

Studia Anglica Posnaniensia 51/1, 2016
doi: 10.1515/stap-2016-0003

CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN
THE (NEW) KOSCIUSZKO FOUNDATION DICTIONARY

ARLETA ADAMSKA-SALACIAK*

Faculty of English, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

ABSTRACT

*The Kościuszko Foundation Dictionary (KFD)*¹, the only bilingual dictionary between Polish and American English, first came out in 1959 (English-Polish volume) and 1961 (Polish-English volume). Between then and 1995, it was reprinted fourteen times, with the content completely intact. In 2003, *The New Kosciuszko Foundation Dictionary (NKFD1)* finally appeared, in two printed volumes accompanied by a CD. Originally intended as a straightforward update of *KFD*, it ended up being closer to a brand new dictionary, linked with its predecessor mainly through the title – a consequence of the continuing patronage of The Kosciuszko Foundation – and through its focus on American English. With around 133,000 main entries, it was, at the time of publication, the most comprehensive English-Polish, Polish-English dictionary in existence. A new, revised and enlarged edition (*NKFD2*) is about to be published soon, this time exclusively in digital form. Having been involved in the latter two projects – respectively, as editor of the English-Polish volume and editor-in-chief – the author examines the development of the dictionary, tracing the continuity and change in its three successive incarnations.

Keywords: bilingual dictionary, English, Polish, The Kosciuszko Foundation

* Corresponding author: Arleta Adamska-Sałaciak, (arleta@wa.amu.edu.pl), Faculty of English, Adam Mickiewicz University, al. Niepodległości 4, 61-874 Poznań, Poland.

¹ This first edition retains the original Polish spelling of the name *Kościuszko*, the two later ones do not (nor is it present in the name of the Kosciuszko Foundation itself).

1. *The Kościuszko Foundation Dictionary*

1.1 Authors

KFD was the work of three distinguished scholars: a Pole and two Americans, none of them a professional lexicographer. In the following, more space is devoted to the Polish author than to his American colleagues, partly because information about him is relatively difficult to find,² and partly because he was both the moving spirit behind the dictionary and its principal author.

Kazimierz Bulas (1903-1970) held a doctorate in philosophy and a post-doctoral degree in archaeology, both from the Jagiellonian University in Cracow. His 1927 doctoral dissertation was devoted to the ancient Greek and Roman illustrations of the *Iliad*; his 1935 *Habilitationsschrift* was entitled *The Chronology of the Athenian Grave Stellas of the Archaic Epoch*. Among his important later works was *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*, a detailed study of a series of artefacts decorated with fish motifs and housed by the Czartoryski Museum in Cracow. In addition to being an expert in classical Greek and Latin, Bulas is claimed to have spoken eight modern languages, with Greek being his special area of interest. He taught the language at the university and, starting in 1931, delivered a number of broadcasts in modern Greek from Radio Cracow and Katowice. Between 1932-1939, he served as the honorary consul for Greece in Cracow.

Soon after the outbreak of World War II, on November 6th, 1939, together with over 180 Polish university professors and lecturers, Bulas was deported to the concentration camp of Oranienburg-Sachsenhausen, and a few months later transferred to Dachau. The Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs and members of the German Archaeological Institute allegedly intervened on his behalf, which may have contributed to his release in May 1940. Back in Nazi-occupied Poland, he managed to earn a living by giving private lessons and teaching Italian in a *Verwaltungsschule* in Cracow. In 1943, he was briefly interned again, this time in Płaszów near Cracow. It was during the war, when confronted with the Nazi efforts to exterminate the entire Polish scholarly and artistic elite, that Bulas conceived his plan to compile a comprehensive dictionary with Polish and (American) English, a dictionary which would bear testimony to the vitality of his native language. Most of the data-gathering and a substantial part of the dictionary compilation happened at that time.

Following the war, Bulas returned to his alma mater as an assistant professor and simultaneously held the position of professor and head of the Department of

² This brief account of Bulas's life and work is based on the the obituary by Krzyżaniak (1970) and the biographical sketch by Perkowska (1989).

Classical Archaeology at the newly founded Nicholas Copernicus University in Toruń. In 1947, he was sent to Rome, to serve as director of the Polish Academy research station there and as vice-director of the Bibliotheca Hertziana. After a few years in Italy, he came to the realization that, in order to complete his work on the dictionary, he needed to be completely immersed in American culture. Accordingly, in 1951 he relocated to Houston, Texas, where he joined Rice University, first as Catalogue Librarian and then Acquisitions Research Librarian. He remained there until his retirement in 1966, and died four years later.

Francis J. Whitfield³ (1916-1996), who collaborated with Bulas on both volumes of the dictionary, was the chief architect of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of California at Berkeley. His mastery of ancient and modern languages was even more impressive than that of his co-author: he is said to have spoken Polish and Russian like an educated native speaker; his knowledge of Greek, Latin, and Old Church Slavic was that of an expert; he had a passive command of several other European languages, including Danish (which allowed him to translate Hjelmslev's works into English); he taught himself Lithuanian, Welsh, Irish, Hungarian, Biblical Hebrew, Arabic, Georgian, and Japanese. Within Slavic linguistics, he was best known for his Old Church Slavic textbook and reader.

Lawrence L. Thomas⁴(1924-2013), who joined Bulas and Whitfield in compiling the Polish-English volume of *KFD*, was also associated with UC Berkeley. He earned a bachelor's degree in international relations and subsequently both a master's and a PhD in Slavic languages and literatures. He remained at Berkeley until 1965, when he moved to the University of Wisconsin-Madison to serve as chair of the Department of Slavic Languages (1968-1974). His research interests ranged from East Slavic historical and descriptive linguistics, through comparative Slavic linguistics and literature, to Polish linguistics and modern Polish literature. He also published an influential monograph on the linguistic theories of Nicholas Marr.

1.2 Compilation and publication history

According to Bulas's own account, repeated later in his biographical notes and obituaries, the bulk of the work on the dictionary was done by him alone between 1940 and 1945. In 1952, the Slavic Department at Columbia University bought the rights to his manuscript, only to cede them a year later to The Kosciuszko Foundation, a New York-based organization dedicated to promoting Polish cul-

³ The following information is based on the obituary by Hughes et al. (1996).

⁴ This information comes from the Memorial resolution of the Faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Madison on the death of Professor Emeritus Lawrence L. Thomas (2013).

ture in the United States and to fostering cultural and educational exchange between the two countries. Also in 1952, Bulas and Whitfield started their collaboration. In 1959, the English-Polish part of *KFD* was published by Mouton, followed in 1961 by the Polish-English part. All in all, as many as fourteen reprints of the dictionary were brought out over the years, the last one in 1995.⁵ Between 1962 and the early 1980s, *KFD* was made available to users in Poland by a major state publisher, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe (PWN).

1.3 Audience, function, sources, and peculiarities

The dictionary is bidirectional, that is, addressed to speakers of both English and Polish. Though such reference works are normally advertised as capable of serving each of the two communities equally well, metalexigraphers are deeply sceptical of claims to that effect (Atkins 1992/1993: 31n.; Adamska-Sałaciak 2016: 145). In reality, despite the authors' best intentions, any bidirectional dictionary inevitably privileges one group of its target users, normally the one more interested in learning 'the other' language. *KFD* is no exception here in that it seems much better attuned to the needs of Poles studying English than to helping English speakers in their efforts to learn Polish.

Like most dictionaries of its time, *KFD* was designed mainly to offer assistance in the reading of foreign-language texts – a function labelled as decoding or receptive in modern metalexigraphy – despite the declaration in the Preface that the dictionary's coverage is comprehensive enough for it to be used also by professional translators. On the whole, *KFD* pays relatively little attention to users' encoding needs (i.e. production in L2), focussing instead on explaining L2 meanings. Needless to say, this ought not to be taken as a criticism, since tending to users' encoding needs in a systematic manner necessitates access to a large body of authentic language data (i.e. a corpus), something Bulas and his contemporaries could only dream of.

According to the authors' Preface, in preparing the English wordlist of *KFD* they drew primarily on the third edition of the *Concise Oxford Dictionary (COD3)*.⁶ The 1951 edition of *COD* was also consulted, as were *Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language* and *The American College Dictionary*. Although Bulas and Whitfield do not mention any of the earlier bilingual English-Polish dictionaries as their source of inspiration, it is extremely unlikely that none whatsoever had been consulted. One candidate for such an unacknowledged source would be *LILIEN*, an unfinished encyclopaedic dic-

⁵ All reprints were published by The Kosciuszko Foundation.

⁶ The third edition of *COD* came out in 1934, but Bulas and Whitfield talk about a 1938 edition, presumably a reprint thereof.

tionary compiled single-handedly by Ernest Lilien and published in 19 fascicles between 1944 and 1951.⁷ In her authoritative history of English-Polish / Polish-English lexicography, Podhajecka (2016: Chapter 23) maintains that *KFD*'s debt to *LILIEN* is indisputable. However, given that *LILIEN*'s massive 960 pages cover only the alphabetic stretch from *A* to *hellbind*, its influence on *KFD* must not be overestimated.

As far as the materials for the Polish-English volume are concerned, the authors mention a number of dictionaries, both general-purpose and specialist ones. The list comprises a maritime dictionary, a pre-war dictionary of military terminology, a technical dictionary (1938), a medical dictionary (1953), a dictionary of library science (1955), and a dictionary of foreign words (1946). It appears that, in view of the lack of an authoritative, up-to-date dictionary of Polish – the so-called *Słownik warszawski (SW)* being badly outdated and Doroszewski's *Słownik Języka Polskiego (SJPD)* having reached only the letter *K* – Bulas, Whitfield, and Thomas did the sensible thing, taking advantage of whatever they could lay their hands on. Add to that the fact that two of the authors were not native speakers and the third had long been out of touch with contemporary spoken Polish, and it is hardly surprising that the Polish-English part of *KFD* ended up being a poor match for the English-Polish one, both in terms of headword choice and as regards the provision of equivalents. Its coverage was also noticeably smaller, a fact which the authors justified, on the one hand, by the Polish language exhibiting less regional variation than English and, on the other, by their decision to omit both slang terms and completely regular formations, such as diminutives or augmentatives. All that notwithstanding, the Polish-English volume of *KFD* does appear to include a considerable number of quaint regionalisms, or else words and phrases barely recognizable to mid-twentieth-century Polish speakers, let alone contemporary ones.

Though incomparably superior, the English-Polish volume is not completely free from idiosyncrasies, either. Compared to the average bilingual dictionary, it is significantly more generous when it comes to dispensing encyclopaedic information. This may be a result of the authors embracing the tradition of American monolingual lexicography, where the encyclopaedic element had always been fairly prominent. No reference work is a better embodiment of that tradition than *WNID2*, a dictionary that was the principal model for *LILIEN* and thereby, conceivably, for *KFD* as well.

⁷ The dictionary is, in fact, explicitly referred to in the *KFD* Preface penned by Stephen P. Mizwa, President of The Kosciuszko Foundation. In this short note, which precedes the authors' Preface, Mizwa recalls the Foundation having supported Lilien's efforts and expresses regret that, due to the lexicographer's death, the project could not be completed.

Somewhat more controversially, for a dictionary that aims to give prominence to the American variety of English, *KFD* features a disproportionately high number of Briticisms, the most curious among them being items of Anglo-Indian provenance, such as, e.g., *kheda* ‘enclosure for catching elephants’, or *chaulmoogra* ‘East-Indian tree, *Taractogenos* or *Hydnocarpus*, the oil of which is used for treating leprosy and skin diseases’.⁸ It is easy to attribute this to *KFD*’s over-reliance on the British *COD3*, though it has to be noted that some earlier English-Polish dictionaries – *LILIEN* again, but also the much earlier *KIERST* – had readily made room for a large number of Indian loanwords (for details, see Podhajecka 2016: Chapter 23).

Finally, like any other dictionary before and after, *KFD* was a product of its time. One consequence is that, judged by today’s standards, it would likely have trouble passing a political correctness test. In particular, a certain proportion of the phrases illustrating headword use might be construed as offensive, due to their explicitly or implicitly negative attitude to various forms of otherness (women, ethnic minorities, people with disabilities, etc). To give just a couple of examples, the Polish-English volume contains such outrageous verbal illustrations (and translations) as *wybielać Murzyna* “wash a blackamoor white” (in the entry for *wybielać* ‘whitewash’) or *nie będzie się wstydzila swego nieślubnego dziecka*⁹ “her baby will have a name” (in the entry for *wstydzić się* ‘be ashamed’). It must be noted, however, that instances like these are significantly less numerous in *KFD* than in *WSAPPA* (*Wielki słownik angielsko-polski, polsko-angielski* by Jan Stanisławski), its main rival on the Polish dictionary market in the second half of the twentieth century.¹⁰

All these reservations notwithstanding, it cannot be stressed emphatically enough that *KFD*’s strengths – most of all, its accurate portrayal of the lexis of contemporary American English – more than compensated for its weaknesses. In Poland, *KFD* was universally recognized as the second most important twentieth-century bilingual dictionary with English (after the above-mentioned *WSAPPA*) and cherished especially by generations of Polish students majoring in English; in North America, it was simply *the* dictionary for the language pair in question. With the English-Polish part as its forte, *KFD* nicely complemented *WSAPPA*, where, by contrast, it was the Polish-English part that could be relied on with greater confidence (see Piotrowski 2001: 213).

⁸ The Polish originals are, respectively, “ogrodzenie do chwytania słońi” and “drzewo wsch.-ind. *Taractogenos* l. *Hydnocarpus*, olej z którego jest używany przeciwko trądowi i chorobom skórnym”.

⁹ Literally: “she won’t be ashamed of her illegitimate baby”.

¹⁰ For some illustrations of the latter dictionary’s inherent sexism, see Adamska-Sałaciak (2006: Chapter 4).

2. *The New Kosciuszko Foundation Dictionary (NKFDI)*

2.1 Background

Some forty years after *KFD* was first published, Joseph E. Gore, then President of The Kosciuszko Foundation, entrusted Professor Jacek Fisiak, then Head of the School of English¹¹ at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, with the task of preparing a new edition of the dictionary. The project, launched late in 1998, was originally meant to last a mere 30 months, but was eventually extended to 48. The compilation, under Jacek Fisiak's editorship, was performed by a team of about fifteen Anglicists,¹² a few of whom had worked on the *Collins English-Polish, Polish-English dictionary (CSAPPE)* a few years earlier and thus had some hands-on experience in practical lexicography. Apart from that core team, a handful of specialists from the AMU Faculty of Polish were recruited to assist in the construction of the Polish wordlist; during the initial stages of the project, a group of distinguished American and Polish linguists served as consultants in the process of fine-tuning the entry format.¹³

At first, it was assumed that the updating process would consist chiefly in adding new headwords and senses to the existing dictionary content. That assumption soon proved to be far too optimistic, as even a preliminary analysis of *KFD*'s Polish-English volume revealed that it had not stood the test of time well enough to serve as the basis for an update. As a result, the Polish-English part of *NKFDI* had to be compiled from scratch. While the lexicographers working on the English-Polish part¹⁴ were able to take *KFD* as their point of departure, the revision process also turned out to be less straightforward than had been anticipated (more details follow in section 2.3).

2.2 Audience, sources, and methods

Like its predecessor, *NKFDI* is a bidirectional dictionary and, like all such dictionaries, it cannot but privilege one of its target user groups, in this case, speakers of Polish. Due to severe time constraints, it was not possible to significantly alter its profile from a decoding to a decoding-cum-encoding dictionary, although, compared with *KFD*, it contains much more material that can be used for the students' own production in the foreign language. The Polish-English part especially is packed with multiword units and their English translations.

¹¹ The AMU School of English has since become the Faculty of English.

¹² The numbers fluctuated over the four-year period, with people leaving on study trips abroad and coming back after a few months.

¹³ All the contributors' names are listed in the printed dictionary.

¹⁴ Of which an electronic version had to be prepared before work proper could start.

Unfortunately, a significant proportion of those are somewhat dated, coming as they do from monolingual dictionaries of Polish, which, until very recently, tended to be extremely conservative.

Also like its predecessor, *NKFDI* relied for its wordlist on existing works of reference. As might be expected, the number of those was greater and their quality higher than whatever Bulas et al. had at their disposal, especially as regards dictionaries of contemporary Polish. Additionally, the compilers of *NKFDI* were able to take advantage of a number of bilingual dictionaries, albeit always smaller than needed and almost always seriously outdated. Given the tight deadlines, no dedicated corpus could be prepared to serve as the dictionary's database, but whenever possible, freely available corpora of both languages (such as BNC or NKJP) were consulted, particularly to help with identifying typical, frequent collocations.

The work was carried out without the help of a professional dictionary writing system.¹⁵ Portions of the content travelled to and fro via e-mail between the lexicographers, the technical editor, and the editors of the two volumes. This means that, while working on a given section of the dictionary, an individual lexicographer had access to nothing but that section; in particular, they were not able to see what other people were doing with entries elsewhere in the dictionary. Such a system is less than ideal for a number of reasons, not least from the point of view of maintaining consistency. To give just one example, it is up to the editors to make sure that the same phrase – which might be entered in the dictionary several times, under different headwords, and in both volumes – always appears in the same canonical form and is always translated in the same way. It takes little imagination to see that ensuring consistency both internally, within each part of the dictionary, and externally, between the two parts, is always a tall order, even when the editor has access to the whole dictionary text at once, let alone when he or she does not.

Despite these technical difficulties, and despite the relatively short time at the team's disposal, the two volumes of *NKFDI* were completed more or less as planned, appearing jointly in the autumn of 2003. Since the present writer was directly involved in the project, it would not be appropriate to attempt an assessment here. The following section thus focuses on describing the revision process itself rather than evaluating its results.

¹⁵ A piece of software which lexicographers usually refer to as a DWS or DPS (dictionary production/publishing system).

2.3 Quantitative growth and content changes¹⁶

On the whole, the dictionary's coverage increased by about 36 per cent: from ca. 98,000 entries in *KFD* (55,000 English-Polish + 43,000 Polish-English) to 132,888 entries in *NKFDI* (73,432 English-Polish + 59,456 Polish-English). Entry depth also grew considerably, which is reflected by the substantial increase in book size: from 1037 pages (English-Polish) and 772 pages (Polish-English) to 1729 and 1256 pages, respectively.

Since the Polish-English part of *NKFDI* had to be compiled wholly independently of *KFD*, there does not seem much point in trying to trace the continuities and discontinuities between the two.¹⁷ The following thus deals exclusively with the modifications to the English-Polish part of the dictionary.

The update of the dictionary content involved several systematic operations:

- adding whole entries (mainly lexical items which entered English post-*KFD*, in the second half of the twentieth century, but also some which *KFD* had simply overlooked)
- adding newly developed or previously ignored senses to existing entries, e.g. *mouse* ('computer input device'), *shrink* ('psychiatrist'), or *gay* ('homosexual')
- removing obsolete senses, occasionally also whole entries (this was done with great circumspection, in order not to deprive those dictionary users who want to read older literature of valuable semantic information; only entries truly redundant from the point of view of the dictionary's profile were dispensed with, such as dated British slang or some relics of the British colonial past mentioned earlier)
- reordering senses to reflect their current distribution patterns (e.g., in *KFD* the first sense of *cabbie* had to do with driving a horse-drawn carriage; the 'handbag' sense of *purse* did not appear until sense number three, and so on and so forth)
- replacing descriptive explanations of meaning with proper translation equivalents, e.g. for *contact lenses*, *avocado*, or *ketchup* (items of this type, rather than being supplied with Polish equivalents, were accompanied in *KFD* by definitions in Polish, often because a Polish equivalent was as yet non-existent¹⁸)
- adding or modifying usage labels to reflect current usage (e.g., *cheat on sb* was labelled in *KFD* as US slang)

¹⁶ Some of the material in this section has previously been discussed in Adamska-Sałaciak (2005).

¹⁷ Their differences and similarities could, naturally, be examined, but that would involve comparing *KFD* and *NKFDI* in the same way as any two unrelated dictionaries might be compared, which is not what this contribution aims to do.

¹⁸ This often produces an unintended comic effect today, a feature exploited for the purposes of harmless entertainment in Adamska-Sałaciak and Gąsiorowski (2006).

- getting rid of any traces of racism, sexism, and similar -isms, either by marking the relevant headwords and/or equivalents with usage labels signalling their potentially offensive nature or by removing or rephrasing objectionable translations and discursive explanations of meaning.

It is perhaps worth noting that, in the course of the revision process, no single entry was left unexamined; most underwent such thorough modifications that the final outcome (*NKFDI*) looks very different from the starting point (*KFD*).¹⁹

3. *The New Kosciuszko Foundation Dictionary App (NKFD2)*

3.1 Background

The most recent update, to be released in digital form only (by the Paragon Software Group), took nine months to complete (July 2014 – March 2015), plus a team of six lexicographers, an editor-in-chief, a technical editor, and an IT specialist. At the time, five of the six lexicographers were PhD holders and one was still working on her dissertation; all their dissertations dealt with either lexicography or lexical semantics. The young people – young women, as it happens – were thus uniquely qualified for the job: short of working with a group of professionally trained lexicographers, one could hardly have wished for a more competent team. The benefits were, of course, mutual, as participation in the project afforded the members a unique opportunity to test their theoretical knowledge about dictionaries in actual dictionary-making practice.²⁰

Each of the lexicographers could draw on her special area of expertise. These included, for instance:

- harvesting recent neologisms from corpora (see Grochocka 2013)
- exploiting the lexicographic potential of the Polish translations of English phrasal verbs found in a parallel corpus (see Perdek 2012)
- specifying the criteria for selecting equivalents of multiword expressions (e.g. idioms or proverbs), both in their canonical forms as well as when creatively modified (see Szczepaniak & Adamska-Sałaciak 2010)
- refining the lexicographic representation of metonymically motivated regular polysemy (see Wojciechowska 2012).

¹⁹ That effect is additionally strengthened by certain microstructural changes, such as dispensing with niching, as well as more user-friendly typography, e.g. enhancing central elements of the entry by the use of bold.

²⁰ Only one of them had previously worked on a dictionary.

In addition, two members of the team were experienced translators, specializing in technical, legal, and medical texts; they also taught translation at the AMU Faculty of English. Thanks to this, for example, all the legal terminology in *NKFD2* could be thoroughly revised, not only, or even not primarily, by consulting specialized dictionaries of law,²¹ but rather on the basis of the translators' own practice of working with comparable corpora.

3.2 Sources and methods

For the identification of new lexical items, the lexicographers working on *NKFD2* used generally accessible corpora, mainly COCA and NKJP; occasionally, in troublesome cases, the Sketch Engine tool with its associated web corpora (enTenTen2012, plTenTen12) was resorted to.²² Additionally, in an effort to get as close as possible to aspects of contemporary spoken Polish not yet documented in monolingual dictionaries of the language, sites such as *Obserwatorium Językowe Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego* (<http://nowewyrazy.uw.edu.pl/>) or *Miejski słownik slangu i mowy potocznej* (www.miejski.pl) were regularly consulted.

The main source of data for checking the correctness of equivalent candidates was the Internet in all its riches. Some fifteen years earlier, when *NKFDI* was being compiled, this particular resource was, of course, already available, but both the amount and the reliability of information, as well as the speed with which it could be retrieved, left much to be desired. Other monolingual and bilingual dictionaries were also consulted, notably *PWNOE/PWNOP*, a large English-Polish, Polish-English dictionary whose two volumes came out, respectively, in 2002 and 2004, after the text of *NKFDI* had already gone to print.

As regards the technical side of things, this time a dedicated in-house dictionary writing system had been developed before any lexicographic work started, thus enabling the lexicographers to work on as many entries at once as was necessary and to see immediately what was going on elsewhere in the dictionary.

3.3 Quantitative growth and content changes

The brief from The Kosciuszko Foundation was to increase the dictionary's coverage by between 5 and 10 per cent. In the end, the number of entries grew by 6.4 per cent, from 132,888 in *NKFDI* (73,432 English-Polish + 59,456 Polish-English) to 141,444 (respectively, 78,405 and 63,039) in *NKFD2*.

²¹ These are often helpless when it comes to proposing Polish equivalents of English legal terms (and the other way round), due to the essential incompatibility of the two legal systems.

²² Individual team members had paid-for access to the Sketch Engine for research purposes.

There was, unfortunately, far too little time to attempt an entry-by-entry revision of the whole dictionary; the decision thus had to be taken to focus on certain thematic areas. The choice of those was, to some extent, subjective, based on the perceived importance of a given domain in modern life and dependent on the lexicographic team's collective expertise. The following are examples of the revisited domains, with some justification occasionally provided in brackets: education; business and finance; globalization, environmental, and social issues; computers and the Internet (greatest amount of lexical innovation); medicine (terminology becoming increasingly Anglicized); law (challenging due to the differences in legal systems); religion (Polish terminology concerning non-Christian-religions and denominations of Christianity other than Catholicism not generally known, even among educated speakers); cuisine (a lot of recent borrowings, often originating in languages other than English, but entering Polish through the medium of English).

4. Conclusions

The foregoing historical sketch already contains some information about how the content of *The (New) Kosciuszko Foundation Dictionary* has evolved over the last fifty-plus years. In the remaining sections, the chief points of continuity and change will be enumerated, in order to better acquaint the reader – and, hopefully, potential user of the dictionary – with the main features of the three successive editions.

4.1 Continuity

Focus on American English, the feature that makes *KFD* unique in the whole history of bilingual English-Polish, Polish-English lexicography, has, of course, been carefully preserved. Compared to that, “preserving the spirit of the dictionary” – something we were asked to do when embarking on *NKFD1* – was a much more elusive goal, but one which seems to have been achieved with a modicum of success. Among the things which many *KFD* users reportedly liked about it was its somewhat discursive nature, visible especially in the more encyclopaedic entries. A large proportion of these have been retained in both *NKFD1* and *NKFD2*. The practice of supplementing equivalents with generous explanatory glosses has also been continued, even if it may sometimes lead to informational redundancy. This was judged to be a small price to pay for maintaining the dictionary's distinctive character, to which generations of users had become accustomed.

Another point of continuity is the dictionary's firmly lexical orientation, i.e. the policy of prioritizing semantic issues over all others. For instance, starting

with *KFD*, information about Polish grammar was dispensed relatively sparingly. In the Foreword to the Polish-English volume, Bulas et al. state explicitly that they “have assumed that non-Polish users of the dictionary will be reasonably familiar with the general structure of Polish grammar”. While no such assumption was made for either *NKFD1* or *NKFD2*, it is still true that the grammatical description the dictionaries provide is not as detailed as some users might wish. Since, as a result of tight schedules, not everything could be done with equal care and thoroughness, we decided to concentrate on equivalent provision and other types of meaning explanation, believing these to constitute the very essence of a general-purpose bilingual dictionary.

4.2 Change

The most important point here is that, in the course of its evolution, the work has acquired certain features of a learners’ (pedagogical) dictionary. Such dictionaries, sometimes dubbed ‘active’, are geared towards encoding. One way in which this can be accomplished is by offering the learner numerous examples of language use which can then serve as models for his or her own production. In the present case, the task was greatly facilitated by a more extensive access to corpora than had been the case during the compilation of *NKFD1*. Time limitations did not allow the operation to be carried out as systematically as we would have liked, but the improvement, in both parts of the dictionary, should not be difficult to see.

Related to the above is a certain microstructural peculiarity that was not consciously planned for, though, on reflection, perhaps it should have been. In *NKFD2*, the depth of a given entry is not always proportional to either the headword’s frequency or its salience in the source language. As a general rule, the more frequent and more heavily polysemous the headword, the more the dictionary should have to say about it; *NKFD2* behaves as expected. However, in the interlingual context, another important factor comes into play, namely, the headword’s degree of complexity for the target user. By complexity here are meant differences in the use of the headword – its grammatical behaviour, collocability, etc – versus its proposed equivalents, that is, differences that follow from the lack of interlingual lexical isomorphism. Consequently, a lexeme that only gets a short entry in a monolingual dictionary of either English or Polish may be treated in *NKFD2* in a much more detailed way – e.g. illustrated with several collocations or even short sentences, often corpus-based and always translated – in an effort to highlight some crucial respect in which the two languages differ.

One major source of frustration for bilingual lexicographers, who are always concerned about the quality of the equivalents they propose, is the paucity of

supporting evidence. During the work on *NKFD1*, that was a frequent worry. More specifically, the lexicographers and editors often felt that a particular lexical borrowing from English into Polish was both inevitable and imminent, and yet it was not much in evidence and was certainly not recorded by monolingual dictionaries of Polish. These days, thanks mainly to the Internet, such evidence is much easier to come by, which gives grounds for including lexical items in a bilingual dictionary even before they have had a chance to become sanctioned by Polish monolingual lexicography.

This, then, is an important way in which *NKFD2* differs not only from *KFD*, but also from *NKFD1*: it offers a more reliable record of the most recent Polish words and expressions borrowed from English. Examples of English loanwords which had not yet been entrenched in Polish when *NKFD1* was being compiled, but which seem perfectly at home now, include such items as: *celebryta* and *celebrytka* ‘celebrity’ masc. and fem.; *mobbing* ‘workplace bullying’, or the highly informal *geek*, *nerd*, *fejk* ‘fake’, *gadżeciarz* ‘gadgeteer’, *hejter* ‘hater’, or *lajkować* ‘to like (on Facebook)’. As regards more specialized registers, one could cite vocabulary items used to talk about the LGBT community, such as *outing* or *gaydar*. There is also a growing body of evidence for the borrowing of multiword units, even highly conventional sayings and expressions, such as *mieć ciastko i zjeść ciastko* ‘to have your cake and eat it (too)’ or *ogon kręci psem* ‘the tail is wagging the dog’. All of these, and a plethora of others like them, now feature in the dictionary either as source-language headwords (or sub-entries), target-language equivalents, or both.

As was made clear at the outset, the above observations are those of a lexicographer-cum-editor involved in the preparation of two of the three dictionaries under scrutiny. Just how well the intended modifications to the successive editions of *The (New) Kosciuszko Foundation Dictionary* translate into assisting users with different language tasks remains to be tested empirically, preferably through a series of dictionary user studies performed on a suitably large population of subjects.

REFERENCES

PRIMARY SOURCES

- BNC = *British National Corpus* (<http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/>)
 COCA = *Corpus of Contemporary American English* (<http://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>)
 COD3 = Fowler, Henry W. and Herbert G. Le Mesurier (eds.). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English*. 1934. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 CSAPPE = Fisiak, Jacek (ed.), 1996. *Collins słownik angielsko-polski, polsko-angielski*. 2 vols. Warszawa: HarperCollins Publishers & Polska Oficyna Wydawnicza BGW.

- KFD* = *The Kosciuszko Foundation Dictionary*. 1959, vol. 1: *English-Polish*, Kazimierz Bulas & Francis J. Whitfield; 1961, vol. 2: *Polish-English*, Kazimierz Bulas, Lawrence L. Thomas & Francis J. Whitfield. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- KIERST* = Kierst, Władysław. 1926-28. *Trzaski, Everta i Michalskiego słownik angielsko-polski i polsko-angielski. English-Polish and Polish-English Dictionary*. Warszawa: Trzaska, Evert i Michalski.
- LILIEN* = Lilien, Ernest. *Lilien's dictionary. Part I: English-Polish. Ernesta Liliena słownik. Cz.1: Angielsko-polski*. Buffalo: Drukiem Dziennika dla Wszystkich [fascicle 1]; Buffalo: Wydawnictwa Słownika Liliena 1944–1945 [fascicles 2–8]; Stevens Point: Wydawnictwa Słownika Liliena 1947–1951 [fascicles 9-19].
- NKFD1* = Fisiak, Jacek (ed.). 2003. *The New Kosciuszko Foundation Dictionary*. (vol. 1: *English-Polish* ed. by Arleta Adamska-Sałaciak; vol. 2: *Polish-English* ed. by Piotr Gąsiorowski). New York: The Kosciuszko Foundation; Kraków: Universitas.
- NKFD2* = Adamska-Sałaciak, Arleta (ed.). 2016. *The New Kosciuszko Foundation Dictionary*. 2nd ed. New York: The Kosciuszko Foundation.
- NKJP* = *Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego* (<http://www.nkjp.pl>)
- PWNOE* = Linde-Usiekiewicz, Jadwiga (ed.). 2002. *PWN-Oxford wielki słownik angielsko-polski*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- PWNOP* = Linde-Usiekiewicz, Jadwiga (ed.). 2004. *PWN-Oxford wielki słownik polsko-angielski*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- SJPD* = Doroszewski, Witold (ed.). 1958-1969. *Słownik języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- SW* = Karłowicz, Jan, Adam Kryński & Władysław Niedźwiedzki (eds.). 1900-1927. *Słownik języka polskiego* (popularly known as *Słownik warszawski*). Warszawa: Nakładem Prenumeratorów i Kasy im. Mianowskiego. 8 vols.
- WNID2* = Neilson, William A., Thomas A. Knott & Paul W. Carhart (eds.). 1934. *Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language*. 2nd ed. Springfield, MA: G. and C. Merriam.
- WSAPPA* = Stanisławski, Jan. 1964. *Wielki słownik angielsko-polski*; 1969. *Wielki słownik polsko-angielski*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Adamska-Sałaciak, Arleta. 2005. A lexicographical remake: The story of the Kosciuszko Foundation (English-Polish) dictionary. In Henrik Gottlieb, Jens Erik Mogensen & Arne Zettersten (eds.), *Symposium on Lexicography XI*, 85–100. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Adamska-Sałaciak, Arleta. 2006. *Meaning and the bilingual dictionary: The case of English and Polish*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Adamska-Sałaciak, Arleta. 2016. Explaining meaning in bilingual dictionaries. In Philip Durkin (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of lexicography*, 144–160. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Adamska-Sałaciak, Arleta & Piotr Gąsiorowski. 2006. *Thumbing one's farewell to muggers, lumberjacks, and women in an interesting condition: A dictionary as a Quonset hut*. In Katarzyna Dziubalska-Kołaczyk (ed.), *IFAtuation: A Life in IFA. A festschrift for Professor Jacek Fisiak on the occasion of his 70th birthday*, 37–42. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

- Atkins, B. T. Sue. 1992/1993. Theoretical lexicography and its relation to dictionary-making. *Dictionaries (Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America)* 14. 4–43. (Reprinted in Thierry Fontenelle (ed.). 2008. *Practical lexicography: A reader*. 31–50. Oxford: Oxford University Press.)
- Grochocka, Marta. 2013. Extracting neologisms from corpora using NeoDet. In Viktor Zakharov et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference CORPUS LINGUISTICS – 2013*, 38–43. St Petersburg: St Petersburg State University.
- Hughes, Robert P., Johanna Nichols & Alan Timberlake. 1996. Francis J. Whitfield, Slavic Languages and Literatures: Berkeley. 1996, *University of California: In Memoriam*. University of California (System) Academic Senate.
- Krzyżaniak, Marian. 1970. In memoriam: Kazimierz Bulas (1903-1970). *The Polish Review* 15.4. 106–107.
- Memorial resolution of the Faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Madison on the death of Professor Emeritus Lawrence L. Thomas*. 2013. University of Wisconsin-Madison. Faculty Document 2454.
- Perdek, Magdalena. 2012. Lexicographic potential of corpus equivalents: The case of English phrasal verbs and their Polish equivalents. In Ruth Vadtvædt Fjeld et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 15th EURALEX International Congress*, 376–388. Oslo: Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies, University of Oslo.
- Perkowska, Urszula. 1989. Kazimierz Bulas. In Leszek Hajdukiewicz (ed.), *Wyrok na Uniwersytet Jagielloński 6 listopada 1939*, 137–138. Kraków: Krajowa Agencja Wydawnicza.
- Piotrowski, Tadeusz. 2001. *Zrozumieć leksykografię*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Podhajecka, Mirosława. 2016. *A history of Polish-English / English-Polish lexicography (1788-1947)*. Opole: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Szczepaniak, Renata & Arleta Adamska-Sałaciak. 2010. Telling it straight: A comparison of selected English and Polish idioms from the semantic field of speaking. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 46.1. 71–93.
- Wojciechowska, Sylwia. 2012. *Conceptual metonymy and lexicographic representation*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag.