



You have downloaded a document from
RE-BUŚ
repository of the University of Silesia in Katowice

Title: English loan translations in the Polish names of professions

Author: Marcin Zabawa

itation style: Zabawa Marcin. (2016). English loan translations in the Polish names of professions. W: B. Cetnarowska, M. Kuczok, M. Zabawa (red.), "Various dimensions of contrastive studies" (s. 204-216). Katowice : Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.



Uznanie autorstwa - Użycie niekomercyjne - Bez utworów zależnych Polska - Licencja ta zezwala na rozpowszechnianie, przedstawianie i wykonywanie utworu jedynie w celach niekomercyjnych oraz pod warunkiem zachowania go w oryginalnej postaci (nie tworzenia utworów zależnych).



UNIwersYTET ŚLĄSKI
W KATOWICACH



Biblioteka
Uniwersytetu Śląskiego



Ministerstwo Nauki
i Szkolnictwa Wyższego

Chapter 12

English loan translations in the Polish names of professions

Marcin Zabawa

University of Silesia in Katowice

The aim of the present chapter, set in the English-Polish context, is to discuss a specific type of the influence of English upon Polish, namely loan translations. The analysis is based on a small corpus, composed of the official list of professions in Polish, compiled by the Polish Ministry of Labour and Social Policy. Loan translations, in contrast to lexical loans, are difficult to identify and analyze. The problems associated with the identification and analysis of loan translations include, among others, terminological confusion, unclear borders between (a) loan translations and loan renditions, (b) loan translations and semantic loans, as well as (c) loan translations and native phraseological innovations. They are discussed in the chapter at some length. Certain criteria, which might be helpful in making the differentiation easier, are also presented.

Key words: loan translations, loan renditions, loan creations, profession names

12.1 Introduction

It is widely known that nowadays the world of work undergoes rapid changes, mostly of extralinguistic character. New professions appear, traditional professions disappear, and sometimes traditional professions are given new names and continue their existence under a changed name. Not surprisingly, changes in the language describing professions often go hand in hand with the changes in the extralinguistic reality. Polish is no exception here; such changes in Polish are often triggered or influenced by English.

The influence of English upon names of professions in Polish is most frequently realized through the existence of English borrowings in Polish. Such borrowings can be generally divided into three major classes: lexical borrowings, semantic borrowings, and loan translations (cf. the classic distinction introduced by Haugen 1950). Lexical borrowing (the term is used to denote both the process and its result) involves the importation of both the form and the meaning, usually with various degree of adaptation to the recipient language; semantic borrowing involves the borrowing of meaning only; loan translations, finally, involve the literal translation of a multi-morphemic lexeme or, more frequently, multi-word idiomatic or semi-idiomatic construction.

Of these, lexical borrowings are most readily noticeable; these are the most common, both in terms of frequency and the number of professions affected. Examples include such constructions as *webmaster*, *lobbysta* (from English *lobbyist*), *broker* or *barman* (examples of all profession names quoted in the chapter are taken from the official list of publications, see Section 12.2). In most cases, however, English loanwords constitute only part of the name, as in e.g., *menedżer imprez sportowych* (cf. English *manager*), *spiker radiowy* (cf. English *speaker*); very frequently, borrowings constitute only the peripheral part of the profession name, as in professions such as *architekt stron internetowych* (cf. English *Internet*; additionally, *architekt* is an example of semantic borrowing), *egzaminator on-line* (cf. English *online*) or *negocjator biznesowy* (cf. English *business*), where the names include assimilated borrowings of English origin (given in brackets). The area of English lexical borrowings in the Polish names of professions is, in comparison with the two remaining areas listed at the beginning (namely, semantic borrowings and loan translations), most thoroughly researched (e.g., Ociepa 2001), and, for a more recent analysis, the paper by the present author (Zabawa 2013) or the chapter in the present volume (Jasińska-Bryjak and Marcol-Cacoń, this volume).

Semantic borrowings in the names of professions are less frequent and, possibly as a result, less frequently studied. Examples of such semantic loans include, among others, the new meaning of *architekt* (cf. *architekt stron internetowych* quoted above; the word *architekt* was traditionally used in Polish in connection with buildings, now the form is also used in a number of new contexts, most probably under the influence of English *architect*) or the new contexts of *administrator* (cf. *administrator sieci informatycznej*; the word *administrator* was again traditionally used in Polish in connection with buildings, now is also used in new contexts, especially connected with computers). In general,

as was stated above, semantic borrowings in the names of professions gained less attention from linguists; as an example of such a study, compare the article by the present author (Zabawa 2012).

Even less thoroughly described is the use of loan translations. It is hoped that the present paper will shed some light on the topic in question.

12.2 Aims of the chapter: Research design

The aim of the paper is twofold: first, as was mentioned above, to discuss a specific type of influence of English upon Polish, namely loan translations; second, to discuss some methodological problems associated with the analysis of English loan translations in Polish.

The present study is based, as in the case of my article on lexical borrowings in the names of professions (Zabawa 2013), on the official list of professions prepared by the Polish Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (available online: <http://www.abc.com.pl/du-akt/-/akt/dz-u-10-82-537>; accessed 26 March 2015). The list is composed hierarchically, with five levels: the most general names, i.e., the names of the entire groups of professions rather than individual professions, are subsumed under 10 classes (marked 0–10). The general groups are then divided into more detailed classes (43 in total); these, in turn, are subdivided into again more detailed types (132 in total). The 132 groups are subdivided further (444 groups altogether). Finally, the 444 groups are subclassified into the names of individual professions (2,360 in total). In general, only the names of individual professions are taken into account in the study (see the following example):

1 *Przedstawiciele władz publicznych, wyżsi urzędnicy i kierownicy* [this is one example of 10 most general classes]

12 *Kierownicy do spraw zarządzania i handlu* [this is one example of 43 large groups]

121 *Kierownicy do spraw obsługi biznesu i zarządzania* [this is one example of 132 groups]

1211 *Kierownicy do spraw finansowych* [this is one example of 444 groups]

121101 *Główny księgowy* [this is one example of 2,360 names of individual professions]

In the present study, only the individual names are taken into consideration; this is done in order to avoid confusion, as sometimes different levels are marked in the same way (see the following example):

82 *Monterzy*
821 *Monterzy*

The present corpus is thus composed of 2,360 official names of professions.

12.3 Problems associated with the analysis of English loan translations in Polish

12.3.1 *Terminological confusion: General remarks*

The first and foremost difficulty is connected with terminological confusion and disagreement as to the range of phenomena subsumed under the name of a loan translation.

The group of loan translations is far from homogeneous; instead, several subgroups can be distinguished. Of particular importance is the classic distinction described by Weinreich (1974): among the group of loan translations, three basic groups are distinguished: (1) loan translations proper, (2) loan renditions, and (3) loan creations. Additionally, a group of semi-calques (Obara 1989; Witalisz 2009) and semi-renditions should also be distinguished. Loan translation, as was stated above, is understood as the literal translation of a multi-morphemic lexeme or multi-word idiomatic or semi-idiomatic construction. Loan rendition, by contrast, involves some degree of deviation from the literal translation. Loan creation involves a completely new rendition; in fact, it is doubtful whether such form is a borrowing or not, as only the general idea is reproduced. Semi-calques or semi-renditions, in turn, contain assimilated lexical borrowings (thus the construction is, using Haugen's terms, a mixture of importation and substitution).

Three problems are predominant here: the difficulty of distinguishing between loan translations and semantic loans, between loan translations and loan renditions, and between loan translations and native phraseological innovations. Additionally, the problem of distinguishing between semi-calques and lexical borrowings can also be taken into account (the present chapter gives only a brief summary of such prob-

lems; for a more detailed treatment see the paper by the present author, Zabawa 2015). Finally, the problems connected with identification can also be mentioned.

12.3.2 Distinguishing between loan translations and semantic loans

Many, if not most, of the calques in the sphere of profession names contain elements used in a new meaning. As for examples, we may consider the construction *kierownik działu zarządzania zasobami ludzkimi*, most probably a calque of English *human resources manager*. The calque in question is not, however, a mere new combination of lexemes in the traditional meaning; instead, it contains the word *zasoby* (resources) used in a new meaning. Traditionally, the word *zasoby* was used in Polish in connection with natural resources, such as oil, gas, water or coal (USJP; cf. also the word *zasób*, which can be used in broader sense, but not the one discussed here). In the construction under analysis, *zasoby* is used in a new meaning, or rather, to be more precise, a new shade of meaning; the word appears in a new collocation *zasoby ludzkie* (human resources), unheard-of before.

Another example is a group of names of professions, all incorporating the word *architekt* (architect) in a new meaning. The constructions in question include *architekt wnętrz* (interior architect), *architekt krajobrazu* (landscape architect), *architekt stron internetowych* (website architect), and *architekt systemów teleinformatycznych* (ICT systems architect). As in the previous case, one of the words, *architekt* (architect) this time, is used in a new sense. It appears also in new constructions, independent of English.

The chief difficulty in such cases is distinguishing between calques and semantic loans. The problem is of theoretical character, but it will influence the number of constructions counted as calques and those counted as containing semantic loans. As for examples, the construction *architekt stron internetowych* can be treated as an English calque in Polish or as a semantic loan *architekt* used not only in a new meaning, but also a new context (for more examples of this kind, see Zabawa 2015). Witalisz (2014), who also discusses the problem, argues convincingly that in most such cases it is not possible to determine whether it was calque or a semantic loan that appeared first in Polish; in consequence, some arbitrary decisions are sometimes unavoidable.

12.3.3 Distinguishing between loan translations and loan renditions

Another problem is connected with the differentiation between loan translations and loan renditions. Loan translation is usually defined as exact translation while loan rendition is defined as approximate translation or translation with some deviation. Two kinds of deviations must be taken into account: semantic and morphosyntactic.

In general, three solutions can be considered here:

Solution 1: Loan translation will be understood as exact translation, both semantically and morphosyntactically; loan rendition, by contrast, will be understood as an approximate translation (semantically and/or morphosyntactically).

Solution 2: Loan translation will be understood as semantically exact translation while loan rendition as semantically approximate translation; morphosyntactic correspondence or its lack is not taken into account at all.

Solution 3: Loan translation will be understood as semantically exact translation, with possible morphosyntactic deviations from the model (only when, due to formal differences between the source and recipient language, it is not possible to form a morphosyntactically “more exact” calque); loan rendition, by contrast, will refer to either (a) semantically approximate translation or (b) semantically exact translation with morphosyntactic deviations greater than resulting from formal differences between source and target language.

Each of the solutions has its shortcomings. In the first case, virtually all cases of English calques in Polish would have to be treated as loan renditions due to the formal constraints of literal rendering of English constructions in Polish. Such literal renderings, naturally, do exist in the real language (e.g., *biznes wiadomości* on the model of English *business news*) but are considered incorrect and described as a violation of Polish morphosyntactic rules (in this case, the inability of a noun to act as a qualifier of another noun). In the second case, by contrast, virtually all cases of English calques in Polish would have to be treated as loan translations proper. Loan renditions would be rare, restricted to a few isolated examples, such as *drapacz chmur* (lit. cloud-scraper, on the model of English *skyscraper*) or, discussed by Witalisz (2012) *czarny koń* (lit. *black horse*, on the model of English *dark horse*).

All things considered, in the present chapter, solution 3 will be adopted. Naturally, it has its shortcomings as well (e.g., in some cases it may be problematic to exactly measure the degree of morphosyntactic deviation from the model), but it seems most balanced.

12.3.4 Distinguishing between loan translations and native phraseological innovations

The main difficulty is connected with distinguishing between loan translations and native phraseological innovations. In some cases, namely in highly idiomatic phrases, the answer is quite straightforward, e.g., *tajemniczy klient* (mystery shopper), which can safely be described as a loan translation of English origin, as it is not only the construction which is new, but also the profession itself. The idiomaticity of the construction also plays a key role here, as it is possible to form a general conclusion that the more idiomatic the phrase in Polish, the more likely it is a calque from English, provided, naturally, that the equivalent construction existed earlier in English (which does not necessarily imply the inclusion in dictionaries, but, for instance, its presence in general and/or specialized English corpora). What is more, as was mentioned above, the very profession is a novelty in Polish. It thus seems highly unlikely that the form was coined spontaneously in Polish without any English influence.

However, one has to remember that it would be a mistake to see all constructions used in Polish that have corresponding structures in English as calques from English. In such extreme view, constructions such as *kierownik hotelu* (hotel manager), *kierownik kina* (cinema manager) or *dyrektor marketingu* (marketing director) would have to be seen as calques from English. This is clearly not only against the intuition but also against the common sense.

In one of my previous articles (Zabawa 2015), I formulated a few criteria which might be helpful in distinguishing between English calques and native constructions. These criteria are not absolute, i.e., they cannot provide definite and conclusive answers in all problematic cases, but nevertheless they appear helpful. The criteria in question include:

- **lexicographical criterion** (i.e., inclusion in dictionaries): if a given English construction (which can be a possible source for a Polish construction) appears in English monolingual dictionaries, but not in Polish ones (or appeared earlier in English dictionaries), it is more likely that the form in Polish is an English calque;
- **corpus criterion** (i.e., an occurrence of a given construction in a corpus): if a given construction appeared earlier in an English corpus, or it appears in an English corpus with a greater frequency than in a Polish one, it is more likely that the form in Polish is an English calque;
- **semantic criterion**: if a new construction in Polish is metaphorical or idiomatic, it is more likely that the form in Polish is an English calque;

- **criterion of analogy:** when there exist many constructions created analogically to a given construction, it is more likely that the form in Polish is a native phraseological innovation, created by analogy with existing constructions;
- **extralinguistic (cultural) criterion:** when it is not only a given construction that is new, but an object or concept described by it as well, it is more likely that the form in Polish is an English calque;
- **source text criterion:** if a new construction appeared first in the texts that are translated or adapted versions from English texts, it is more likely that the form in Polish is an English calque.

Despite all the criteria, however, it is still sometimes not an easy task to distinguish between English loan translations or loan renditions and native semantic innovations. Besides, some of the criteria are not easy to use in practice, e.g., comparing English and Polish corpora cannot frequently provide final answers, as different corpora have different size, different internal structure, etc.

12.3.5 Distinguishing between semi-calques and lexical borrowings

Another problem, though of a related nature, is connected with distinguishing between semi-calques (or semi-renditions) and lexical borrowings. Examples of constructions, in which case such problems may appear, include e.g., *instruktor fitness* (cf. English *fitness instructor*), *egzaminator on-line* (cf. *on-line examiner*), *specjalista do spraw marketingu i handlu* (cf. *marketing and sales specialist* and *marketing and sales manager*), *specjalista do spraw public relations* (cf. *public relations specialist* and *public relations manager*), *organizator eventów* (cf. *event organizer*), *kierownik call center* (cf. *call center manager*). In general, similar criteria as presented in the section above, can be used.

12.3.6 Problems connected with identification

Additionally, loan translations are frequently difficult to identify. While the identification of English lexical borrowing, with the exception of some problems connected with etymology of internationalisms, poses usually no particular problems, the identification of calques is often problematic. This is partially the result of unclear borders between loan translations and related phenomena (e.g., semantic loans, see previous sections) but also the frequent existence of numerous variants of a given construction, e.g., *key account manager*, *key client manager*, *key*

customer manager, key client specialist, key customer specialist or information broker, knowledge broker, information consultant, cyberian, freelance librarian, researcher, data dealer, independent information professional, data broker (on the basis of Wikipedia, <http://en.wikipedia.org>). It is thus often difficult, if not impossible, to precisely pinpoint the English source construction.

12.4 The analysis of loan translations found in the corpus

The present section presents examples of the names of professions that can reasonably be treated as calques (marked as C), semi-calques (marked as SC) or renditions (marked as R) from English, followed by the detailed analysis of two chosen examples. In addition, there are also three examples of loan creations (LC). The possible English source constructions are given in brackets:

- (1) *specjalista do spraw kultury firmy* (company culture specialist) [C]
- (2) *kierownik działu zarządzania zasobami ludzkimi* (human resources manager / human resources department manager) [C]
- (3) *kierownik wioski dziecięcej* (children's village manager) [C]
- (4) *psycholog biznesu* (business psychologist) [SC]
- (5) *architekt krajobrazu* (landscape architect) [C]
- (6) *inżynier inżynierii środowiska* (environmental engineering specialist / environmental engineer) [C]
- (7) *dyrektor sprzedaży* (sales director) [C]
- (8) *dyrektor wykonawczy* (executive director) [C]
- (9) *architekt stron internetowych* (website architect) [SC]
- (10) *specjalista do spraw zarządzania talentami* (talent management specialist) [C]
- (11) *tajemniczy klient* (mystery shopper) [C]
- (12) *agent sprzedaży bezpośredniej* (direct sales agent) [C]
- (13) *specjalista zarządzania ryzykiem* (risk management specialist) [C]
- (14) *programista aplikacji* (application programmer) [C]
- (15) *specjalista do spraw kluczowych klientów* (key account manager / key client manager / key customer manager / key client specialist / key customer specialist) [C]
- (16) *kierownik centrum obsługi telefonicznej* (call center manager) [R]
- (17) *opiekun marki* (brand manager) [R]
- (18) *tester oprogramowania komputerowego* (software tester) [SC]
- (19) *architekt systemów teleinformatycznych* (ICT systems architect) [C]
- (20) *specjalista do spraw marketingu i handlu* (marketing and sales specialist) [SC]
- (21) *specjalista marketingu społecznego* (social marketing specialist) [SC]

- (22) *dealer aktywów finansowych* (financial assets dealer/manager) [SC]
 (23) *etyk biznesu* (business ethicist) [SC]
 (24) *broker informacji* (information broker) [SC]
 (25) *dyrektor generalny* (chief executive officer, chief executive, managing director) [R]
 (26) *autor tekstów i sloganów reklamowych* (copywriter) [LC]
 (27) *promotor marki* (trendsetter) [LC]
 (28) *projektant stron internetowych* (webmaster) [LC]

The two first constructions (*specjalista do spraw kultury firmy* and *kierownik działu zarządzania zasobami ludzkimi*) will be analyzed in greater detail, with the use of the criteria discussed in Section 12.3.4.

The first construction to be analyzed is *specjalista do spraw kultury firmy*, most probably a calque from English, with the possible source construction *company culture specialist*.

The lexicographical criterion: the phrase *kultura firmy* / *company culture* is not included in either Polish dictionaries (USJP, WSJP) or English dictionaries (OED, ODE, OALD; OED lists, however, the construction *corporate culture*; the construction was first used, according to the dictionary, in 1966). All things considered, this criterion does not yield a conclusive result.

The corpus criterion: in the case of English, the earliest occurrence of *company culture* dates back to 1983 (in the case of COHA; 1990 in the case of COCA) while *kultura firmy* to 2001 (NKJP). The form thus clearly appears to be used earlier in English than in Polish.

The semantic criterion: the construction *kultura firmy* can be said to be partly idiomatic: *firma* is used in its basic meaning but *kultura* is used in a new sense. Thus, it is possible to note that there is a certain hint for the English origin of the phrase.

The criterion of analogy: *kultura firmy* does not seem to be created in Polish by analogy to other semantically similar structures; thus, there is no indication that the construction was created in Polish without English influence.

The extralinguistic (cultural) criterion: the very concept of company culture appears new in the Polish reality; as a result, there is a hint that the form is of English origin.

Source text criterion: there is no hint here that the form is of English origin.

When all the criteria are taken into consideration, it is possible to formulate a hypothesis that the construction *specjalista do spraw kultury firmy* is, most probably, a calque from English, with the possible source construction *company culture specialist*. It is a semantically exact translation; admittedly, there is a deviation at the morphosyntactic level,

which results, however, from formal differences between English and Polish (cf. **firmy kultury specjalista*).

The second construction to be analyzed in detail is *kierownik działu zarządzania zasobami ludzkimi*, most probably a calque of English *human resources manager* or *human resources department manager*.

The lexicographical criterion: the phrase *zasoby ludzkie* / *human resources* is included in English dictionaries, namely, ODE (2010), OALD (2015), and OED. According to OED, the construction was first used as early as 1915 (in the sense of “people, esp. personnel or workers, regarded as an asset of a business or other organization”; in the second sense, viz. “the department in an organization dealing with the administration, management, training, etc., of staff”, the form dates back to 1965). The Polish construction, by contrast, does not appear in Polish dictionaries (USJP, WSJP). Thus, the lexicographical criterion clearly indicates that the form is likely to be an English calque.

The corpus criterion: in the case of English, the earliest occurrence of *human resources* dates back to 1817 (in the case of COHA; 1990 in the case of COCA) while *zasoby ludzkie* to 1992 (NKJP). The form thus clearly appears to be used earlier in English than in Polish.

The semantic criterion: the construction *zasoby ludzkie* can be said to be partly idiomatic, as the word *zasoby* appears in a new, unheard-of before, context. Thus, there is a certain hint for the English origin of the phrase.

The extralinguistic (cultural) criterion: the concept of human resources itself is not new in the Polish reality (cf. the existence of such native constructions as e.g., *dział personalny*, *kierownik działu personalnego*, etc.). Thus, there is no hint here that the construction might be of the English origin.

Source text criterion: there is no hint that the form is of English origin.

With all the criteria taken into consideration, it can be said that the form *kierownik działu zarządzania zasobami ludzkimi* is, most probably, an English calque. Again, as in the previous case, it is a semantically exact translation, but morphosyntactically an approximate one; this deviation is, however, a result of the systematic differences between Polish and English (cf. **ludzkich zasobów zarządzający kierownik*).

12.5 Final remarks and conclusions

In general, it can be stated that English loan translations do not appear very frequently in the official Polish names of professions.

This is understandable, since the majority of the names denote well-known, traditional professions.

If one is to assess loan translations appearing in the profession names normatively, the situation is a bit paradoxical: on the one hand, their occurrence is justifiable, as they can be seen as a conscious attempt to avoid excessive use of English lexical borrowings (particularly in the case of the names of new professions). On the other hand, however, they not infrequently introduce new, unnatural collocations (such as, e.g., *zarządzanie ryzykiem*, *zarządzanie talentami*). Many constructions created by means of calquing (conscious or not) are semantically not transparent; as a result, their meaning may not be easily understood, e.g., *broker informacji* or *dealer aktywów finansowych*. This, however, may refer to English lexical borrowings as well (cf. Zabawa 2013: 219) as they can also hinder comprehensibility.

It is thus not possible to state uniformly that the use of English loan translations is more (or less) justified than the use of English lexical borrowings. It would seem that each construction should be assessed separately. This, however, clearly falls outside the scope of the present chapter.

References

Dictionaries

- OALD. *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary*. 2015. 9th edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- OED. *Oxford English dictionary*. 2015. <http://www.oed.com/> (accessed 4 December 2015).
- ODE. *Oxford dictionary of English*. 2010. 3rd edn. Ed. A. Stevenson. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SZA. *Słownik zapożyczeń angielskich w polszczyźnie*. 2010. Ed. E. Mańczak-Wohlfeld. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- USJP. *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego*. 2003. Ed. S. Dubisz. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- WSJP. *Wielki słownik języka polskiego*. 2014. <http://www.wsjp.pl/> (accessed 4 December 2015).

Corpora

- COCA. *Corpus of Contemporary American English*. <http://corpus.byu.edu/coca> (accessed 4 December 2015).
- COHA. *Corpus of Historical American English*. <http://corpus.byu.edu/coha> (accessed 4 December 2015).

NKJP. *Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego*. <http://www.nkjp.pl> (accessed 4 December 2015).

Books and articles

- Haugen, E. 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26. 210–231.
- Obara, J. 1989. *Teoretyczne problemy kalkowania*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Ociepa, R. O współczesnych anglicyzmach w nazewnictwie zawodów i stanowisk służbowych. *Poradnik Językowy* 6. 49–55.
- Weinreich, U. 1974. *Languages in contact. Findings and problems*. The Hague–Paris: Mouton.
- Witalisz, A. 2009. Czy nowe polskie zestawienia determinatywne powielają wzór angielski? In K. Ożóg (ed.), *Język żyje. Rzecz o współczesnej polszczyźnie*, 87–97. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego.
- Witalisz, A. 2012. English loan translations in Polish – preliminary comments. In Z. Wąsik & P. Chruszczewski (eds.), *Languages in Contact 2011*, 225–235. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Filologicznej we Wrocławiu.
- Witalisz, A. 2014. A reconsideration of the notions of semantic loan and loan translation in the analysis of English linguistic influence on Polish. In P. Chruszczewski & J. R. Rickford (eds.), *Languages in contact vol. 1: Languages in Contact 2012*, 221–235. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Filologicznej.
- Zabawa, M. 2012. *Promotor, prezeniter* i inne: innowacje semantyczne w nazwach zawodów. *Język Polski* XCII 3. 174–183.
- Zabawa, M. 2013. English lexical loans in the Polish names of professions. *Linguistica Silesiana* 34. 207–220.
- Zabawa, M. 2015. O trudnościach w badaniu zapożyczeń semantycznych i kalk frazeologicznych. *Język Polski* XCV 4. 306–315.