search for the same Latin headwords as in the case of Calepino's and Megiser's polyglots turned out to be too difficult. Therefore, Table 3 below shows selected German lemmas with their corresponding English and Polish glosses.

German headword	English gloss	Polish gloss
Athem	*the breath / a breathing*	*oddech / duch / dech / odetchnienie*
Barbierer	*a barbour*	*balwierz*
Befelch	*Commission / charge a commandement*	*rozkazanie*
Bettler	*a begger*	*żebrak, choder*
Buck	*mugworte*	*bilica / czarna y biala*
Creus	*a cresse*	*krziz*
Cucumer	*a cucumer / a cucumber*	*ogorek*
Deuten	*to signifie before athing happeneth*	*przepowiadam*
Doppel	*double*	*dwoisti*
Dornheck	*a bushe of thornes*	*cziernina wszelyaka*
Eigen	*propre*	*wl'asni*
Fussfall	*praying, requesting*	*pokorna prozba*
Gast	*he that is called to a bankett or feast*	*do goszcziny wezwany*
Gebären	*to begette*	*rodze*
Gürtel	*a girdle*	*pas, tasma*
[Leibeigen]	*a slave that is born in ourawni house*	*w domu naszim urodzoni*
[Weise Gassen][36]	*a broade streat*	*ulicza / szeroka*

Table 3. A sample of Henisch's English and Polish wordlists

One might wonder where Henisch's equivalents come from. Establishing the origin of the two wordlists without further research is impossible, but the lexicographer definitely drew on Calepino's vernacular wordlists. *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku* (1966–) provides evidence that the Polish items for *Buck*, *Doppel*, *Dornheck*,

---

[36] It should be noted that *Leibeigen* and *weise Gassen* are sublemmas, which is why they go beyond the alphabet range A–G.

Fussfall, *Gast*, and *Gürtel* were borrowed from Calepino,[37] even though the original glosses were shortened, supposedly to keep the dictionary within practicable limits. One more similarity deserves mention: the lexicographer employs a single prime to mark the Polish diacritic *ł*, as in *wl'asni,* which is a characteristic feature of Calepino's Polish wordlist. The origin of Henisch's English wordlist has not been established, but one might assume, by way of analogy, that it is also derivative of Calepino. Interestingly, the inclusion of Flemish as a target language suggests that Henisch resorted to one of Calepino's eleven-language editions.

Would *Thesaurus linguae and sapientiae Germanicae* have been of any use to the British immigrants in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth? The answer is straightforward. While Calepino's and Megiser's polyglot dictionaries could, at least theoretically, have been used to facilitate Polish-English communication, Henisch's dictionary was targeted primarily at German speakers. Since most of the newcomers from the British Isles are unlikely to have spoken German – the dictionary's source language – fluently enough to look up Polish or English equivalents, *Teütsche Sprach und Weissheit* was clearly beyond their reach. Furthermore, the fact that the work was unfinished should also be treated as a negative factor.

5. Conclusions

As this study demonstrates, the early beginnings of Polish-English / English-Polish lexicography can indeed be traced back to polyglot dictionaries, three of which were published as early as the sixteenth century. The research, however, posed a genuine challenge, which is somewhat paradoxical, given that both Megiser and Henisch had drawn heavily on Calepino's foreign wordlists. The main problem is that the lexical material under analysis is roughly comparable, but establishing the scope of affinity has been fraught with difficulty; not only did the lexicographers modify Calepino's glosses, but they also employed other sources of data. What is more, the Middle Polish and Early Modern English usage respectively had to be checked against extensive documentation material, which made the study both time-consuming and labour-intensive.

Even though the British immigrants in Poland needed bilingual wordbooks, the Polish and English wordlists of the polyglots do not seem to have been targeted specifically at them. More precisely, Calepino's lists of Polish and English glosses enabled the dictionary to enter the Polish and English markets in order to meet a growing demand for erudite works facilitating Latin-vernacular translation,[38] Megiser's dictionary was intended primarily for comparative linguistic studies,

---

[37]   It is quite likely that the other equivalents were likewise borrowed from Calepino. This, how-ever, cannot be confirmed, because *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*, available in the alphabet range A–Rowny, still awaits completion.

[38]   To put it differently, the primary aim of the foreign wordlists was to help users render Latin texts into the respective vernaculars. Thanks to the linear arrangement of glosses, mutual translatability (e.g. Polish-English / English-Polish) was also possible, at least to a limited extent.

whereas Henisch addressed his unfinished volume to German speakers. Summing up, both the assumed aims and the envisaged audience made the three polyglot dictionaries unsuitable for practical, everyday purposes.

As is clear from the historical context sketched at the beginning, there is yet much to be done in this research area. Therefore, in the next paper (Podhajecka forthcoming b), I will examine two remaining polyglots published in the Enlightenment, Christoph Warmer's *Gazophylacium decem linguarum Europaearum…* (1691) and Peter Simon Pallas' *Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa…* (1787–1789), to provide readers with a complete picture of the early Polish-English / English-Polish dictionary-making tradition. Interestingly, despite being quite dissimilar in form and contents, the two enterprises share one essential feature: in contrast to their predecessors, neither of them has been based on Calepino.

References

Dictionaries and databases[39]

LEME = Lancashire I. (ed.). 2013. *Lexicons of Early Modern English*. [an online database, available at: leme.library.utoronto.ca]. Toronto.

OED = Murray J. et al. (eds.). 1884–1928. *The Oxford English dictionary. The new English dictionary on historical principles* [1st edition]; Murray J. et al. (eds.). 1933. *The Oxford English dictionary. Being a corrected reissue with an introduction, supplement, and bibliography*; Burchfield R. (ed.). 1972–1986. *A supplement to the Oxford English dictionary* [vols. 1–4]; Simpson J., Weiner E. (eds.). 1989. *The Oxford English dictionary* [2nd edition]; Simpson J. (ed.). 2000-. *OED online* [3rd edition]. [available at: www.oed.com]. Oxford.

Anon. 1580. *Wokabularz rozmaitych i potrzebnych sentencji, polskim i niemieckim młodzieńcom na pożytek teraz zebrany. Ein Vocabular mancherley schönen und nothwendigen Sententien, der polnischen und deutschen Jugent zu Nutz zusamen getragen*. Królewiec.

Baret J. 1574. *An alveary or triple dictionary, in English, Latin, and French* (…). [available at: leme.library.utoronto.ca/lexicons/record.cfm?id=127]. London.

Chalmers A. (ed.). 1813. *The general biographical dictionary: Containing an historical and critical account of the lives and writings of the most eminent persons in every nation; particularly the British and Irish; from the earliest accounts to the present time*. [vol. 8]. London.

Cooper T. 1584. *Thesaurus linguae Romanae et Britannicae tam accurate congestus*. [available at: leme.library.utoronto.ca/lexicons/record.cfm?id=101]. London.

Cotgrave R. 1611. *A dictionarie of the French and English tongues*. [available at: leme.library.utoronto.ca/lexicons/record.cfm?id=298]. London.

Elyot T. 1538. *The dictionary of Sir Thomas Elyot knyght*. [available at: leme.library.utoronto.ca/lexicons/record.cfm?id=53]. London.

Florio J. 1578. *Florio his firste fruites: which yeelde familiar speech, merie prouerbes, wittie sentences, and golden sayings. Also a perfect induction* (…). [available at: leme.library.utoronto.ca/lexicons/record.cfm?id=147]. London.

Huloet R. 1552. *ABCedarium Anglico Latinum, pro tyrunculis*. [available at: leme.library.utoronto.ca/lexicons/record.cfm?id=75]. London.

---

[39] The polyglot dictionaries under analysis have only been listed in the body of the paper.

[Jankiewitsch de Miriewo T.] 1790–1791. *Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa… / Sravnitel'nyj slovar' vsex" jazykov" i narečij…* [vols. 1–4]. Sanktpeterburg [= St. Petersburg].

Kunstmann, H.A. 1794. *Kurzes Wörterbuch in deutscher, französischer, italienischer, englischer und polnischer Sprache, zum gebrauche für die Jugend.* Berlin.[40]

Linde S.B. 1807–1814. *Słownik języka polskiego.* [vols. 1–6]. Warszawa.

Maczinsky I. [= Mączyński J.] 1564. *Lexicon Latino-Polonicum* (…). [Facsimile: Olesch R. (ed.). 1973. Köln, Wien]. Regiomonti Borussiae [= Królewiec / Königsberg].

Mulcaster R. 1582. *The first part of the elementarie which entreateth chefelie of the right writing of our English tung, set furth by Richard Mulcaster.* [available at: leme.library. utoronto.ca/lexicons/record.cfm?id=164]. London.

Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku = Mayenowa M.R., Pepłowski F. (eds.). 1966–1994. *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku.* [vols. 1–34]; Mrowcewicz K., Potoniec P. (eds.). 1995–. *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku.* [vol. 35]. [available at: kpbc.umk.pl/publication/17781]. Warszawa.

Other

Adelung F. 1815. *Catherinens der Grossen Verdienste um die vergleichende Sprachenkunde.* St. Petersburg.

Antonowicz J. 1788. *Grammatyka dla Polaków chcących się uczyć angielskiego ięzyka krótko zebrana przez* (…) *Bazyliana prowincyi litewskiéy za pozwoleniem zwierzchności pierwszy raz pod prassę oddana.* Warszawa.

Bajer P.P. 2012. *Scots in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, 16th to 18th centuries: The formation and disappearance of an ethnic group.* Leiden.

Barycz H. 1969. *Z dziejów polskich wędrówek naukowych za granicę.* Wrocław, Warszawa.

Benedyktowicz W. 1959. Z dziejów wydania "Zielonej księgi". – *Przegląd Humanistyczny* 5.14: 125–137.

Biegańska A. 2001. The learned Scots in Poland (from the mid-sixteenth to the close of the eighteenth century). – *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 43.1: 1–27.

Budziak R. 2012. Zur ältesten Geschichte der deutsch-polnischen Lexikographie. Wörterbücher aus dem 16. und 17. Jahrhundert. – *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 57.1: 93–105.

Catalogue de la Bibliotèque Municipale publié sous la direction du Comité de la Société Belfortaine d'Émulation. 1887. Belfort.

Cieśla M. 1974. *Dzieje nauki języków obcych w zarysie. Monografia z zakresu historii kultury.* Warszawa.

Claes F. 1974. *Lijst van Nederlandse woordenlijsten en woordenboeken gedrukt tot 1600.* [= *Bibliotheca Bibliographica Neerlandica* 4]. Niewkoop.

Considine J. 2008. *Dictionaries in early modern Europe: Lexicography and the making of heritage.* Cambridge.

Dąbrowski J. 1962. *Polacy w Anglii i o Anglii.* Kraków.

Estreicher K. 1896. *Bibliografia polska.* [vol. 14 (pars 3/03): *Stólecie XV–XVIII w układzie abecadłowym*.; The letter section C, available at: www.estreicher.uj.edu.pl/staropolska/ indeks/5500,0031.html]. Kraków.

Frączek A. 1999. *Zur Geschichte der deutsch-polnischen und polnisch-deutschen Lexikographie (1772–1868).* Tübingen.

---

[40] It is another polyglot with Polish and English wordlists which was found after this paper had been submitted for publication.

Gordon P. 1859. *Passages from the diary of General Patrick Gordon of Auchleuchries. A.D. 1635 – A.D. 1699*. Aberdeen.

Gruszczyński W. 2011. Nie tylko łacina, czyli o językach zestawianych z polszczyzną w słownikach z XVI, XVII i XVIII wieku. – Gruszczyński W., Polkowska L. (eds.). *Problemy leksykografii. Historia – metodologia – praktyka*. Warszawa: 53–72.

Hanks P. 2013. Lexicography from earliest times to the present. – Keith A. (ed.). *The Oxford handbook of the history of linguistics*. Oxford: 503–536.

Hartmann R.R.K. 2001. *Teaching and researching lexicography*. Harlow.

Hayashi T. 1978. *The theory of English bilingual lexicography 1530–1791*. [= *Studies in the history of the language sciences* 18]. Amsterdam, Philadelphia.

Hüllen W. 1990: Motives behind 17th century lexicography: A comparison between German and English dictionaries of that time. – Magay T., Zigány J. (eds.). *BudaLEX '88 Proceedings. Papers from the Third International EURALEX Congress, Budapest, 4–9 September 1988*. Budapest: 189–196.

Hüllen W. 1999. *English dictionaries 800–1700. The topical tradition*. Oxford, New York.

Kaltz B. 1985. Documents / Dokumente. Christian Jakob Kraus' review of "Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa" ed. by Peter Simon Pallas (St. Petersburg, 1787). Introduction, translation and notes. – *Historiographia Linguistica* 12: 229‒260.

Kędelska E. 1995. *Studia nad łacińsko-polską leksykografią drugiej połowy XVI wieku*. Warszawa.

Kishimoto E. 2005. The adaptation of the European polyglot dictionary of Calepino in Japan: *Dictionarium Latino Lusitanicum, ac Iaponicum* (1595). – Zwartjes O., Altman C. (eds.). *Missionary linguistics II. Lingüística misionera II. Orthography and phonology. Selected papers from the Second International Conference on Missionary Linguistics, São Paulo, 10–13 March, 2004*. [= *Studies in the history of the language sciences*]. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: 205–223.

Krawczyk A. 2002. The British in Poland in the seventeenth century. – *The Seventeenth Century* 17.2: 254–272.

Krawczyk A. 2010. Szkocki arystokrata Patrick Gordon (1635–1699) w służbie wojennej Szwecji, Polski oraz Rosji – jego pamiętnik. – Achremczyk S. (ed.). *Między Barokiem a Oświeceniem. Wielkie bitwy*. Olsztyn: 218–250.

Labarre A. 1975. *Bibliographie du dictionarium d'Ambrogio Calepino (1502–1779)*. [= *Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana* 26]. Baden-Baden.

Lach D.F. 1977a. *Asia in the making of Europe* [vol. 1: *The century of discovery*; part 2]. Chicago, London.

Lach D.F. 1977b. *Asia in the making of Europe* [vol. 2: *A century of wonder*; part 3: *The scholarly disciplines*]. Chicago, London.

Lach D.F., van Kley E.J. 1993. *Asia in the making of Europe* [vol. 3: *A century of advance*; part 1: *Trade, missions, literature*]. Chicago, London.

Lewaszkiewicz T. 1990. Osobliwe wyrazy łużyckie w Słowniku Lindego. – Lachmann R. et al. (eds.). "*Tgolí chole Mêstró*". *Gedenkschrift für Reinhold Olesch*. Köln, Wien: 205–212.

Mańczak-Wohlfeld E. 2001. The English equivalents in *Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa*. – Witalisz W. (ed.). "*And gladly wolde he lerne and gladly teche.*" *Studies on language and literature in honour of Professor Dr. Karl Heinz Göller*. Kraków: 181–186.

Mrozowska K. (ed.). 1981. *Raporty Szkoły Głównej Koronnej o generalnych wizytach szkół Komisji Edukacji Narodowej*. Wrocław, Warszawa.

Oesterreicher H. 1927. Nieco o dziale polskim w jedenastojęzycznym słowniku Kalepina z r. 1590. – *Prace Filologiczne* 12: 465–473.

Ostromęcka-Frączak B. 2005. Leksyka w najstarszych słownikach słoweńskich i jej zróżnicowanie terytorialne. – *Rozprawy Komisji Językowej* ŁTN 50: 75–83.

Pinnavaia L. 2013. Traveling words, words of traveling: 17th century English travelogues of Italy. – McConchie R.W. et al. (eds.). *Selected proceedings of the 2012 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 3).* [available at: www.lingref.com/cpp/hel-lex/2012/paper2842.pdf]. Somerville (MA): 128–140.

Piotrowski T. 2001. *Zrozumieć leksykografię.* Warszawa.

Podhajecka M. 2013. Researching the beginnings of bilingual Polish-English / English-Polish lexicography: An introduction. – *International Journal of Lexicography* 26.4: 449–468.

Podhajecka M. [forthcoming a]. The Polish and English wordlists of Calepino's *Dictionarium undecim linguarum* (…) (1590): Origin, coverage and orthography. – Kozianka M., Bock B. (eds.). *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Historical Lexicography and Lexicology (ICHLL 6).* Hamburg.

Podhajecka M. [forthcoming b]. Researching the beginnings of bilingual Polish-English / English-Polish lexicography: Polyglot dictionaries (part 2). – *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis* 131.

Prędota S. 1996. *Thesaurus Polyglottus* (1603) Hieronima Megisera z częścią niderlandzką i polską. – *Orbis Linguarum* 5: 251–256.

Prędota S., Woronczak J. (ed.). 2002. *Christophorus Warmers Nederlandse en Poolse samenspraken van 1691.* Wrocław.

Rosenthal J.M. 1966. Marcin Czechowic and Jacob of Bełżyce: Arian-Jewish encounters in 16th century Poland. – *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 34: 77–97.

Sosnowski R. 2006. 150 anni della lessicografia bilingue italiano-polacca (1856–2006). – Cresti E. (ed.). *Prospettive nello studio del lessico italiano. Atti del IX Congresso della Società Internazionale di Linguistica e Filologia Italiana (SILFI 2006).* [vol. 1]. Firenze: 71–76.

Stachowski S. 1969. *Wyrazy serbsko-chorwackie w "Thesaurus Polyglottus" H. Megisera (1603).* Warszawa, Wrocław.

Stankiewicz E. 1984. *Grammars and dictionaries of the Slavic languages from the Middle Ages up to 1850: An annotated bibliography.* Berlin.

Stein G. 1985a. *The English dictionary before Cawdrey.* Tübingen.

Stein G. 1985b. English-German / German-English lexicography: Its early beginnings. – Kučera A. et al. (eds.). *Lexicographica: International Annual for Lexicography* 1. Tübingen: 134–164.

Stein G. 1989a. The emerging role of English in the dictionaries of Renaissance Europe. – *Folia Linguistica Historica* 9.1: 29–138.

Stein G. 1989b. Problems of affinity in early polyglot word lists. – Fries U., Heusser M. (eds.). *Meaning and beyond: Ernst Leisi zum 70. Geburtstag.* Tübingen: 93–114.

Steuart A.F. 1915. *Papers relating to the Scots in Poland, 1576–1793.* Edinburgh.

Watson F. 1908. *The English grammar schools to 1660: Their curriculum and practice.* Cambridge.

Wendland F. 1992. *Peter Simon Pallas, 1741–1811: Materialien einer Biographie.* [vol. 1]. Berlin, New York.

Worthington D. 2012. *British and Irish experiences and impressions of Central Europe, c. 1560–1688.* Farnham (UK).

Zgusta L. 1984. Translational equivalence in the bilingual dictionary. – Hartmann R.R.K.
    (ed.). *LEXeter'83 proceedings. Papers from the International Conference on Lexicography
    at Exeter, 9–12 September 1983.* Tübingen: 147–154.

Zwoliński P. 1981. Dziesięciojęzyczny podręcznik dialektu śląskiego z końca XVII wieku. –
    Kwartalnik Opolski 27: 53–58.

Sources of figures

Fig. 1: Calepinus A. 1590. *Dictionarium undecim linguarum* … Basileae: books.google.pl/
    books?id=jbBu1GCWF-MC.

Fig. 2: Megiserus H. 1613. *Thesaurus polyglottus: vel, dictionarium multilingue* … Francofurti
    ad Moenum: books.google.pl/books?id=pcpOAAAAcAAJ.

Fig. 3: Henisch G. 1616. *Teütsche Sprach und Weissheit. Thesaurus linguae and sapientiae
    Germanicae* … Augustae Vindelicorum: books.google.pl/books?id=BsRMAAAAcAAJ.