

*The last such dictionary*¹

Jerzy Tomaszczyk

University of Łódź, Poland

tomas@uni.lodz.pl

Abstract

The paper is a review of *Słownik polskich leksemów potocznych* (Dictionary of Polish colloquial vocabulary), conceived and edited by the late Professor Władysław Lubaś and executed by a team of which the professor was a member and leader. The review concentrates on lexicographic method, internal consistency and coverage of Polish colloquial lexicon. To this end the dictionary is placed in the context of other dictionaries of Polish published since mid 20th century including specialized dictionaries which focused on colloquial language and other related varieties, such as e.g., slang, sexual and vulgar vocabulary, feminitiva. The main point of criticism is that the dictionary is too traditional, having drawn its headwords almost exclusively from written sources – fiction and non-fiction – or from other dictionaries, noticeably frequently taking over material from them verbatim. On the other hand, only lip service is paid to authentic conversational behavior. Other than that the work is truly impressive and great fun to thumb through. Significantly, and unsurprisingly, the dictionary is the most extensive treatment of colloquial

¹ *Słownik polskich leksemów potocznych*, edited by Władysław Lubaś (vols. I-VII) and by Władysław Lubaś and Katarzyna Skowronek (vols. VIII and IX), published by Wydawnictwo Naukowe DWT, Kraków (vol. I) and by Wydawnictwo Lexis, Kraków (vols. II-IX); year of publication 2001 (vol. I, A-Ć, 601 pages), 2003 (vol. II, D-F, 518 pages), 2004 (vol. III, G-J, 531 pages), 2006 (vol. IV, K-L, 547 pages), 2009 (vol. V, Ł-Na, 607 pages), 2011 (vol. VI, Na-Od, 498 pages), 2013 (vol. VII, Oe-Oz, 413 pages), 2015 (vol. VIII, P-Pa, 220 pages), and 2016 (vol. IX, Pa-Pi, 203 pages). Volumes I-IV and VII-IX were refereed by Bogusław Dunaj and Stanisław Grabias, vol. V – by Bogusław Dunaj, and with vol. VI no referee is named. Entry articles were written by Elżbieta Kuryło (EK), Renarda Lebda (RL), Władysław Lubaś (WL) and Krystyna Urban (KU). The initial volumes are accessible at <http://rcin.org.pl/dlibra/publication/39408?tab=1> (information courtesy of Prof. Tadeusz Piotrowski, pc).

vocabulary by far, but also compares very favourably with e.g., Polish phraseological dictionaries.

Keywords: academic lexicography; colloquial language; emotional load; language and gender; vulgar language; borrowing from English

1. Introduction

There is a certain ambivalence about colloquial language: native speakers of Polish, above all the more language conscious ones, which typically means those with more education, tend to despise it as much as they despise jargon or borrowings from other languages (but see Urban, 1983). That, however, does not stop them from – occasionally – taking recourse to colloquial vocabulary, or jargon or loans, but when they do they will often incorporate a comment in their turn to the effect that the word or phrase they have just used – or are about to use – is ugly and they do not like it (Tomaszczyk, 2015).

Polish linguistics tended not to pay too much attention to it until about the 1970s when interest in colloquial language exploded giving rise to a range of urban language projects across the country and resulted in numerous studies and publications (cf. e.g., Anusiewicz & Nieckuła, 1992; Boniecka, 2013; Boniecka & Grabias, 2007; Gajda & Adamiszyn, 1991, 1994; Grabias, 1981; Lubaś, 2003; Warchała, 2003). A very useful summary of the different positions that can be found in Chapter 1 of Niemczyk-Jacek (2015). In addition, at least three dictionaries have been published, that is Anusiewicz and Skawiński (1996), Lubaś (2001-2016), and Czeszewski (2006), a modified (but see Moch, 2007) version of Czeszewski (2001). In a nutshell, the variety is seen as every speaker's first language, a true vernacular, and the center of the stylistic system of a language (Bartmiński, 2001/2012; Rejter, 2006, pp. 42-71). Significantly, colloquial language is studied not just of itself and for itself but, instead, it is seen as an integral part of the way in which language users perceive and experience the world (cf. Anusiewicz, 1992; Hołówka, 1986; Lebda, 2003). It is thus not at all surprising that the variety has come to play an increasing role in everyday communication, including the media (Handke, 2011; Lubaś 2000c; Warchoł-Schlottmann, 2004, 2005).

The dictionary under review, together with *Polskie Gadanie* (Lubaś, 2003), a comprehensive theoretical treatment of colloquial Polish, can be regarded both as a crowning achievement in Professor Lubaś' lifetime preoccupation with urban sociolinguistics and, at the same time, an inevitable, logical outcome of a research enterprise that spanned several decades and involved an impressive array of Polish language specialists of various persuasions.

The work is unfinished, only just over 60% (headwords starting with A–Pi) of it has been published. Volumes VIII and IX, each less than half the size of any of the earlier volumes, were seen to publication by Katarzyna Skowronek, the reason being the editor's death in 2014. It should be stressed that Profesor Lubaś was not 'just' the chief editor: the dictionary was his idea and he was also personally and directly involved in the reading program and in the creation of the entries. It is thus not clear how the project will be continued although on the basis of Lubaś (2000a, p. 59) one may assume that the macrostructure and the basic headword list were all ready by the time the first volume appeared. Then, in the front matter to Vol. IX we read that "remarks concerning vols. VIII–X by Krystyna Skowronek – everywhere else it is Katarzyna - can be found in Vol. VIII". So there is going to be Vol. X, definitely not the last. Whatever happens, the work may well turn out to be the last traditional (printed) scholarly dictionary in Poland (cf. e.g., Czyżewska & Frączek, 2004; Żmigrodzki, 2010).

While the other two dictionaries of Polish colloquialisms, that is Anusiewicz and Skawiński (1996), and Czeszewski (2006), can be described as popular, the Lubaś dictionary (henceforth the dictionary) is a piece of solid academic work par excellence. It is much bigger – by far – than the other two in terms of the number of pages (407 and 386 vs. 5141) and in terms of the number of entries (ca. 8000 and ca. 7000 (authors' counts) vs. 27574 (my count)). A simple extrapolation yields ca 43500 entries for the whole work, somewhat less than the "more than 50 thousand" envisaged in Lubaś (2000a, p. 59), but in good agreement with Lubaś (2000b, p. 161) ("more than 40 thousand"). Still, what has already been published is impressive enough to deserve serious attention. Why it is not even mentioned in the otherwise satisfactory review of recent Polish lexicography (Worbs, 2013) is not easy to see.

2. Sources and documentation

The lexical material for the dictionary comes from a variety of sources, all listed in the front matter to each volume. The project started with a reading programme involving 436 book titles (vol. I), a figure that grew to 620 titles (vols. VIII and IX) published in 1950–2010. Similarly, there were 127 newspaper (daily and weekly) titles with Vol. I and 184 titles with vol. IX. The team appear to have gone through all Polish dictionaries starting with Prof. Doroszewski's (11 volume) work published in 1958–1969. The lists include 17 dictionaries with vol. I and 31 dictionaries with Vol. IX, as well as 6/8 academic publications focusing on lexical matters. Finally, for samples of genuine conversational language the compilers made use of radio and tv broadcasts, transcripts from an urban language project (Lubaś, 1978, 1980) as well as their own idiolects. There were 17

readers up till 1986 and four afterwards (the four constituted the inner circle, doubling as entry article writers; they are listed at the beginning of this review). It should be clear then that while the strategic decisions had been made, and the bulk of the work had been done, by the time the first volume was published, the team were flexible in their approach and adapted to changing circumstances, above all the ongoing supply of new data.

To get a sense of how the different sources of lexical material have contributed to the final shape of the dictionary I have looked at the first 150 senses denoting 'human being' (excluding pluralia tantum, forms of address and insults) in each of the nine volumes. Note that anthropocentrism is regarded as a criterial characteristic of colloquial language and, accordingly, the 'human being' is the sole focus of the Anusiewicz/Skawiński dictionary (cf. e.g., Anusiewicz & Skawiński, 1996, p. 9). The total of 1350 senses are documented by means of 2392 citations, of which 829 (34.65%), represent literary fiction, 605 (25.3%) come from the Internet, 396 (16.6%) represent non-fiction writing, 345 (14.4%) are from print media, and 174 (7.3%) had the National Corpus of Polish (nkjp.pl) as their source. The combined contributions from radio and television, movie scripts, (overheard) conversations, and entry article writers' idiolects amount to 1.8% of total items. The figure of 2392 citations per 1350 senses translates into mere 1.77 citations per sense. Given the type of sense (entry) that was examined, these figures may not be very representative of the entire work, but it may still be interesting to see how these figures break down volume by volume and, equally relevant, what the mean of 1.77 really means. The figures (Table 1) that follow are percentages relative to the total number of citations per 150 'human being' senses in each of the nine volumes. F stands for literary fiction, NF – non-fiction, P – the press, nkjp – the National Corpus of Polish, I – the Internet, Roman numbers represent the volumes. The figures in the bottom row are total numbers of citations for the first 150 'human being' senses in the given volume (relative to which the percentages were calculated).

Table 1 Percentages relative to the total number of citations per 150 'human being' senses in each of the nine volumes

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	Total items/%
F	41.7	54.4	53.2	43.9	59.6	32.1	12.5	17.2	7.8	= 829/34.7
NF	41.7	24.1	29.9	17.4	21.1	14.2	3.5	9.6	3.9	= 396/16.6
P	9.6	16.4	14.6	37.4	14.3	17.6	3.9	12.8	10.3	= 345/14.4
Nkjp						17.2	6.2	4.0	18.5	= 174/7.3
I				0.8	3.1	18.9	73.8	55.6	58.4	= 605/25.3
Misc.	6.9	5.1	2.3	3.5	1.8	0.5	-	0.8	1.1	= 43/1.8
Total items	115	195	301	115	322	557	256	250	281	= 2392

Before we can discuss the data above it has to be added that a noticeable proportion of the headwords and definitions, though not – as a rule – citations, have been taken over from other dictionaries (D). The numbers for each volume, and percentages relative to the 150 senses, are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Headwords and definitions taken from other dictionaries

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	Total/%
D	92 (61)	79 (53)	34 (23)	87 (58)	53 (35)	27 (18)	29 (19)	24 (16)	11 (7)	436/(32)
+ cit	2	-	1	-	-	16	9	13	4	45/(10)

The numbers in the second row represent citations that accompany the (human being) senses taken over from other dictionaries. These amount to a little over 10%, which means that 90% of the time material taken over from other dictionaries was deemed to require no additional documentation. The percentage next to the total of 436 is calculated relative to the figure of 1350, the total number of senses examined, i.e., close to one third of the time the headwords (senses) were borrowed from other dictionaries: in his introduction to the dictionary (Lubaś, 2001, p. XII) the editor states that other dictionaries served as 'control sources' to complement the team's own materials. The major suppliers of headwords and definitions to the total of 436 were SGS (134/30.7%), SSP (81/18.6%), SJPD (43/9.9%), SSPA (24/5.5%), USJP (22/5%), NSI (22/5%). Just as an example, the SGS contributed 42 items to Vol. I, 23 to Vol. IV, and just 1 to Vol. VI; the SSP contributed 30 items to Vol. IV, 18 to Vol. II, and none to Vol. III; the SJPD contributed 16 items to Vol. IV, 10 to Vol. II and none to Vol. IX; finally, SA contributed 15 items to Vol. I, 3 to Vol. V, one to Vol. VII and none to all the others.

Returning now to the main table, the strikingly large differences in the extent of the editor's reliance on the various sources of lexical information and the equally large differences in the amount of documentation – the total items (citations) row at the bottom – may justify the conclusion, tentative as yet, that each volume is a separate piece of work, a conclusion that draws some support from the fact that entry article writers did not form a team of invariable composition across the nine volumes, which is quite understandable with work of such magnitude that was spread over more than two decades. The teams were as follows: I, II and VII – EK, WL, KU; III and IV – EK, RL, WL, KU; V – letters Ł and N – EK, letter M – RL, WL, with the cooperation of Danuta Ambroziewicz; VI – EK, RL; VIII and IX – KU. More of a team work, it would seem, with Vols. I-IV and VII than with Vols. V, VI, and VIII, IX.

The reliance on the traditional sources of headwords and citations – literary fiction, non-fiction, the press – varies from one volume to the next but, with the exception of the press, that reliance decreases noticeably in later volumes.

The Polish corpus comes in in Vol. VI, seems to have been just about discarded soon afterwards but comes back in force in Vol. IX. The Internet makes a symbolic appearance in Vols. IV and V, has a much bigger impact in Vol. VI, and becomes the most powerful influence in Vols. VII-IX. The editor's and entry article writers' flexibility and adaptability in the face of steady inflow of new language data can be seen from the publication dates of the newspaper texts used as sources of citations for Volumes II, IV, VI and VIII, as an example. The texts excerpted for Vol. II were published in 1983–2003, and texts published in 2002 provided 21.4% of the citations; the texts excerpted for Vol. IV were published in 1989-2006, and those published in 2003 account for one third of the citations. In the case of Vol. VI, the range is 1983-2009, and 20% of the citations came from texts published in 2003. With Vol. VIII, the corresponding figures are 1991–2011, and 27% of the citations bear the date of 2007. The percentages of newspaper texts published in 2000 or later, i.e., more recently, are 57 (II), 78.6 (IV), 73.3 (VI) and 85.7 (VIII). Thus, newspapers, which contribute 14.4% of the citations, allowed the team to keep track of new developments in the Polish colloquial lexicon. One would expect that to be the case to a greater extent with the Internet but that does not seem to have happened: the dates for Internet citations for Vol. VIII, published in 2015, range over 2003-2012, with only one citation for 2012 and less than 50% of all bearing the date of either 2010 or 2011, while for Vol. IX, published in 2016, the range is 2000-2012, with four citation for 2012 and just under 50% published in 2010 and 2011, that is little difference in this respect between volumes VIII and IX. In point of fact, in terms of recency of excerption vis-à-vis publication date, internet citations for Vol. VII, published in 2013, have a much better showing: the range is similar, i.e., 2003-2012, but texts published in 2010-2012 account for two thirds of all citations with almost half of them (31% of all citations) bearing the date of 2012. It is as if Volumes VII-IX, or possibly also Vol. X, were being prepared at one go, at least as far as the use of the Internet as a source of citations is concerned.

Dictionaries turn out to have been relied on most heavily in Volumes I, IV, and II, and much less so in volumes VI- IX, which is when the *nkjp* and the Internet came to be used in the making of the dictionary. An interesting development in evidence as of Vol. VI is the adoption of headwords and definitions from other dictionaries and, at the same time, the adoption of citations from the *nkjp* and/or the Internet. Commenting on the sources of lexical material for his dictionary of colloquialisms Professor Lubaś had to admit (Lubaś, 2001, p. XI) that the headwords – and citations – had to be second-hand; with this development the dictionary has moved some way towards becoming a conveyor belt although, in truth, the scale is small.

Books, both literary fiction and non-fiction, which together have contributed 51.3% of the citations, are said to have been published in 1950–2010, but

the year of publication of particular volumes would be too time consuming to establish given the habit of Polish publishers to quote the date of the current/most recent printing, not to mention the fact that some books are collection of texts originally published much earlier, that is before WWII. Taking the publication dates at face value it turns out that books published in the course of some years were more likely to be included in the reading program than others. The peak years were 1996 – 34 titles; 1983 – 31; 1997 – 30, 2002 – 30, and 1999 – 29 (adding up to exactly a quarter of all books excerpted); by contrast, there were 7 titles for 1987, 5 for 1991, and 6 for 2001. The peak five-year periods were 1996-2000 – 120 titles and 1981-1985 – 105 or, taken together, more than one third of all titles; three books were published in 1935-37 and another three in 2011-2012. On the whole then books as sources of lexical material for the dictionary can be assumed to represent the language of the second half of the 20th century except that, by the editor's own admission, they are second-hand sources (for colloquial language), which must be responsible for the impression a reader has that a significant proportion of what is in the dictionary is either dated or very rare. The figures in this paragraph are for the sources as listed in the front matter to volume IX. One other relevant point: if it is remembered that 17 people participated in the reading program until 1986 and only four afterwards, the figures presented in this paragraph demonstrate how its intensity fluctuated over the years, but that it did not really diminish – on average – in the later period (post-1986).

To see if there is any justification for the impression that at least some headwords in the dictionary are dated or rare, I have selected 99 no-citation headwords/senses from the nine volumes – the first eleven in each volume that had no citations and were unambiguous enough to be easy to check in the corpus – and looked them up in the nkjp. Of the 99 items examined 96 had found their way into the dictionary from other dictionaries, 84 are not in the nkjp (i.e., the full corpus of over 1.5 bn words), and 15 are documented by a total of 74 citations. The dictionaries involved include – among others – a dictionary of student slang, Kaczmarek et al. (1994) (SGS), based on input from students from around the country, except that it was ready for publication in 1973 and was shelved by communist-time censorship as potentially harmful – a source of 23 items among the 99 senses; a dictionary of argot, Kania (1995) 8/99; a dictionary of sexual vocabulary, Lewinson (1999) (SSP), itself based on 17 dictionaries published between 1913-1996 and almost 150 scholarly texts on the subject published between 1909-1995, 18/99. There are in the Lewinson dictionary over 1500 words for prostitute – twenty of them are in the set of 99 discussed here. Finally, 11 citationless senses out of the 99 are from the Doroszewski (1958-1969) dictionary. These figures are not intended to be in any way representative

of the dictionary. They only show that there is a sizable component of truly second-hand input, some of which is dated and much of which is rare. One example is the form *drała* (II/185), defined as “run away, run fast”, and taken over from the Doroszewski dictionary where we learn that the form had first been recorded in *Słownik Wileński* (Zdanowicz et al., 1861). The illustrative fragment in the Lubaś dictionary is quoted after Doroszewski where it is a citation from Eliza Orzeszkowa, a 19th century writer, and the other two of the citations in Doroszewski’s dictionary coincide with citations in *Słownik Warszawski* (Kartowicz et al., 1900) (literary fiction). Interestingly, being identified as a (defective) verb in the Lubaś dictionary and an interjection in *Słownik Warszawski*, the word is given a verbal definition in the Lubaś dictionary and nominal definitions in the other three dictionaries. It is missing from all the dictionaries published after the Doroszewski dictionary. The two citations in the nkjp (full version) are from 19th c. novels. The point is that although the word does not impress one as exotic – it is obviously related to the reasonably common verb *drałować* “walk fast in the absence of any means of transport” – both dictionary and corpus evidence shows that it is not used much. Other members of the synonym series – *dać dyla*, *dać drapaką*, *dać nogę* – can boast at least 97, 122 and 266 citations respectively (nkjp, full version).

Let us now deal with the mean figure of 1.77 citations per sense for the 1350 ‘human being’ senses. If you open any volume of the dictionary at random you may be confronted by a double page full of citations running over from a previous page, where the entry article starts or, at the other end of the scale, and more commonly, you may be looking at two pages full of short entry articles – up to 30 or more per double page – consisting of a headword or phrase, a brief definition, and reference to the source, often enough another dictionary. Table 3 includes numerical data for no citation and for single citation items for the 1350 senses (9 times 150); in the third row we can see the number of senses documented with two or more citations (150 minus the figures in rows 1 and 2), and in the bottom row are mean numbers of citations per sense for senses documented with two or more citations, as listed in row 3:

Table 3 Data for no citation or single citation

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	Total items/%
No citation	95	66	34	84	54	6	17	14	3	373/27.6
Single citation	35	45	66	45	40	36	58	56	67	448/33.2
2 or more cit.	20	39	50	21	56	108	65	80	80	519/38.4
Number cit/sense	3.8	3.7	4.7	3.3	4.9	4.7	3.1	2.4	2.7	

As can be seen, of the total of 1350 senses 27.6% carry no citations, and another 33.2% are documented with single citations. Single citation status is

reasonably evenly distributed across the nine volumes, no citation occurs particularly frequently in volumes I, II and IV, and is distinctly less common in volumes VI-IX, correlating very well with the dictionary makers' growing reliance on the Internet. Indirectly, this is reflected in the figures for the number of senses documented with two or more citations (the third row) and the figures in the bottom row, that is the number of citations per sense in that group. Two examples will make clear what this is about. Among the first 150 human being senses in Vol. V 54 are not documented at all, 40 are documented with single citations, and 56 are documented with two or more citations. The 274 citations employed to do the job are distributed as follows: eighteen senses are documented with two citations, 7 with 3, 5 with 4, 5 with 5, 10 with 6, 7 with 7, 2 with 9, 1 with 11, and one sense is illustrated by means of twenty eight (28) citations. The message the reader gets is that this is what the team found in the materials they excerpted for the dictionary, almost exclusively from the reading program. The picture is basically representative of volumes I-VI. By contrast, the 212 citations illustrating the 80 two-or-more-citations senses in volume VIII present a very different distribution: 48 senses are illustrated by means of two citations, 29 by 3, and two by four. That is all. Period. The picture is representative of vols. VII-IX.

Again, it is as if each of the volumes were a separate piece of work, a conclusion that is further supported by figures representing mean numbers of entry articles per double page across the nine volumes (Table 4). But before we look at those, another point relevant to citations: if no-citation and single citation entries/senses suggest that not infrequently the teams experienced difficulty securing sufficient documentation, in quite a number of cases we find two citations from a single source or author, e.g., *galopant*, 1(III/19), *jocular* "runner, walker", *kumploszczak* (IV/413), "pal, mate", *pakulszczanka* (VIII/62), "sexually attractive young female"; somewhat less frequently we have three citations from a single author or source, e.g., *deskorolkowiec* (II/53), "skater", *ludzieniek* (IV/537), *tenderly* "human being", *partyjnik* (VIII/192), "(communist) party member"; or as many as four citations from a single source/author: *gazetkowicz* (III/42), *jocular* "reader of *Gazetka*, supplement to *Gazeta Wyborcza* newspaper". A likely conclusion is that either the forms involved have limited range of use or that the sources excerpted failed to supply enough documentation. NB. two citations above means both citations, three – all three, four – all four.

Table 4 Mean number of entry articles

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX
mean entries/double page	18.05	14.08	13.61	17.95	11.35	8.4	11.25	9.26	10.48
range	0-32	1-31	0-30	2-32	0-22	2-19	2-20	2-15	3-17

The distinctly lower figures for Volumes VI-IX, and the lower ranges, translate into longer – on average – entry articles and reflect increasing reliance on, first, nkjp, and then – the Internet as sources of citations. As has been shown in the previous set of figures, well over half of the ‘human being’ senses in Volumes I and IV (63.3 and 56 %) were not documented with citations. The ‘longer – on average – entry articles’ in Vols. VI-IX does not tell the whole story. The data on the previous page on the number of citations per sense for the senses illustrated with two or more citations (bottom row) may be interpreted as illustrating a change in the editors’ approach to lexicographic description: in the early volumes, where lexical material came almost exclusively from printed sources, the teams appear to have been going through page after page after page of text, looking for suitable content which, after processing, ended up in the dictionary, one noticeable side effect being longer citations and – for high frequency items – more citations, up to two or three dozen per sense, sometimes quite long. In the more recent volumes, which involved the increasing use of the nkjp and – especially - the Internet, the search seems to have been more focused, resulting – commonly – in entry articles more equal in size and involving between two and four citations, often quite short.

The figure of 1.8% for genuine conversational material (strictly speaking, movie scripts for one are not authentic conversation and radio/tv talk are not prototypical either) is disappointing. In his introduction to the dictionary Professor Lubaś (2001, p. XI) does concede that natural, everyday conversation would have been the obvious and most appropriate source of lexical material but that – he goes on to say – securing a satisfying volume of authentic conversational data would have been impossible to achieve for technical and economic reasons. It is nevertheless something of an enigma why – of at least three existing sets of transcripts from urban language projects (Dunaj, 1979; Kamińska, 1989, 1992; Lubaś, 1978, 1980; see also Gruchmanowa & Walczak, 1990) only the Lubaś set was excerpted for the dictionary.

What the findings presented above mean is that the editor insisted on complete coverage – everything that met the criteria of colloquiality had to find its way into the dictionary. Since the rich and increasingly richer reading programme failed, apparently, to deliver, the decision was to borrow headwords from existing dictionaries. But general language dictionaries, such as Doroszewski (1958-1969), Dunaj (1996), or Dubisz (2003), do not carry large numbers of colloquial vocabulary so the decision was to draw heavily on publications that specifically focus on colloquial and similar language, including, above all Kaczmarek et al. (1994) (student slang – SGS); Lewinson, 1999 (sexual vocabulary – SSP); and Czeszewski (2001) (youth slang – SSM), as well as, for example, a study of the language of Rzeszów scouts (Kułakowska, 1999). As has

already been demonstrated lexical items (words and phrases) drawn from such sources constitute a significant proportion of the headword list and, characteristically, they are entered in the dictionary in the form they had in the source, together with (often abbreviated) definitions but without citations. Hence the large number of citation-less senses (entries) in the initial volumes. The reader is left to presume that headword forms and definitions were deemed trustworthy enough but the citations were not. The real reason may have been that SGS does not provide citations at all; SSP provides a small number of citations – at least one on every page though usually quite a few – but they all come from literary fiction or poetry, are typically dated, and – considering the focus of the dictionary – appear to have been included to lend it some respectability; SSM does have adequate illustrative material but the bits of text or conversation one finds there remind one of the sort of thing one would associate with foreign language dictionaries or textbooks, i.e., made up examples of typical use, and not genuine citations required for scholarly dictionaries. Of the specialized dictionaries covering similar ground only Kania's dictionary of argot (Kania, 1995, SA) can boast full textual documentation (one citation per sense) but the Lubaś teams found no use for that either. Only in a very small number of cases did they find some use for the illustrative material from SJDP (Doroszewski, 1958-69). The few examples include *alfabeta* N (I/20), *ironical, jocular* "an illiterate person who only knows the alphabet", and *gapcia* N (III/27), *jocular* "an absent-minded person".

Copying material from other dictionaries may come at a cost. In Vol. IV/377 we find the word *krzaczasta*, N, taken over from SGS/43 and defined as "tysy. This strikes a Polish-speaking reader as odd on two counts: the headword looks like an adjective but is marked as a noun; the headword looks feminine but the putative synonym qua definition – an adjective that is more often used as a noun denoting a bald man – is definitely masculine. To solve the puzzle we go to the source (Kaczmarek, et al. 1994) to find that the headword should read *grzqbiel krzaczasta*, a botanical term. The headword was adopted from a dictionary of student slang where it is surrounded by a series of synonyms so its status should be quite transparent to readers of that dictionary – jocular nonce use among biology or botany students – but it would not be immediately obvious to users of the Lubaś dictionary where it is entered in alphabetical order and with no illustration whatever. In other words, context can make a lot of difference. Needless to say, the term is absent from the full version of the nkjp.

An accidental finding I am not prepared to discuss here is that the first 150 'human being' senses are spread over pages 3–40 and 1–42 in Vols. I and IV, respectively, and over pp 36–131 in Vol. II, pp 2–82 in Vol. III, pp 3–93 in Vol. V, pp 1–275 (!) in Vol. VI, pp 1–207 (!) in Vol. VII, pp 3–116 in Vol. VIII, and pp 6–110 in vol. IX.

3. Loans from English

As has been pointed out above, uncritical adoption of headword forms and their definitions from other dictionaries may carry its own risks. One example involves three separate entries (here and elsewhere in the present text the definitions have been translated by myself):

- looser* (IV/534), N, 1. "loser" SSM 128 (Czeszewski, 2001)
- 2. "a person without money" SSM 128 (Czeszewski, 2001)
- luser* (IV/535), N, 'beginning hacker, loser', WS 71 (Chaciński 2003)
- luser* (IV/543), N, "a naïve person" WS 71 (Chaciński, 2003)

For one thing, due to obvious oversight, the forms found on pp. 534 and 535 are listed out of order – they should be moved to p. 543. Secondly, the three are all one and the same word and should be included in a single entry. Finally, *looser* is taken over from SSM 128 together with the definitions but without the illustrative material. In the SSM it is labeled *zast* i.e., overheard, so the compiler never saw it in writing and, instead, created the written form basing on whatever English they commanded, a clear example of somebody's interlanguage English (*lose* and *loose* are notoriously confused by Polish students of English). Another case of two separate entries for what appears to be one and the same word/phrase involves *fak*, *fak*, *fak*, vb. (II/388-9) defined as: *vulgar* "go away, get off my back", and *fuck*, *fuck*, *fuck* vb. imperative (II/500), defined as: *vulgar* "go away, leave me in peace". The two citations come from different sources but the slight difference in wording does not justify the treatment. Exactly the same applies to *frontman* and *frontmen* (II/491) as well as *tiskacz* (V/65) and *tyskacz* (V/91) (from whiskey) – two slightly different forms with minimally different definitions drawn from different sources and treated as separate entries: thus, *frontman* is defined as "dominating member of a rock band who defines its style, often the vocalist", while *frontmen* is defined as "the most important member of a band or the soloist", *tiskacz*, in turn, is *jocular* "whisky", and *tyskacz* is (*jocular*) "whisky – alcohol". Incidentally, alternative spelling forms are recognized in the dictionary, e.g., *of kors/ofkors/ofkoz/ofc* (VII/14), from E "of course, with six out of seven citations having been excerpted from discussion forums, are all listed in a single entry article.

The *looser/luser* and similar examples may serve as an excuse for a brief account of how English lexical influences are dealt with in the dictionary. According to Lubaś (2003, p. 500ff), foreign loans make a "very modest" contribution to Polish colloquial vocabulary (see also Zabawa 2007 for a similar sentiment with respect specifically to the English element, and Korzeniowska & Zięba-Plebankiewicz, 2008). As for English loans in the dictionary I have counted

a total of 1039 senses and 854 entries involving English-origin lexical material, which is equivalent to 3.09 percent of the total number of entries, clearly more than the 1.82 percent in the Dubisz (2003) general Polish dictionary. The total of 854 entries consists of 256 loans proper, 513 derived forms, and 85 calques. Included in the total are a handful of items based on names, real or fictitious, e.g., *batman* (I/126) "public transport employee whose job is to check if passengers have valid tickets", *eisenhowerówka* (II/327), "army jacket", or *Jackson* (III/438) "20 dollar bill", but Polish words with deliberately deformed spelling to make them look English, e.g., *dźqdra* (II/314), N, 1. "jądra", lit. testicles; 2. "something funny"; *fucktycznie* (II/501), ADV. "in fact"; or *qpa* (IV/425), N for *kupa*, or "faeces" are not, even though *fucktycznie* is actually labeled *Anglicism*. Manifestations of the latter behavior are mostly found in electronic communication. Interestingly, of the 256 loans proper only 97 (37.89%) are labeled *Anglicism* or *from English*, while for the derived forms the corresponding percentage is 13.84; for calques it goes down to nothing. Here again there are considerable differences among the volumes. The figures in Table 5 are percentages of items marked *Anglicism/from English* for loans and derived forms taken together (calques are not included) relative to the total number of both in the given volume (N).

Table 5 Percentages of Anglicisms

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX
<i>Anglicisms</i>	21.54	17.44	18.36	21.48	14.89	5.5	76.92	5.2	7.6
N	181	258	147	121	47	36	91	38	13

While the considerable differences in the number of English-origin items in the different volumes – the figures in the N row – may be due to chance, or perhaps reflect differences in the way excerption was carried out, differences in the extent to which items were or were not marked as English are more difficult to explain. Professor Lubaś (2003, p. 500ff) does distinguish between loans proper and derived forms, and predicts that the overall count would be much larger if the latter were included in it, but the solutions adopted in the dictionary can be confusing, and not only with respect to the English element. Thus, *bumaga* (I/311) "official document" and *gieroj* (III/64) *jocular, derisive* "hero, brave man" are marked as Russian, but *bumażka* (I/311), *ironically* "official document", *gierojka* (III/64) "brave, possessive woman", *gierojski* (III/64) "a show-off", or *kułak* (IV/416), *contemptuously* "farm owner, esp. a rich one, employing hired hand" are not; *korekt* "correct" (separate entries for *adj* and *adv*) are marked as English but in Polish they are of French origin. *Eksklusyf* (II/331) "exclusive" is not marked as German nor is *kuch* (IV/395) "yeast pastry", and *oficjel* (VII/14) "public official" is not marked as French. For English, *hatarjowanie*

(III/244) (from how are you), and *lady dla ubogich* (IV/483), (not much of a lady) are labelled English, but *necior* (VI/1), *jocular "internet"* is not, nor is *kuk* (IV/405) "cook" in the language of Rzeszów scouts, or *być det* (I/331) "be completely drunk", or *klip* (IV/169) "music (video) clip", or *klincz* (IV/169) "deadlock". Such omissions and inconsistencies are quite numerous in the dictionary suggesting that specifying the precise status of foreign words and phrases was not a priority.

Of the 479 English-origin items identified in Vols. I, III, V, VII and IX, one hundred and eleven, or 23.2%, are entered in the Dubisz (2003) dictionary of general Polish. The figure can be seen as a rough approximation of the extent of overlap between the two dictionaries. In view of the numerous reports on colloquial vocabulary making inroads into general Polish usage (in addition to the works cited at the beginning of this text cf. also Ożóg, 2001; Smółkowa, 2000), the (open) question is whether there is any chance of general and colloquial lexicons ever becoming part of a single lexicographic description.

4. Gender and feminine forms

A large and lexicographically challenging subset of Polish nouns are those denoting human beings, the reason being the intractable problem of Polish grammatical gender (for a recent overview see Wierzbicka, 2014, cf. also Bobrowski, 2014; Żmigrodzki, 2008, pp. 172-197 provides a useful account of the lexicographic problems involved).

The gender situation has obvious consequences for the way nouns are defined in dictionaries. In the Lubaś dictionary nouns that have 'male human being' as its unique referent have the word *man/of a man (boy/of a boy)* in the definition, e.g., *deskarz* (II/83) "(male) skater. Similarly, when the unique referent is a woman/girl one of these words will appear in the definition, e.g., *babula* (I/72), "old woman". When the referent can be either man or woman, the key word in the definition will be *człowiek* – "human being", e.g., *niemota* (VI/126) "slow-witted human being", *ktoś* – "somebody", e.g., *oko i ucho* (VII/143), lit. eye and ear – "(somebody's) informer", or *osoba* – "person", e.g., *chorągiewka* (I/439) – "a person without their own opinion". This is fair enough. What we are served by the dictionary however is not so straightforward: we find, for example, *lunaticzka* (I/542), definitely feminine with *o osobie* "about a sluggish person"; "łotr spod ciemnej gwiazdy" (V/76), definitely masculine with *ktoś* "somebody wicked, scoundrel", or *paskudnica fem* and *paskudnik masc* (VIII/202-203), both with *o kimś* "about somebody" in their definitions: *paskudnica* is defined as "about sb. ugly, wicked, evil" while *paskudnik* is *jocularly or ironically* "about sb. stubborn, obnoxious", so separate entries seem justified.

The treatment given to feminine forms is a distinguishing characteristic of the dictionary. On the whole, there seem to be many more of them in the Lubaś dictionary than in general dictionaries of Polish which must be a reflection, first – of the difference between standard and colloquial language and, secondly – of a truly descriptive nature of the work, where textual evidence counts for more than conviction or (linguistic) ideology. By coincidence, in 2015 a dictionary was published of Polish *feminitiva*, words that have woman/girl as their unique referent (Małocha-Krupa, 2015). Since Vol. VIII of the Lubaś dictionary was also published in 2015, the obvious thing to do was to compare the *feminitiva* in the two dictionaries. The Małocha-Krupa dictionary, which is of general Polish and is based on excerption of ‘authentic written texts’ including literary fiction, non-fiction, the press as well as numerous Internet sources, has 42 headwords for P-Pa, of which only one – *paskudnica* – is labelled *pot.* ‘coll.’. The dictionary also lists *pankówa* (VIII/121 in the Lubaś dictionary), “(female) enthusiast or performer of punk music; follower of punk style in fashion” but there is no *pot.* ‘coll.’ label next to it. By virtue of being included in the Lubaś dictionary, the word is obviously regarded as colloquial by the editor. By contrast, vol. VIII of the Lubaś dictionary – letters P-Pa – lists 80 feminine human agent headwords and 108 senses. The disproportionate coverage of feminine vocabulary is even more marked when we compare the *feminitiva* dictionary with vol. IX of the Lubaś work (27 vs. 74 entries/80 senses between Pa-Pie), with three words appearing in both of which only one is labelled *pot.* ‘coll.’ in the *feminitiva* book. The two dictionaries are not really comparable because the Lubaś dictionary lists large numbers of expressive words while the Małocha-Krupa work actually excludes such items, e.g., the various emotionally loaded derivatives of *mama* “mother” but the disproportion tells us something about the relation between standard and colloquial Polish. Included in my count of 154/188 *feminitiva* headwords/senses in vols. VIII-IX of the the Lubaś dictionary are forms that have woman/girl in the definition so *paskudnica* is not included because it is defined as “about sb. ugly, wicked, evil”, even though the three citations that follow all refer to females and the word as such has feminine form. The case could thus possibly be moved to the paragraph where questionable decisions are presented (see below, near the end of this paper).

In a patriarchal society, feminine nouns denoting human agents, including job titles, have been subject to debate ever since Polish women won voting rights for themselves in 1919, that is for close to a century (Woźniak, 2014). In the work under review feminine forms are entered and accorded separate entry status which are either missing from general dictionaries, such as *archeolożka* “archeologist”, or *filolożka*, “philologist”, or are included within the entries for masculine forms, such as *kacapka*, *contemptuously* “Russian woman”, or *filozofka*,

"philosopher". With respect to the last example, the entry for the masculine form *filozof* has two senses, 1. "wise person"; 2. *ironically* "smart alec", while the feminine form has three senses, 1. "female scholar in philosophy", 2. "worldly-wise woman", 3. "smart-alecky woman". Noticeably, the citation for the masculine sense 1 is about "my grandmother". Incidentally, the 'basic' sense of the masculine form *filozof* as "scholar in philosophy" is not included in the dictionary because it is part of the standard lexicon.

Even a cursory look at the masculine and feminine nouns denoting human agents and included in the Lubaś dictionary lends support to the conclusion, once again, that the editor's aim was full coverage and symmetry: On the whole there are more masculine forms than feminine forms, e.g., there is *drugi*, "another person of the kind, typically like a celebrity" as in "drugi Adam Małysz", but no *druga*, as in "druga Julia Roberts". An interesting case in this respect is that of *parafianin* (VIII/162) "a backward, stupid, dull person" – among the 307 citations for *parafianin* in the nkjp there are 17 corresponding to the "backward, dull person" sense, all of which have the form of metalinguistic comments to the effect that the form is "dated/dictionary/encyclopaedic". *Parafianka*, on the other hand, has 144 citations in the corpus, none of which corresponds to the "backward person" sense, and it is thus – unsurprisingly – not entered in the dictionary; *piekielnica* (IX/186) "quarrelsome woman" and *piekielnik* (IX/187) "devil; also a person condemned to hell after death" are both entered and accorded separate entry status because – despite formal similarity – they are different words; the masculine forms have more senses than feminine forms, e.g., *krzykacz/krzykaczka* (IV/380), "he/she who talks a lot but does not do much" – 5 to 1 senses; *ogłdacz/ogłdaczka* (VII/30), "viewer" – 3 to 1; *patkarz/patkarka* (VIII/91-2), i.e., contemptuously "spiteful, unjust critic" – 6 to 1; similarly, the masculine senses have more citations than the feminine senses, but there are exceptions, e.g., *kuma 3/kum 2* (IV/417) "neighbor" – 4 to 1, or *kretynka/kretyn* (IV/358-9) contemptuously "about sb. unintelligent, thoughtless, stupid" – 4 to 3, even though feminine forms are used with reference to female humans while masculine forms may refer to males, females, as well as animals or things, as illustrated by one of the citations for *kretyn*, which has a monkey as the referent. Often enough, the masculine form is documented with citations, the feminine form is borrowed from another dictionary, e.g., *kamrat/kamratka* (IV/29), "mate", with *kabalarka/kabalarz* (IV/1), "fortune teller" as a rare counterexample, or is supplied by the author of the entry article, e.g., *krytykant/krytykantka* (IV/377), "he/she who enjoys criticizing". Possibly for that reason the definitions of masculine senses are often richer, contain more content, than definitions of feminine senses, as in the case of *nabożnisia/nabożniś* (VI/281), ironically and with criticism "overly, ostentatiously pious man, bigot" vs. "overly pious

woman", or *onetowiec/onetówka* (VII/230-231), disapprovingly "Internet user making use of the Onet web portal, posting comments on it" vs. 'female user of the Onet web portal". There are numerous cases where masculine and feminine forms are entered separately even though their definitions are identical, e.g., *dwunastolatek/dwunastolatka* (II/250), "twelve-year-old", *czepialska/czepialski* (I/567), "woman/man who criticizes someone without a reason, who pokes her/his nose into other people's affairs, usually trivial", or *kaowiec/kaowczyni* (IV/39), "person responsible for organizing cultural events/activities in a community centre", and only a few where the two are collapsed into a single entry, e.g., *jedynak/jedynaczka* (III/513), "only child", *mądralińska/mądraliński* (V/157), derisively "somebody pretending to be very smart", or *jeden/jedna* N (III/507) "unspecified person". Where masculine and feminine forms have different definitions and there are no citations, the definitions often come from different dictionaries e.g., *dupol/dupola* (II/234), vulgar "stupid, naive person" vs. negatively valued "woman, usu. young". Let it be noted, however, that when compared to SJPD the Lubaś dictionary turns out to be quite user friendly, at least where feminine forms are involved. In SJPD feminine forms are not defined, the reader being referred to the masculine form, in the Lubaś dictionary they are afforded their own definitions, e.g., *gapowiczka* N (III/31), "female passenger without a ticket", or *łapiduszka*, N (V/37), *jocular* "nurse".

To sum up this section, in the context of colloquial language's gradual rise to respectability, or at least its recognition as a legitimate variety, the Lubaś dictionary may be seen as a complement to dictionaries of general Polish the way they have been so far. This is what comparison with Małocha-Krupa's work may be taken to imply. It is thus perhaps not at all surprising that vol. I of the Lubaś dictionary covers the letters A-Ć, precisely as does SJP. A question was posed in the preceding section (English lexical influences in colloquial Polish) whether the two could not be collapsed into one.

5. Tests of coverage

It is always tempting to find fault with a dictionary for not having included one item or another that the reviewer thinks should be there. I have looked up several dozen items quoted in Bańko and Kłosińska (1994) (conversational items not found in dictionaries) and Handke (2011) (new vocabulary in everyday use) as well as items that came my way while this review was coming into being and found only a handful of them missing in the Lubaś work, of which at least some are too recent to have made it into the dictionary. For example, the common phrase *(po)jechać/iść po bandzie* "engage in risky behavior, take things too far" is illustrated in the full version of nkjp by a single citation in 1996, 2 in 2001, 17

in 2005, and 112 in 2008 – Volume I of the dictionary went to the press in 2000. Here is one difference between printed and online dictionaries. Strictly speaking, the phrase is indeed missing from Vol. I but what looks like a related form *pić po bandzie* “drink heavily” can be found in Vol. IX/181. However, this form is not to be found in the nkjp or in monco ; the 1320 citations of *po bandzie* in monco are dominated by combinations with the verbs (*po*)*jechać*, *lecieć* and their derivatives, including nouns but there are also rare uses with e.g., *grać* or *żartować* “play” or “joke” which means that *pić po bandzie* could be regarded as a nonce extension rather than a set phrase. Another example is *ciacho* “attractive young male”, with 17 attestations in the balanced subcorpus of the nkjp, the earliest dated 2003. It is basically the same story with the phrases *o co ci biega* “what’s your problem”, and *włazić/wchodzić komuś) bez wazeliny* “brown-nose sb”. The few omissions that are clearly there might possibly not have occurred had the team been able to include more authentic conversation among their data sources. Some examples are *dziękuję* “thank you” (in answer to a compliment), *dobrze* “well” when starting a move or cutting in, *chciałem/chciałam* literally “I wanted”, as a more polite version of *chcę* “I want”, *nie wiem* “I don’t know” to mark uncertainty, as in “There were, I don’t know, twenty people at the meeting”. It could be argued though that of the two layers of colloquial vocabulary, viz. emotionally neutral and emotionally loaded (expressive) (cf. Zdunkiewicz-Jedynak, 2006, p. 85), it is the latter that is the main focus of the dictionary.

A further test of coverage involved 100 items selected from a dictionary of rhyming phrases said to be characteristic of colloquial Polish (Nagajowa, 2005). The items selected for this part of the study were ones that looked familiar and were not proverbs or aphorisms (excluded from the Lubaś dictionary by design, cf. Lubaś, 2001, p. XV). Of the 100 items checked, 81 are in the dictionary. Unsurprisingly, the items included in the Lubaś dictionary are those with fair to large numbers of contexts in the nkjp, e.g., *jako tako*, “so so”, 6023 paragraphs in the balanced nkjp, or *ni pies ni wydra*, “neither fish nor fowl”, 32 paragraphs in the balanced corpus; those that are missing from the Lubaś dictionary are either also missing from the corpus or have a small number of paragraphs: *chora na bachora*, “a female who is very eager to have sex”, not in the corpus, or *dzieci śmieci*, a condescending form of address to a group of children, 1 paragraph in the corpus. Nagajowa (2005) was a one-woman project, based on notes the author had been collecting for over twenty years. Noticeably, each of the more than one thousand entries has one sense next to it, and the form of some of the head phrases appears not to be canonical. For example, while *obietanka cacanka* is defined by Nagajowa as “empty promise”, the Lubaś dictionary has an entry for *obietanka*, N, “an empty promise”, and another entry for *obietanki cacanki* (*a głupiemu radość*), *usu. pl.* “insincere, hollow promises”; in the corpus,

in turn, we find two paragraphs for the singular form of the phrase *obiecanka cacanka*, and 81 paragraphs for the plural *obiecanki cacanki*. Semantically, *obiecanka* and *obiecanki cacanki* amount to the same, except that the latter is a proverb-like phrase, and the difference between the singular and plural forms of the phrase is that the plural form is by far the more common. As for senses, Nagajowa has one for *hocki-klocki, jocular, condescending* “trivia, unimportant things people say” where Lubaś has as many as six. Another example are phrases with *ani ... ani*, of which there are seven in the Nagajowa dictionary and as many as 12 in the Lubaś dictionary, but one phrase included in the former is missing from the latter (*ani tak ani siak*, “in no way, neither good nor bad”; 8 paragraphs in balanced nkjp). For the most part, the phrases in the Nagajowa dictionary represent one person’s native speaker competence, so it is hardly surprising that Nagajowa and Lubaś ascribe different meanings to some of the phrases, e.g., *dialogi na cztery nogi* is *jocular* “sexual intercourse” in the former and “conversation that does not make any sense” in the latter, with corpus evidence – 52 paragraphs in the full nkjp and 25 contexts in monco, favouring Lubaś’ interpretation.

Nagajowa’s work is no match for the Lubaś dictionary, focusing, as it does on only a fragment of the Polish colloquial lexicon. But it is noteworthy that the Lubaś dictionary lists more of the rhyming phrases and gives them more adequate, evidence-based treatment. Compare this with the remarks, below, about phraseology and vulgar language. Learners of Polish as a foreign language or, more likely, developers of learning/teaching aids for such people, will no doubt appreciate the very copious phraseology in the dictionary: there are, for example, 116 phrases with *co, particle* and *adverb*, “what” in the Lubaś dictionary, as against 28 such phrases in the large phraseological dictionary (Müldner-Nieckowski, 2003). For the verb *iść/chodzić* “go on foot, walk”, there are 65 phrases in the phraseological dictionary against 158 phrases in the Lubaś dictionary where we find, in addition, 69 phrases with *idzie* (3rd person sg) and 16 senses of (coś komuś) *idzie/szło/poszło/pójdzie* spread over 5.5 pages. Finally, there are 44 phrases with the verb *pchać*, “push”, in the dictionary under review, compared to 3 – three – in the phraseological dictionary. That is some difference. And it is Polish as she is spoke, no question about it. Note, by the way, that each phrase is entered separately, which makes comparisons between this dictionary and other dictionaries in terms of the number of entries pointless. Hence, also, my preference for counting senses rather than headwords.

Some readers may find the very numerous instances of vulgar usage depressing but it all rings true and is very well documented: there would be little point pretending such language does not exist (cf. e.g., Taras, 2011). The inclusion of vulgar items in a dictionary like the one discussed here deserves a comment as well, and some data too. There is mounting evidence that vulgar language is

spreading to more and more people of both sexes, all ages, and all walks of life, and is seen and heard in a widening range of contexts and situations of language use (cf. e.g., Lubaś, 2003, pp. 208-210) leading, inevitably, to devulgarization (Kowalikowa, 2008; see also Biernacka-Ligieza, 2005; Będkowska-Kopczyk, 2009; Grybosiova, 1998/2003; Statkiewicz, 2000): with a growing number of speakers what used to be regarded as positively vulgar has been morphing into unmarked, everyday language. It is also noteworthy – in the context of the present review – that while the editor relied heavily on existing, specialized dictionaries, e.g., of student slang (SGS) or sexual vocabulary (SSP), Grochowski's dictionary of vulgar language (1995), while listed among the sources consulted/excerpted, has been exploited only sparingly for entry words/phrases, and not at all for the illustrative material.

The most common ugly word in Polish is the multifunctional noun *kurwa*, *lit.* "whore", much in use as a swear word, a vulgar interjection, and a hesitation noise. The basic form alone appears in 4606 contexts in the balanced version of the nkjp. It is represented in the Lubaś dictionary by a total of 93 senses (the basic form, morphologically derived forms and phrases; the numerous euphemisms are not included in the count) and illustrated by 181 citations, of which 32 are from other dictionaries and 2 were supplied by KU. That is, 147 citations, or more than 80%, are from fiction, non-fiction and the press. By contrast, in the Grochowski dictionary there are 45 senses and 108 examples. The number of examples per sense is higher in the Grochowski dictionary (2.4 vs. 1.95), but of the 108 examples in his dictionary 69, or 64%, represent the compiler's native speaker intuition. Eight senses, including 5 phrases, were taken over by the Lubaś team from the Grochowski dictionary, but not even one "citation". One phrase that was conspicuously not taken over from the Grochowski dictionary is *kurwa nie do zdarcia* (*about a prostitute*) "resilient, one that cannot be exploited beyond repair" (my interpretation). Putting native speaker intuition aside, we look at dictionary evidence to find that the phrase is not as in the Grochowski dictionary but, instead, *nie do zdarcia* (Bańko, 2000; Bańko et al., 1992; Dubisz, 2003) and it can take both human and non-human subjects. There are 74 paragraphs with the phrase in the balanced nkjp, 474 in the full version, with a wide range of subjects but, surprise, surprise, *kurwa* is not one of them. The 'phrase' is also absent from the much larger monco corpus (monco.frazeo.pl; more than 3.3 billion words). What follows from this little exercise is that the Lubaś dictionary turns out, again, to be a prime example of the good old evidence-based lexicography, at least much has been done for it to be so.

A somewhat different picture emerges when the dictionary is tested against the examples in Dąbkowski (2015), a report on an internet dictionary of slang and colloquial (conversational) language (<http://www.miejski.pl/>) that was launched in 2006 as a grassroots project based on crowdsourcing. The conclusion

has to be that the Lubaś dictionary is of the old school, where text printed on paper was king: even if the Internet came to be relied on as of vol.VI it has been above all as a source of citations, not the headwords, hence the absence of typical electronic communication vocabulary in it.

6. Usage labels

This is a dictionary of colloquial vocabulary, so the label *pot(oczny)* 'coll(ocual)' is assumed to apply to all headwords/phrases. For that reason the label is not used. But one of the defining characteristics of colloquial words and phrases is emotional load (e.g., Zgólkowa, 1991), which means that extensive use of appropriate labels could be expected. Among the 1350 senses selected for closer examination a total of 569 are accompanied by a usage label, of which 26, or 4.6 %, are for nonce formations or items restricted to a register or region. That is, 543 out of 1350 senses, or 40 %, carry at least one label saying that the word is emotionally loaded. Judging by the evidence of other dictionaries, this number – and the percentage – could be higher. Thus *dinosaur 2* (II/66), "vintage pop star who continues to be popular", labelled *żartobliwie* "jocular" in Dubisz (2003) and Sobol (2007), carries no label in the Lubaś dictionary, nor does *pajac 2* (VIII/47), "inappropriately dressed person", labelled *lekceważąco* "depreciating" in Dunaj (1996) and Dubisz (2003), or *damulka* (II/37), "pretentious woman", labelled *lekceważąco* "depreciating" in Dubisz (2003) and *z silnym odcieniem żartobliwym lub z niechęcią* "strongly jocular or unfriendly" in Dunaj (1996). In the Lubaś dictionary *pejsak* and *pejsaty* (IX/92), both referring to (male) Jew, are labelled *pogardliwie* "contemptuous", but *pejs*, a synonym, has no label, although corpus evidence suggests it should. *Pedał 2* (IX/73), "(male) homosexual" is correctly labelled *wulgarnie, pogardliwie* "vulgar, contemptuous", similarly as in other dictionaries, while *pedał 3* (IX/73) has no label, which happens to be correct, except that a brief note would be welcome to the effect that it applies to situations where the word is used by homosexuals when talking about other homosexuals, including themselves, as implied by one of the citations which is from Robert Biedroń's blog (an open gay politician), a note that would not be very different from the one accompanying *pedałówka* (IX/77) *bez negatywnego nacechowania* "with no negative marking" – "female friend of a gay man". Such an explicit disclaimer is fully justified in view of the fact that the word is obviously related to the very vulgar and contemptuous *pedał*.

Of the 43 emotional load labels four come up in every single volume and, taken together, these four account for well over half of all tokens: *żartobliwie* "jocular" – 108, *lekceważąco* "depreciating" – 81, *pogardliwie* "contemptuous" – 69, *ironicznie* "ironical" – 55 = 313 out of 543, i.e., 57.6%). Twenty one of the

labels, almost 50 %, are used with 1 to 7 tokens, mostly just one, with no additional qualification felt to be necessary. By contrast, the remaining 22 labels, typically used with larger numbers of tokens, appear to have been considered too ambiguous, or insufficiently precise, and another label was added (sometimes as many as two). For example, *gniewnie* "angrily" is used with 12 items and in nine cases – 75% - another label is considered necessary, with *niechętnie* "hostile" it is 10 out of 16 (62.5%), and in the case of *ironicznie* "ironically" it is 33 out of 55 tokens (60%). Altogether, of the 543 items carrying emotional load labels 157 – 28.9% – required further qualification (NB. the additional labels are identical or very similar to the "main" labels, and they are not included in the overall count). Twenty one of the labels are single word ones (ADV), occasionally modified by *nieco* "somewhat", or *niekiedy* "sometimes"; 22 labels are prepositional phrases, e.g., *z podziwem* 'with admiration', *z politowaniem* 'with pity', in one case the "label" is a descriptive statement *przechodzi do języka ogólnego* "is in the process of becoming part of general (standard) Polish", i.e., losing its colloquial status; the item is *okulistka* (VII/173) "female eye doctor". The six tokens of *z zabarwieniem dodatnim* (vols. I, IV, VII) and seven tokens of *pozytywnym nacechowaniem* (vols. VIII and IX), "with positive marking" are so similar that entry article writers' personal preference cannot be excluded.

As for positive vs negative emotional load – leaving unclear cases aside, above all the 108 tokens of *zartobliwie* "jocular" – we are left with 50 positively labelled items and 380 negatively labelled items, or 11.63 to 88.37%, a numerical version of the statement that in texts we observe a wider range of negative emotions and the relevant words are more common (cf. e.g., Lubaś, 2003, p. 204). Out of context many of the items labelled *zartobliwie* "jocular" are hard to classify as either positive or negative, e.g., *kapłanek* (IV/43), *jocular* "chaplain, priest", but close to one third of the time the label is supplemented with another label, and that can be quite explicit, one way or the other, e.g., *nervusek* (VI/5-6), *jocular, tenderly* "a nervous man, child, person", *łysa pała* (VI/90) *jocular, offensive* "bald man", *tysolec* (VI/93) *jocular, warm-hearted* "bald child", *niewykształciuch* (VI/202) *jocular, contemptuous* "person without higher education". Then there are items where the use of labels makes it clear that emotional load can be variable and context-dependent: *diablica* (II/61) *with admiration or anger* "about a (bad) woman", *paker 1* (VIII/55) *both positively and negatively* "about someone who is on anabolic steroids to improve their body build", or *pegeerówka* (IX/90) *usually depreciating* "young woman on a collective farm or residing in a village where there was a collective farm". This last point may actually be taken to apply not just to the three examples above for emotional load can be a property not only of words but of entire texts or text fragments (cf. e.g., Fontaine et al., 2013). What the reader may miss is a list of usage labels with definitions, especially as so many of them are used in the dictionary.

7. Some doubtful cases

What has been presented thus far makes it clear that the dictionary is not very homogenous: side by side with content – viz. headwords and definitions that go with them – that is very well documented, there is content that is not documented at all. On top of that there is material lifted from other dictionaries, often enough poorly documented (or else, the circumstance that some items are listed in other dictionaries is presumed to count as sufficient documentation). With respect to definitions, this has led to solutions that are hardly user friendly. Thus, there are definitions which leave the reader thoroughly uninformed, e.g., *byszur*, N (I/357) or *mudak*, N (V/252), both defined as “man”, *dipis*, N (II/67), defined as “immigrant” (cf. displaced person), or *funkować/fankować*, vb. (II/396) defined as “to play music”. Contrast this with the rich definition of e.g., *kretyn* (IV/338) *insulting, contemptuous* “of a man or boy, also figuratively about sth negatively valued, of someone unintelligent, thoughtless, displaying irritating behavior or looks”. Then there are numerous nominal forms defined by means of adjectives, e.g., *aligant* (I/21) “dressed without taste”; *drobina* (II/203) “overweight, lumbering”; *herbatnik* (III/285) “abandoned”; *kostusia* (IV/299) “thin, haggard”; *kucyk* (IV/398) “short”; and many others like them. The reader has to be a native speaker of Polish to be able to guess that all of these refer to people; to decide what contribution such items make to an utterance one would have to have access to that utterance or larger text fragment. Furthermore, there are instances where the definition and the citation are not wholly compatible: *panusia* 1 (VIII/117) “lady”, is described as involving positive emotion, but the *panusia* in the citation strikes me as condescending or patronizing; *narzygać* vb. (V/499) is defined as “to vomit”, but the citation makes it obvious that the form requires further specification, such as “na coś/na kogoś/do czegoś” (on sb or sth or into sth) to distinguish the form from *rzygać*, i.e., “to vomit”; the citation to illustrate *ojciec* 1. (VII/87) *familiar* “about father or elderly man” would more appropriately accompany the standard, non-colloquial sense of the word (“father”), albeit used in a jocular way.

Most uninspiring are cases where a series of words taken over from another dictionary are entered separately and given identical definitions, e.g., *alkochemik*, *alcohol*, *alkoholas*, *alkoholomierz*, *alkoholog*, *alkoholikus* (I/21), all separately defined – and, in this particular case, all on the same page – as “drunk”, “drunkard”, “someone who likes to wet his whistle”. Another example of the same involves *glon* (III/78) *tajza* (V/19), *neptek* (VI/3) and numerous others, all defined as *about a man* “unfriendly, harming others, taking advantage of them”. The source in both cases, and in many others, is SGS, a thesaurus-like dictionary where the putative synonyms are made more precise through the use of usage labels.

Circularity creeps in occasionally, especially when a number of similar forms mean roughly the same thing: *leniuch/leniuszek/leniowiec* (IV/508-509) "lazy person" or *któtlowiec/któtnica/któtnicka/któtnicki/któtnik* (IV/186) "person given to quarreling". Alternative forms seem to create problems; on p. 233, vol. IV there is the entry *kolubryna/kolumbryna*, N 1. "ironically about sb. large, awkward, lumbering, overweight, esp. of a woman", and on the same page we have another entry *kolumbryna/kolubryna*, N, defined as "fat woman". The first entry is based on the team's own excerpt, the other is borrowed from another dictionary. One wonders whether the two entries could not be collapsed into one. As a matter of fact, there are in the dictionary numerous cases of entries involving multiple senses, some of which are quoted verbatim from other dictionaries and happen to be minimally different from some of the other senses but which, it seems, could easily be combined with them. Examples include *bęcwał* (I/165) "dolt" – 8 senses; or *frajer* (II/480) "silly fool" – 13 senses. In a similar way, *kawałek muzyka/malarza* and *kawałek artysty/filologa*, etc. (IV/85) "something of a musician, etc." are accorded separate entries in spite of very similar definitions which happen to have been taken over from different dictionaries. Needless to say, there are no citations here. On the other hand, *kawał babska; kawał baby/kobiety/kobity; kawał dziewuchy* – all referring to females with varying degrees of neutral to positive emotional involvement, and *kawał chama; kawał chłopa; kawał chuja; kawał czorta*, etc. – all referring to males with varying degrees of negative emotional involvement - (IV/82-86), despite obvious parallelism, are demonstrated – through the use of citations – to deserve separate treatment. Whether the same applies to *kląć jak dorożkarz; kląć jak dragon; kląć jak furman* (IV/154), "swear with great vehemence", or to *kompletny dureń, kompletny fiot, kompletny idiota, kompletny imbecyl, kompletny osioł* (IV/253), "utter idiot, etc." is not obvious (separate entries with identical definitions). A case of gross inconsistency involves the entries *parówa* and *parówka* (VIII/182). Strictly speaking there are two entries with *parówa* as the headword: one with 5 senses, numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 (no sense 3), and one with a single sense, labelled *only singular*, and defined as "very hot, humid air". The entry for *parówka*, also with 5 senses, has sense 1 labelled *only singular* and defined as "very hot, humid air". Another questionable solution of the homonymy/polysemy problem concerns the entries for *bum* 8 (I/311) "jobless, often also homeless person" and *bumbs/bums* (I/312) "homeless person" (from English "bum").

Some other potentially doubtful cases include: Is *leżeć do góry dupą* (IV/518) "do nothing, laze around", not vulgar?, Are *ciemno jak u Murzyna* (I/483) *adv. jocular* "completely dark" and *dostać opeer* (II/159) "to be given a dressing down", not euphemisms? *Lukadło* (IV/540), *jocular* "mirror", is said to have been supplied by Renarda Lebda, a member of the entry article writing team, but the

word can be found in Czeszewski (2001, p. 129), a dictionary listed among the sources consulted, or indeed excerpted for the Lubaś dictionary. Is this to be taken to mean that the sources listed in the front matter to each volume were excerpted selectively? That does not appear to have been the case with the very numerous words for “prostitute” adopted from SSP. The way *dupokrata* (II/234) *bawdy, malicious* “a democrat”, *kosiarz* (IV/294) “knifer”, *otyliada* (VII/394) “athletic successes of the butterfly champion Otylia Jędrzejczak” or *cizia na ciof/ciow* (I/510) “an approachable, sexually attractive young female” are handled – definitions, citations – implies that they are highly restricted (possibly nonce formations) but there is no indication to that effect (save the demonstrative *tu*, or here, in the definition of *kosiarz*). As it happens, in the full version of the nkjp there are two citations for *dupokrata*, two for *otyliada*, and none for *cizia na ciof/ciow*. Now, I would be the last person to propose that rare or dated lexemes should not be listed in dictionaries – where else would one be looking for such items? The dictionary under review can actually be said to be something of a monument to Polish speakers’ (or writers’) lexical ingenuity. One would nevertheless expect the information provided to be reasonably full.

8. Suggestions for improvements

Just in case another edition, or printing, is contemplated, here are some hints for minor improvements, mostly purely technical/typographical – no claim to exhaustiveness is made: *babcia* (I/58-59) “grandmother, etc.” – senses 5 and 6 are missing (similarly, as has already been pointed out, sense 3 is missing in the article for *parówa* (VIII/182)), sense 4 is missing in the entry article for *piq tak* (IX/165), and *paluch* (VIII/85) has two senses identified as 5; *bateria* (I/125) has only one sense, so 1. is superfluous; it is exactly the same with *petować* (IX/131) “stub out a cigarette”; restricted currency (1950s) is indicated for *bikiniarz* (I/190) “a man dressed in extravagant, Western-style clothes and behaving in extravagant ways” but not for derivatives *bikiniarski* (I/189) “western, American” and *bikiniarstwo* (I/189) “western, American lifestyle”; *klawiszmen* (IV/154) “jazz pianist” comes after *klawiszowiec* (IV/153) “keyboardist”, i.e., out of alphabetical order (as do the entries for *looser* and *luser* (IV/534 and 535) relative to *luser* (IV/543) mentioned earlier); part of speech label is missing from the entry for *kawał babska* (4/82) *unfriendly* “about a negatively perceived woman”; *środowiskowe* (restricted range) label is attached to *komis* (IV/248) “make-up examination”, but not to *komisarz* “student who is granted another chance at taking an exam”; pronunciation (stress) is indicated for *korekt adverb* but not for *korekt adjective*; similarly, pronunciation is not indicated for *oldtimer* (VII/196) “vintage vehicle, vintage sea-going vessel” and its derivatives; *lunatyczka*

(IV/542) “sluggish person” is adopted from SGS but no page reference is quoted; in the definition of *osa* (VII/316) “someone given to making biting remarks, treating others in a spiteful way”, the comma between “osoba” and “uszczypliwie” is superfluous; part of speech label is missing in the entry for *pajaczysko* (VIII/50), *ironically, contemptuously* “clown, buffoon, flippant, irresponsible person”; the first citation at *pan od fikołków* (VIII/123), “PE teacher” from the *Polityka* newspaper has no date; type of source (novel) is not specified for *parobas 2* (VIII/179) “young farmer”; the name of the political faction *Polska Jest Najważniejsza* (IX/91) is abbreviated to PJN, not PJT. The given name of R. Lebda is Renarda, not Renata (front matter to vol. I/XXXV); similarly, on the reverse of the title page to vol. IX Katarzyna Skowronek is renamed as Krystyna. The date in the middle of the right-hand column on p. 88 (vol. IX) should probably read 07.12.1993 and not 19993; *pazerny* (IX/34), “greedy, avaricious; rapacious”, taken over from Dubisz 2003/III/7, is marked as N, instead of ADJ. The reference to NSI/120 in the entry for e.g., *dolarowiec* (II/122) ‘owner of US dollars’ would perhaps be more helpful if it ran as NS 2, I/120. But it is appreciated that more than five thousand pages of man-made dictionary text can hardly be expected to be flawless.

9. Overall evaluation

For all its shortcomings the dictionary is great fun to thumb through and browse, especially where there is evidence the job has been done properly, i.e., the text has resulted from the team’s own excerption of original sources. Particularly noticeable are the numerous cases where the definition is complemented by comprehensive, highly apposite citations, some running for half a column or more, giving the reader a perfect idea of what is involved and this in a way that no lexicographic definition can match. Some outstanding examples can be found in the entry articles for *kompociarz* (IV/253) “drug addict who drinks *kompot*, poppy straw infusion”, *kundel 2.* (IV/424) “about sb who is negatively perceived, who is not a member of an in-group or elite”, *kuroniówka 2.* (IV/443) “soup”, *ogon 5.* (VII/43) “tail”, *palant 2.* (VIII/65) “emotionally underdeveloped man, skirt-chaser, ladykiller”, *parasolniczka* (VIII/167) *jocular* “a girl with an umbrella”. Admittedly, on its own, the definitions of e.g., *kuroniówka* or *ogon* look as useless as some of the definitions presented earlier in this text – it is the citations that make all the difference.

As Poland’s leading sociolinguist, the editor made sure sociolinguistic (and pragmatic) information has been given the attention it deserves (cf. Kuryło, 2005). This, in fact, is one of the unique features of the dictionary, although earlier attempts in this direction had been made in Bogustawski and Wawrzyńczyk (1993), and Bańko (2000). Thus, with headwords or senses that resulted from the team’s own excerption of original texts there is explicit information in the

entry articles about the type of text excerpted, who produced the utterance (a character or the narrator), speaker's and addressee's sex, age, education, occupation, social background, place of residence, relative social standing of the speaker and his/her interlocutor, as well as the situation of language use, i.e., private, public, local, general, semi-/official. It goes without saying that such information would have been much more useful if the excerption involved genuine conversational texts. This applies even more strongly to exclamations, another – truly unique – type of entry in the dictionary.

To sum up. This is an impressive chunk of lexicographic work, albeit unfinished. The laudable attempt at complete coverage of the colloquial lexicon has been reasonably successful, as far as it goes, up to the turn of 20/21 centuries. The work is uneven – side by side with truly excellent product, the fruit of the team's own excerption and analysis, the reader is confronted with material of poorer quality taken over from other, older dictionaries. The fact that a sizable proportion of the headwords are rare and/or dated is not a problem, but the continuing expansion of colloquial speech and its unstoppable invasion of all forms of communication creates a need for more work of this kind with a focus on current usage and with more attention being paid to first-hand source materials, including authentic conversation, and – increasingly – electronic communication. The approach to colloquiality implemented in the dictionary is fully consistent with the editor's views as expounded – above all – in Lubaś (2013) as well as in, e.g., Lubaś (1996) and Lubaś (1999).

At several points in this review it has been made known that the dictionary is the result of collaboration involving – initially – 17 people, a number that went down to just four after 1986 but additionally involved the cooperation of another two persons, all under the leadership of the late Professor Władysław Lubaś. The exact nature of the collaboration cannot be gleaned – in any reliable way – from the final product, but it is clear that most of the people who got involved in the work at the early stage were junior academics some of whom – with the passage of time – got intimately involved in linguistic scholarship, including various aspects of colloquial language, sociolinguistics, pragmatics and lexicography and can thus be assumed to have contributed to the project, directly or indirectly, a lot more than just the usual spadework, or drudgery. This applies at the very least to the three collaborators who stayed with the project – on and off – throughout its lifetime, i.e., Elżbieta Kuryło (e.g., 1997, 2005, see also Kuryło & Urban, 1994, 2003), Renarda Lebda (e.g., 2003, 2013) and Krystyna Urban (e.g., 1979, 1983, 1990a, 1990b), as well as Aldona Skudrzykowska (e.g., 1992, 1994) and Jacek Warchała (e.g., 1994, 1995, 2003, see also Warchała & Skudrzyk, 2005, 2007), even though the last two did not quite subscribe to prof. Lubaś' take on colloquiality (cf. Lubaś, 2010).

Abbreviations

monco – monco.frazeo.pl

nkjp – *Narodowy korpus języka polskiego* (National Corpus of Polish), nkjp.pl

NSI – see Smótkowa (Ed.) (1998)

SA – see Kania (1995)

SGS – see Kaczmarek et al. (1993)

SJPD – see Doroszewski (1958-1969)

SSM – see Czeszewski (2001)

SSP – see Lewinson (1999)

SSPA – see Widawski (1997)

USJP – see Dubisz (2003)

WS – see Chaciński (2003)

References

- Anusiewicz, J. (1992). Potoczność jako sposób doświadczania świata i jako postawa. In J. Anusiewicz & F. Nieckuła (Eds.), *Potoczność w języku i w kulturze* (pp. 10-20). Wrocław: Wiedza o kulturze.
- Anusiewicz, J., & Skawiński, J. (1996). *Słownik polszczyzny potocznej*. Warszawa – Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Bańko, M. (2000). *Inny słownik języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Bańko, M. (Ed.). (2006). *Polszczyzna na co dzień*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Bańko, M., & Kłosińska, A. (1994). Polszczyzna mówiona nieobecna w słownikach. In Z. Kurzowa & W. Śliwiński (Eds.), *Współczesna polszczyzna mówiona w odmiennie opracowanej (oficjalnej)* (pp. 89-95). Kraków: Universitas.
- Bańko, M., Krajewska, M., & Sobol, E. (Eds.). (1992). *Słownik języka polskiego: suplement*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Bartmiński, J. (2001/2012). Styl potoczny. In J. Bartmiński (Ed.), *Współczesny język polski* (pp. 115-134). Lublin Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Będkowska-Kopczyk, A. (2009). Przekleństwa jako przykład łamania tabu. In A. Dąbrowska (Ed.), *Tom jubileuszowy* (pp. 209-224). Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Biernacka-Ligięza, I. (2005). Wulgaryzmy w prasie alternatywnej. In A. Dąbrowska & A. Nowakowska (Eds.), *Życzliwość i agresja w języku i kulturze* (pp. 315-325). Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Bobrowski, I. (2014). Rodzaj gramatyczny w języku polskim i jego genderowe implikacje. In M. Karwatowska, R. Litwiński, A. Siwiec, & B. Jarosz (Eds.), *O płci, ciele, seksualności w języku i mediach* (pp. 39-49). Lublin Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Bogustawski, A., & Wawrzyńczyk, J. (1993). *Polszczyzna jaką znamy. Nowa sonda słownikowa*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Boniecka, B. (2013). *Strukturuwanie potoczności w komunikacji werbalnej*. Lublin Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Chaciński, B. (2003). *Wypasiony słownik najmłodszej polszczyzny*. Kraków: Znak.
- Czeszewski, M. (2001). *Słownik slangu młodzieżowego*. Piła: Wydawnictwo Ekolog.
- Czeszewski, M. (2006). *Słownik polszczyzny potocznej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Czyżewska, M., & Frączek, A. (2004). Przyszłość słowników w Polsce (conference report). *Poradnik Językowy*, 6, 73-77.

- Dąbkowski, G. (2015). Miejski słownik slangu i mowy potocznej. In E. Wierzbicka-Piotrowska (Ed.), *Dialog pokoleń w języku potocznym, w języku wsi i miasta, w literaturze, w publicystyce, w tekstach kultury* (pp. 371-378). Warszawa: Towarzystwo Kultury Języka.
- Dąbrowska, A. (Ed.). (2009). *Tabu w języku i kulturze*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Doroszewski, W. (Ed.). (1958-1969). *Słownik języka polskiego*. Vols. I-XI. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Dubisz, S. (Ed.). (2003). *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego*. Vols. I-IV. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Dunaj, B. (1979). *Wybór tekstów języka mówionego mieszkańców Krakowa*. Kraków.
- Dunaj, B. (1996). *Słownik współczesnego języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wilga.
- Fontaine, J. J., Scherer, R. K., & Soriano, C. (Eds.). (2013). *Components of emotional meaning. A sourcebook*. Oxford: University Press.
- Grabias, S. (1981). *O ekspresywności języka: ekspresja a słowotwórstwo*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Lubelskie.
- Grochowski, M. (1995). *Słownik polskich przekleństw i wulgaryzmów*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Gruchmanowa, M., & Walczak, B. (Eds.). (1999). *Słownik gwary miejskiej Poznania*. Warszawa – Poznań: Viribus Unitis.
- Grybosiowa, A. (1998/2003). Liberalizacja społecznej oceny wulgaryzmów. In A. Grybosiowa (Ed.), *Język wtopiony w rzeczywistość* (pp. 32-41). Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Handke, K. (2011). Polszczyzna codzienna – geneza i czynniki stabilizujące. *Rozprawy Komisji Językowej ŁTN, LVII*, 57-67.
- Hołowka, T. (1986). *Myślenie potoczne. Heterogeniczność zdrowego rozsądku*. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Kaczmarek, L., T. Skubalanka, & Grabias, S. (1994). *Słownik gwary studenckiej*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Kamińska M. (Ed.). (1989). *Wybór tekstów języka mówionego mieszkańców Łodzi i regionu: generacja najstarsza*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Kamińska, M. (Ed.). (1992). *Wybór tekstów języka mówionego mieszkańców Łodzi i regionu: generacja starsza, średnia i najmłodsza*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Kania, St. (1995). *Słownik argotyzmów*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Karłowicz, J., Kryński, A., & Niedźwiedzki, W. (1900-1927). *Słownik języka polskiego*. Vols. I-VIII. Warszawa.
- Korzeniowska, A., & Zięba-Plebankiewicz, M. (2008). Wpływ języka angielskiego na polszczyznę potoczną. In J. Krieger-Knieja & U. Paprocka-Piotrowska

- (Eds.), *Komunikacja językowa w społeczeństwie informacyjnym* (pp. 213-223). Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.
- Kowalikowa, J. (2009). O wulgaryzacji i dewulgaryzacji we współczesnej polszczyźnie. In A. Dąbrowska (Ed.), *Tom jubileuszowy* (pp. 81-88). Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Kułakowska, M. (1999). Słownictwo i frazeologia środowiskowa rzeszowskich harcerzy. In B. Grzeszczuk (Ed.), *Język. Teoria – dydaktyka* (pp. 99-137). Rzeszów: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna.
- Kuryło, E. (1997). Opis pragmatyczny w słowniku potocyzmów polskich. *Socjolingwistyka*, XV, 33-39.
- Kuryło, E. (2005). Socjolingwistyczne uwarunkowania aktów mowy. *Socjolingwistyka*, XIX, 7-17.
- Kuryło, E., & Urban, K. (1994). Wartościowanie w wypowiedziach publicznych kobiet i mężczyzn. In S. Gajda & Z. Adamiszyn (Eds.), *Przemiany współczesnej polszczyzny* (pp. 113-118). Opole: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna im. Powstańców Śląskich.
- Kuryło, E., & Urban, K. (2003). Socjolingwistyczne aspekty antonimów. *Socjolingwistyka*, XVII, 115-125.
- Lebda, R. (2003). Potoczność – czyli mowa bytu. *Bulletin de la Société Polonaise de Linguistique*, LIX, 113-124.
- Lebda, R. (2013). Od ekspresywności językowej do tańcuchowej metody skojarzeń. In J. Panasiuk & T. Woźniak (Eds.), *Język – człowiek – społeczeństwo. Księga jubileuszowa dedykowana profesorowi Stanisławowi Grabiasowi* (pp. 101-107). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Lewinson, J. (1999). *Słownik seksualizmów polskich*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
- Lubaś, W. (Ed.). (1978/1980). *Teksty języka mówionego mieszkańców miast Górnego Śląska i Zagłębia*. Vols. 1 & 2.
- Lubaś, W. (1996). Kłopoty z wyodrębnieniem potocznej leksyki polskiej. In H. Wróbel (Ed.), *Studia z leksykologii i gramatyki języków słowiańskich* (pp. 7-16). Kraków: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.
- Lubaś, W. (1999). Potoczna odmiana polszczyzny. In B. Wyderka (Ed.), *O kształcie języka. Studia i rozprawy* (pp. 145-152). Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski.
- Lubaś, W. (2000a). Rola słownictwa potocznego w polszczyźnie ostatniego dziesięciolecia. In J. Mazur (Ed.), *Słownictwo współczesnej polszczyzny w okresie przemian* (pp. 59-68). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Lubaś, W. (2000b). O powstającym słowniku potocyzmów. *Język Polski* LXXX (3/4), 161-175.

- Lubaś, W. (2000c). Słownictwo potoczne w mediach. In J. Bralczyk & K. Misiótek-Kłosińska (Eds.), *Język w mediach masowych* (pp. 83-95). Warszawa: Rada Języka Polskiego.
- Lubaś, W. (2001). Introduction. In W. Lubaś (Ed.), *Słownik polskich leksemów potocznych* (pp. II-XXXVII). Kraków: Lexis.
- Lubaś, W. (Ed.), (2001-2016). *Słownik polskich leksemów potocznych*. Kraków: Lexis.
- Lubaś, W. (2003). *Polskie gadanie: podstawowe cechy i funkcje potocznej odmiany polszczyzny*. Opole: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Lubaś, W. (2010). Uzupełnienia do potoczności. In R. Przybylska, J. Kaś, & K. Sikora (Eds.), *Symbolae grammaticae in honorem Bogusłai Dunaj* (pp. 393-401). Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Małocha-Krupa, A. (Ed.). (2015). *Słownik nazw żeńskich polszczyzny*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Moch, W. (2007). Review of Maciej Czeszewski's *Słownik polszczyzny potocznej. Poradnik Językowy*, 9/648, 92-96.
- Müldner-Nieckowski, P. (2003). *Wielki słownik frazeologiczny języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Świat Książki.
- Nagajowa, M. (2005). *Słownik rymowanek potocznego języka polskiego czyli o naszym stosunku do ludzi, języka i realiów codzienności*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Key Text.
- Niemczyk-Jacek, M. (2015). *Kategoria potoczności w tekście literackim na przykładzie dramatów Stanisława Wyspiańskiego*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo LIBRON.
- Ożóg, K. (2001). *Polszczyzna przelomu XX i XXI wieku. Wybrane zagadnienia*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego.
- Rejter, A. (2006). *Leksyka ekspresywna w historii języka polskiego. Kulturowo-komunikacyjne konteksty potoczności*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Skudrzykowa, A. (1992). Potoczność a strategia uwiarygodnienia. *Socjolingwistyka*, XII-XIII, 47-53.
- Skudrzykowa, A. (1994). Między mówioną a pisaną odmianą języka, czyli o analfabetyzmie funkcjonalnym we współczesnej polszczyźnie. In S. Gajda & A. Adamiszyn (Eds.), *Język potoczny jako przedmiot badań językoznawczych* (pp. 209-214). Opole: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna im. Powstańców Śląskich.
- Smółkowa, T. (Ed.). (1998). *Nowe słownictwo polskie. Materiały z lat 1985-1992, Część I: A-O*. Kraków: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.
- Smółkowa, T. (2000). Leksyka w początkowym okresie przemian ustrojowych. Rodzaje zmian. In J. Mazur (Ed.), *Słownictwo współczesnej polszczyzny w okresie przemian* (pp. 51-58). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

- Sobol, E. (Ed.). (2007). *Słownik języka polskiego PWN*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Statkiewicz, H. (2000). Neutralizacja nacechowania stylistycznego i ekspresywnego w słownictwie współczesnej polszczyzny. In Mazur, J. (Ed.), *Słownictwo współczesnej polszczyzny w okresie przemian* (pp. 65-75). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Taras, B. (2011). Ekspansja wulgarności w języku i kulturze. *Język Polski*, *XCI*, 372-380.
- Tomaszczyk, J. (2015). Evaluative discourse in conversation and in a corpus. Paper presented at ICLC13, Newcastle, UK.
- Urban, K. (1979). Przechodzenie elementów języka potocznego (kolokwializmów) do języka ogólnego w opinii społecznej. *Metody badawcze. Socjolingwistyka*, *II*, 175-181.
- Urban, K. (1983). Współczesna polszczyzna radiowa i telewizyjna w opinii społecznej. *Socjolingwistyka*, *V*, 61-76.
- Urban, K. (1990a). Społeczna waloryzacja kolokwializmów. *Socjolingwistyka*, *IX*, 47-60.
- Urban, K. (1990b). Wzorce językowe w opinii społecznej. *Socjolingwistyka*, *X*, 7-19.
- Warchała, J. (1994). Pojęcie stopnia gramatyczności a badania języka potocznego. In S. Gajda & A. Adamiszyn (Eds.), *Język potoczny jako przedmiot badań językoznawczych* (pp. 189-196). Opole: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna im. Powstańców Śląskich.
- Warchała, J. (1995). Interakcyjna koncepcja badań języka potocznego. In D. Bieńkowska (Ed.), *Wielkie miasto: czynniki integrujące i dezintegrujące, Part II* (pp. 96-106). Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Warchała, J. (2003). *Kategoria potoczności w języku*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Warchała, J., & Skudrzyk, A., (2005). Uwagi o języku i stylu potocznym. In M. Kita & B. Witosz (Eds.), *Spotkanie. Księga jubileuszowa dla profesora Aleksandra Wilkonia* (pp. 115-119). Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Warchała, J., & Furgalska-Skudrzyk, A. (2007). Potoczność – kategoria rozmyta? In B. Boniecka & S. Grabias (Eds.), *Potoczność a zachowania językowe Polaków* (pp. 21-32). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Warchoń-Schlottmann, M. (2004). Ekspansja wyrażen potocznych do języka oficjalnego. *Poradnik Językowy*, *5(614)*, 31-41.
- Warchoń-Schlottmann, M. (2005). Neutralizacja i nobilitacja wyrazów potocznych w języku publicznym po przelocie. In G. Szpila (Ed.), *Język trzeciego tysiąclecia III, vol. 1, Tendencje rozwojowe współczesnej polszczyzny* (pp. 263-270). Kraków: Tertium.
- Widawski, M. (1997). *Nowy słownik slangu i potocznej angielszczyzny*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo L&L.

- Wierzbicka, A. (2014). Rodzaj gramatyczny w języku polskim – przegląd koncepcji. *Polonica*, XXXIV, 155-165.
- Worbs, E. (2013). West-Slavic languages. In R. H. Gouws, U. Heid, W. Schweickard, & H. H. Wiegand (Eds.), *Dictionaries: An international encyclopedia of lexicography (HSK 5.4)* (pp. 861-871). Berlin and Boston: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Zabawa, M. (2007). Współczesny mówiony język polski: ile polszczyzny w polszczyźnie? *Prace Filologiczne*, LII, 433-442.
- Zdanowicz, A., Szyszko, M. B., Filipowicz, J., Tomaszewicz, W., Czepliński, F., & Korotyński, W. (1861). *Słownik języka polskiego*, Vols. I-II. Wilno. (Digital version 2014).
- Zdunkiewicz-Jedynak, D. (2006). ABC stylistyki. In Bańko, M. (Ed.), *Polszczyzna na co dzień* (pp. 33-95). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Zgótkowa, H. (1991). Leksyka ekspresywna jako wyróżnik potocznej odmiany współczesnej polszczyzny. S. Gajda & A. Adamiszyn (Eds.), *Język potoczny jako przedmiot badań językoznawczych* (pp. 45-52). Opole: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna im. Powstańców Śląskich.
- Żmigrodzki, P. (2008). *Słowo – słownik – rzeczywistość. Z problemów leksykografii i metaleksykografii*. Kraków: Lexis.
- Żmigrodzki, P. (2010). Metaleksykografia XX w. a słowniki przyszłości. In R. Przybylska, J. Kaś, & K. Sikora (Eds.), *Symbolae gramaticae in honorem Bogusłai Dunaj* (pp. 529-536). Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.