Izabela Dąbrowska
John Paul II University of Applied Sciences in Biala Podlaska,
the Department of Modern Languages
ORCID: 0000-0002-2472-3794

Katarzyna Cyran
John Paul II University of Applied Sciences in Biala Podlaska, The Academic Library
ORCID: 0000-0002-6525-0997

Influence of the English Language on Librarianship Terminology on Polish University Sites

Abstract

The following article discusses theoretical and practical aspects concerning terminology in the field of librarianship by showing how new terms are coined or incorporated from other languages. It presents key librarian terminology used on the websites of leading Polish academic libraries aiming to assess the extent of the influence of the English language on the Polish librarianship jargon. The analysis draws on fundamental terms selected from five websites and discusses their etymology. Three main trends – neologisms, borrowings and semanticisms – are shown and illustrated with appropriate examples.

Keywords: LIS terminology, librarianship, specialist terms, neologisms, borrowings, semanticisms

1. Introduction

The importance of nomenclature in scientific practice began to be widely recognised as early as in the 18th century. The development of science, intensified by technical inventions and scientific discoveries, contributed to the emergence of scientific concepts and, subsequently, to the formation of terms. However, concepts and terms relating to particular scientific activities arose much earlier. For instance, in the field of library science, they go back to ancient times, when libraries were first created. Along with the foundation of ancient institutions, there emerged concepts relating to particular activities, their categorisations and names. However, the modern development of librarianship and technology, the turn towards information technology (IT) and online communication, as well as the activities of the Library

of Congress in Washington towards the creation of a universal cataloguing format changed the trend. Together with an expansion of knowledge into new subfields such as bibliometrics or scientometry they have resulted in new terminology being brought over into the domain mostly from the English language. In consonance with these trends, this article presents selected key terms from the field of librarianship and argues about their etymology, present–day use, and function.

2. Terms vs concepts

Until the mid–twentieth century, neither linguists nor researchers in the fields of humanities and social sciences dealt with terminology, which arose simultaneously with practical activities in particular domains. In the literature on the subject, one can find dozens of definitions of the word "term," which predominantly point to it being "a name of a scientific or technical concept" (Tomaszczyk 2014: 27). This general definition though serves as a good starting point for deliberations on the subject of naming and distinguishing "concept"– an abstract, multi–layered, dynamic structure, with its content and scope, form "term"– a concrete name of an entity. Accordingly, the use of "terms," which are practical and multifunctional, allowed for categorisation and systematisation of knowledge in an unambiguous way. It facilitated the use of numerous functions in human activity, out of which cognitive and communicative seem to stand out.

3. Terminology in theoretical considerations

Since the issue of terms was put into foreground due to their role they play in every scientific and practical activity and description of its outcomes in research and development, in specialist texts creation, as well as in knowledge transfer and translation, there have evolved different theories and perspectives on terminology. In the 1930s, Eugen Wüster, representing the so–called Vienna school, declared terminology to be an interdisciplinary and autonomous discipline. Basing on his experience in organizing technical terminology, he was mainly concerned with the standardization of terms. His work led to the formulation of the General Terminology Theory (GTT), which was however later refuted. Its main weaknesses were a reliance on single–meaning relationships of concepts and terms, lack of terminological variation, as well as disregard of syntactic and diachronic relationships of terms (Faber 2009: 111–112).

With time, there appeared new proposals attempting to integrate terminology into wider contexts. And so, Gaudin (1993: 225) proposed the so–called a socioterminological approach to scientific lexicon, which takes a linguistic sign at its starting point but respects polysemy of terms, and adopts descriptive functions. Thus, the standardization of terminology seemed unrealistic and harmful in further development of specialised languages, where synonymy and polysemy are inevitable due to social and professional developments (Faber 2009: 113).

Then came the Communicative Theory of Terminology (CTT), proposed mainly by Cabré (1999: 87), an extension of socioterminologists' findings as it took into account the multidimensionality of terminological units. It stressed the complexity of specialised language items by putting them into social, linguistic and cognitive perspective. In a way, the theory discussed terms through "sets of conditions"

(Cabré 1999: 184) deriving from a particular field, conceptual structure, meaning, significance, syntax and communicative context. In short, terms are to be approached through language doors, but they must be seen in the general context of specialised communication.

The last decades shifted linguists' focus towards cognition and the conceptual networks underlying language. Temmerman (2000: 16) criticised General Terminology Theory as unrealistic and incapable of explaining specialised language. In her view, items could not have clear–cut boundaries, monosemic reference and be perceived only synchronically. She proposed analysing terms embedded in community discourse. The sociocognitive approach that she fostered took into account the relationships between language and thought, thought and reality, and reality and language. None of the elements in the tringle could be neglected as it is humans who involve language in understanding the world, and it is man who formulates opinions. Likewise, terms cannot function as elements of an isolated system, but as elements of specialist knowledge – entities that help preserve and disseminate human expertise as it is man who creates terms in the research area. Finally, a vital feature of the sociocognitive approach is its acceptance of the diachronic dimension of terminological units. The last tenet allows for changes in the terminological use of items, their variation in cultural and social groups, as well as their presence both in general and specialized language.

What makes the sociocognitive theory stand out from the rest is its emphasis on conceptual organisation of terminology, where category structure is prototypical and "the representations of relations between concepts in this framework are in the form of idealised cognitive models (ICMs)" (Faber 2009: 117). Also, the already mentioned diacritic perspective on vocabulary, its meaning and use in different contexts and by different social groups seem to indicate that the issue of terminology is not rigidly restricted to a set of principles and premises of compiling terminological data as was the case in the GTT. Instead, concepts and terms turned out to be multidimensional in their nature.

The recent theory of terms and their use in text frames, propounded by Frame–based terminology theory (Faber *et al* 2005) goes further in its analysis of specialised terms. It stresses their behaviour in texts and not the mere distinction between terms and general vocabulary. Consequently, understanding of any terminology–laden text compels understanding of a given domain.

In short, a variety of theoretical approaches to terminology and its categorisation, as well as lexicalisation processes in corpus research on different domains resulted in a rejection of traditional terminology theory that impedes a pragmatic and realistic description of a large number of categories and terms. The main principles of modern procedures understanding in terminology forwarded by the sociocognitive theory combine semasiological and onomasiological perspectives, the usage of synonymy and polysemy in special languages or diachronic influence on accepted solutions. Also, borrowings that relate to the source language domains, involving creations of terms based on the source domains models or the ones inspired by them, give rise to explicit lexicalisations (Temmerman 2000: 187). As Hjørland (2005: 18) stresses, culturally produced signs and symbols are increasingly internationalised. Consequently, any domain analysis sees its users as belonging to different cultures, social structures and domains of knowledge who share specific communication practices. Accordingly, it might be assumed that many terms that are continually introduced to the existing systems are utilised by them on a pragmatic basis.

On the basis of the genetic criterion, items incorporated from other languages can be divided into neologisms, neosemanticisms, and borrowings (Tomaszczyk 2014: 64). In case of neologisms, newly

coined items are formed from native word–formation elements. Neosemanticisms, in turn, use words and expressions deriving from general language in new terminological senses, which undermines the principle of monosemic use of professional items. Finally, new entries in specialised language come in the form of borrowings, especially in the areas of IT, business and economics. Increasingly, the tendency to internationalize terminology lets any language introduce significant numbers of needed items. Most often such terms are adapted to the target language in their spelling, phonological and grammatical structure but there are also those which come intact.

The fact that much specialised vocabulary enters professional domains as borrowings seems worrying to language purists, but the phenomenon is not a new one. There has always existed a language with a strong influence on other, less dominant ones. In ancient times, it was Latin and Greek that took over all civilised spheres – education, legal provisions or church. Later their role was fulfilled by Norman languages and presently it is the English language that dominates (Scarpa 2020: 254–258). Still, a constant influx of foreign terms has its benefits. It fills in gaps in the terminological systems and eliminates less known or ambiguous items.

4. Librarianship as a domain of scientific terminology

One of the areas where a specialised language is employed, namely for informing customers or communicating and cooperating within and between alike institutions, including academies, are libraries. Functioning as portals to culture and knowledge, libraries play a significant role in any society. Databases, services and other resources create opportunities for learning, support literacy and education and help shape new ideas and perspectives that are essential to a creative and innovative society (Roberts 2012: 52–52). Accordingly, librarianship is understood as a field related to the principle and practice of selecting, acquiring, organising, disseminating and providing access to information in accordance with the specific needs of groups of people or individuals (Cheong 2008: 1–3). The profession itself has existed since ancient times and has undergone many changes influenced by political, religious, educational, intellectual and cultural events, encompassing a number of countries and people.

Over years, the field has become a largely interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary domain that influences practices, perspectives and tools for the management of information technology and their relationships to education and other areas. One of such tools that librarianship, as a professional discipline, has developed is its specialist language with own specific terminology. Because libraries were already known in the ancient world, many librarianship terms derive from ancient Greek or Latin, which in turn entered the western languages as borrowings. Simultaneously, the discipline's intense development specially after the Enlightenment period resulted in the introduction of numerous new terms, mostly from the English language, the modern lingua franca (Bordonaro 2017: 169–170).

Furthermore, a significant role in popularising English in librarianship was played by the Library of Congress (the United States), responsible for the creation of the MARC format in the 1960s, adopted by all libraries of the world. The English dominance was also reinforced by ISO/TC 37 Technical Committee – Terminology and other language and content resources, whose primary aims was standardisation of scientific descriptions, resources, technologies and services relating to any domain terminology

(Tomaszczyk 2014: 61–62). Accordingly, items enriching library jargon represent numerous fields, first of all, computer sciences, information technology, economy or marketing.

Enriching the terminology of librarianship follows two dominant trends. One concerns borrowing in its three distinct cases; that is direct borrowing of items and phrases in the form of loanwords compatible with original words at the spelling and phonological level (*tablet*, *ranking*), adjusted terms with adapted spelling and pronunciation (*lider*, *menadżer*), and calques like *sprzęg* or *powierzchnia międzyfazowa* (interface), whose Polish equivalents seem impractical. Out of the three options offered by borrowing, the greatest cognitive and communicative value for the user are the loanwords compatible with original spelling and pronunciation (Tomaszczyk 2014: 68). The other trend pertains to semanticisms, *i.e.* an extension of the already existing items that have broadened their meanings. Such a phenomenon is visible in subsidiary items relating, for example, to words and expressions in information technology (IT), *i.e.* Polish verbs like *ściągać* (download) used in a new sense to transfer (software, data) from a distant to local computer or many other such semanticisms, such as *aplikacja* (application), *mysz* (mouse), *wirus* (virus) or *sieć* (web). They are primarily connected with computer science domain but ultimately find their way into librarianship jargon due to the field's interdisciplinarity (Zabawa 2014: 75).

However, as any other specialised field, librarianship employs both the English language for international contacts, research and knowledge dissemination and its own indigenous tongue for domestic purposes like communicating with library users, providing information on websites and presenting specific instructions. These two language spheres function side by side complementing each other. Increasingly, the mutual contacts result in either direct borrowing from the English language or linguistic transfer. Hence, the solution to linguistic problems and barriers in the area of librarianship that emerge in connection with the internationalisation of various aspects of library services can be found in consistent and transparent use of librarianship terminology.

5. Polish librarian terminology: A case study

The Polish librarian terminology seems to reflect the above discussed trends as its key items tend to derive from the original sources, including Greek, Latin, and English although the amount of vocabulary coming from particular sources varies. To illustrate the trends, 50 commonly used terms were selected and the frequency of their use was checked in iWeb: The 14 Billion Word Web Corpus. Furthermore, to obtain etymological evidence on the items, we consulted *The Oxford English Dictionary*.

In order to investigate how the studied terminology is used in practice, we had analysed the websites of leading academic institutions in Poland and chose five from the top ten in the country. These include university libraries in Poznań, Cracow, Warsaw, Katowice, and one of University of Technology in Warsaw. All were distinguished by the *Perspektywy* journal in its annual ranking as the best academic institutions in Poland. Further, two of them - The University of Warsaw, and the Jagiellonian University - are also in the Shanghai Academic Ranking of World Universities ranking placing in between 301–400. Besides, what is noteworthy, the selected websites provide professional English–language equivalents on their English–version sites, and not translations made by machines of the Google translate type, which is indicated by a marker on the website.

6. Results of the research

The first significant group of terms used in the field of librarianship, assigned to issues in the field of science, have been borrowed in their unchanged form from English. Their Polish counterparts do exit, as in *open access – otwarty dostęp* or *Impact Factor – współczynnik wpływu*, but they are not popular. In common understanding they are loanwords of meanings attributed to entities used in the field of librarianship. Still, some of their roots may have come from other languages that functions as lingua franca centuries earlier (Millward 1996: 50).

The scrutinised vocabulary allowed for making several remarks concerning the use of key librarianship terms on the English versions of leading Polish academic libraries. Foremost, the most often encountered key terms on the sites are borrowings, which is well reflected in key librarian terminology presented in Table 1.

Tab. 1) Key borrowings in librarianship terminology

No.	Source language – English	Target language – Polish	Frequency of use in iWeb	Origin of the words forming the term
1.	leader	leader	1075861	Old English – lædere Old Frisian ledera, Dutch leider, Old High German leitari, German Leiter
2.	Impact Factor	Impact Factor	1946	Impact – Latin impactus Factor – Old French factor, faitor, Latin factor
3.	open access	open access	19581	Open – Old English Open Access – Old French acces
4.	Creative Commons	Creative Commons	17880	Create – from Latin creates, –ive – directly from Latin adjectival suffix –ivus Common – Old French commune and Medieval Latin communia

The first term, *leader*, marks the first field of a MARC record (Machine Readable Cataloguing record). Leader is fixed in length of 24 characters (00–23). It consists of data elements that provide information about a descriptive position of an item. The term is strictly connected with the phrase *MARC record,* and both are widely–accepted borrowings in the librarianship domain. It functions as an element of the internal bibliographic description; the term *leader* does not appear directly on library websites (see Table 5). The next one, *Impact Factor*, a measure used for academic journals reflects the average number of citations in most recent articles, can be translated into Polish as *współczynnik wpływu* although the Polish equivalent is not commonly used. The phrase was coined by Eugene Garfield, the founder of the Institute for Scientific Information in 1955, and from 1975 used to indicated Impact Factors calculated yearly for

all journals listed in the Journal Citation Reports (Reitz 2004–2014). In the analysed websites, the phrase appears as a borrowing in the form of *Impact Factor* in the Polish site version.

Another commonly used borrowing is the English expression *Open Access* (OA), which refers to online research outputs that are free of any restrictions on access (*e.g.*, access tolls) and free of many restrictions on use (*e.g.*, certain copyright and license restrictions). Similarly to *Impact Factor*, the term *Open Access* appears in its original form in the Polish–version website although, as was the case with *Impact Factor*, it has its Polish counterpart, *i.e. otwarty dostęp*. Still, the term *Open Access* in its English version is so popular that it is used even in Polish government regulations. Also, the term *Creative Commons* has been borrowed directly from English. It is one of several public copyright licenses that enable free distribution of an otherwise copyrighted "work". A CC license is used when an author wants to give other people the right to share, use, and build upon a work that the author has created, providing the author flexibility (for example, only non–commercial uses of a given work), as well as protecting people who use or redistribute an author's work from concerns of copyright infringement (Shergill 2017).

These are just a few examples that indicate a strong tendency of relying on borrowings in the librarianship jargon. When borrowed, the words and phrases preserve the original non–integrated forms, *i.e.*, they are spelt and pronounced as in original (*Leader*, *Impact Factor*, *Open Access*), or the integrated ones that adapt features of the target language orthography or pronunciation as in *repositorium*. On the analysed websites, the four key terms can be found in the original forms of *Leader*, *Impact Factor, Open Access* or *Creative Commons* both on the English and Polish–version sites.

Another relatively large group of borrowings in the field of librarianship constitute abbreviations, which tend to be adopted without any changes, although Polish versions of the terms do exist. Full phrases are usually transferred into Polish in the form of calques that show morphemic substitution, which, according to Haguen (1950: 214), puts them in the category of loanshifts. Table 3 presents five well–known examples of abbreviations from the field of librarianship borrowed and transferred into Polish.

Tab. 2) Abbreviations in the field of librarianship

No.	Abbreviations	Full name and the Polish translation	Frequency of use in iWeb	Origin of the words forming the term
1.	MARC (format)	Machine Readable Cataloguing Katalogowanie do odczytu maszynowego	90	Machine – middle French machine, Latin machina Read – Old English rædan able – from Latin –abilis Catalogue – Greek katalogos, Late Latin catalogus, from Old French catalogue
2.	ILS	Integrated Library System Zintegrowany system biblioteczny	ILS – 4501 Integrated Library System – 239	Integrate – Latin integrates Library – from Latin librarium System – Late Latin systema

No.	Abbreviations	Full name and the Polish translation	Frequency of use in iWeb	Origin of the words forming the term
3.	ISSN	International Standard Serial Number Międzynarodowy znormalizowany numer wydawnictw ciągłych	796	Inter– from Latin inter National Old French nacion Standard Old French estandart Serial English series + –al. Number Anglo–French noumbre, Old French nombre Latin numerus
4.	ISBN	International Standard Book Number Międzynarodowy znormalizowany numer książki	25230	International – as above Standard – as above Book – Old English boc Number – as above
5.	OPAC	Online Public Access Catalogue Katalog dostępny online	896	Online – On + line On – Old English on, Proto–Germanic *ana "on Line – Old English line Public – Latin publicus Access – Old French acces Catalogue – Greek katalogos, Late Latin catalogus, Old French catalogue

Abbreviations are commonly used in any specialist language including the field of librarianship. The heavy use of such forms is currently gaining a particular importance due to the dominant trends of simplifying and economising on language use in effective communication (Patil, 2020). Most frequently, abbreviations are neologisms formed from full, predominantly English names, and due to their convenient forms gain international character. The wide application of well–known acronyms is also conditioned by their functioning as single words, without the need of providing fill equivalents.

The term *MARC* (Machine Readable Cataloguing), a well–known acronym, was developed in the 1960s and, by 1971, its formats became a national standard for dissemination of bibliographic data in the United States and, subsequently, an international standard in 1973. The *MARC* phrase itself is an example of terminological internationalisation, popular and known in the library environment around the world (Arnold 1986: 260). The same can be said about the phrase *Machine Readable Cataloguing,* rendered into Polish as *katalogowanie do odczytu maszynowego.* As the application of the Polish counterpart might lead to information noise in communication, again its internationally recognised shortcut seems desirable. Also the abbreviations *ISSN* and *ISBN,* are acronyms better known in this form than by their full names. *ISSN* stands for *International Standard Serial Number* (Międzynarodowy Znormalizowany Numer Wydawnictwa Ciągłego), first drafted by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) in 1971 and published as ISO 3297 in 1975 (Tripathy P. and Tripathy K., 2017: 199). The *ISBN,* in turn, introduced in 1967, denotes an *International Standard Book Number* (Międzynarodowy Znormalizowany

Numer Książki) and is a unique numeric commercial book identifier (Bradley 1992: 25). Academic institutions in Poland use these acronyms in the public access information and do not take advantage of the Polish equivalents of the terms. Finally, the term *OPAC*, which stands for *Online Public Access Catalogue* (Katalog Dostępny Online) functions as a gateway to the library's collection (OPAC 2021). Similarly to *ISSN* and *ISBN*, it is the abbreviated form of the term that appears on the institutional sites.

All the examples given in Table 2 are widely known and used among librarians around the world, hence they are employed exclusively in the form of acronyms and not as their full names or translations. Such practice facilitates communication and allows for overcoming language barriers in the library community.

The next popular trend in incorporating specialised terms is borrowing in which expressions from the source language are translated via literal, word–for–word, or root–for–root translation (Miller 2010: 45). Table 3 lists 28 examples of common calques in the librarianship field.

Tab. 3) Calques/Loans in librarianship terminology

No.	Source language – English	Target language – Polish	Frequency of use in iWeb	Origin of the words forming the term
1.	catalogue	katalog	86551	from Greek katalogos, Late Latin catalogus, from Old French catalogue
2.	repository	repozytorium	118461	French repositoire Late Latin repositorium
3.	bibliographic description	opis bibliograficzny	73	Bibliography from Greek bibliographia biblion book+ graphos description Old French Description (12c.) Latin descriptionem
4.	alphabetical order	układ alfabetyczny	14137	Alphabet Late Latin alphabetum, Greek alphabetos, alpha + beta. Order Old French ordre Latin ordinem
5.	place of publishing	miejsce wydania	3	Publish Old French publier from Latin publicare

No.	Source language – English	Target language – Polish	Frequency of use in iWeb	Origin of the words forming the term
6.	subject cataloguing	katalogowanie rzeczowe	6	<u>Subject</u> from Old French sogit, suget, subget Latin subiectus <u>Cataloguing</u> – catalogue – as above
7.	designation of edition	oznaczenie wydania	1	<u>Designation</u> Latin designationem <u>Edition</u> Latin editionem
8.	Title–page	strona tytułowa	726	<u>Title</u> Old French title <u>Page</u> French page, from Old French pagene Latin pagina
9.	retrieval system	system wyszukiwawczy	1455	<u>Retrieve</u> Old French Retreuver <u>System</u> Late Latin systema
10.	Universal Decimal Classification	Uniwersalna Klasyfikacja Dziesiętna	31	<u>Universal</u> Old French universel, Latin universalis <u>Decimal</u> Latin decimalis Latin decimus <u>Classification</u> Latin stem of classify, or from French classification.
11.	information retrieval language	język informacyjno–wyszukiwawczy	–	<u>Information</u> from Old French informacion, enformacion, Latin informationem <u>Retrieval</u> – as above. <u>Language</u> Old French langage Latin linguaticum, Latin lingua
12.	database	baza danych	840219	<u>Data</u> Latin datum <u>Base</u> Old French bas Latin basis

No.	Source language – English	Target language – Polish	Frequency of use in iWeb	Origin of the words forming the term
13.	key word	słowo kluczowe	11410	Keyword Key+word Key Old English cæg Word Old English word
14.	electronic book	książka elektroniczna	1136	Electric Latin electrum "amber," Greek ēlektron Electronic 1901, pertaining to electrons; electron + –ic; Book Old English boc
15.	library card	karta biblioteczna	13145	Library Old French librairie, Latin librarium Card Old French carte, Medieval Latin carta/ charta
16.	collections	zbiory	283967	Old French collection Latin collectionem
17.	library account	konto biblioteczne	1383	Account Old French acont Late Latin computes, Latin computare
18.	open stacks	wolny dostęp	115	Open Old English open Stack Old Norse stakkr Proto– Germanic *stakon, Russian stog
19.	user	użytkownik	2359345	User use Old French us, Latin usus
20.	selection	selekcja	1064775	from Latin selectionem
21.	inventory	inwentarz	433978	Old French inventoire Medieval Latin inventorium,
22.	conservation	konserwacja	328170	Latin conservationem

No.	Source language – English	Target language – Polish	Frequency of use in iWeb	Origin of the words forming the term
23.	E–resources electronic resources	źródła elektroniczne	799	Electronic electron + –ic; electron Resource from French resourse Old French resourdre Latin resurgere
24.	library training	szkolenie biblioteczne	73	Training Old French train Vulgar Latin traginare, Latin trahere Library – as above
25.	registration	rejestracja	756756	Registration French registration Medieval Latin registrationem
26.	interlibrary loan	wypożyczalnia międzybiblioteczna	5551	Loan Old Norse lan Proto–Germanic laikhwniz, Old High German lehan, German Lehn Old English læn Inter – as above Library – as above
27.	bibliometric analysis	analiza bibliometryczna	41	Analysis Medieval Latin analysis, Greek analysis Bibliometrics biblio+metrics Biblio French bibliologie Metrics French métrique
28.	scientific production	dorobek naukowy	90	Scientific French scientifique, Medieval Latin scientificus, Latin scientia Production Old French production Medieval Latin productionem, Latin producere

Different trends are visible in the way calques are incorporated into Polish. Some are adjusted in the spelling and pronunciation, others – select less popular equivalents. For example, the term *repository* is rendered into Polish as *repozytorium*. The item stands for "an online archive for collecting, preserving, and disseminating digital copies of the intellectual output of an institution" (Bhardwaj 2014: 5) and, due to its usage, is significant in librarian specifications. Originally, it stems from Latin, where it assumes the form of *repositorium* (Gove 1961: 1926). Polish academic libraries use the Polish equivalent of the term.

In case of phrases such as *place of publishing* or *designation of an edition,* the Polish counterparts lose prepositions as the target language is inflectional and passes information about cases via word endings. Otherwise, the remaining phrases consist of the same respective numbers of words, except for *front–page* (a compound noun) and *strona tytułowa* (a phrase) or database (a compound noun) and *baza danych* (a phrase). What is different is that some items change their grammatical forms from nouns into adjectives as in *retrieval* (wyszukiwawczy) or *information* (informacyjny) and the word order becomes adjusted to the target language, *i.e. alphabetical order* is altered into *układ alfabetyczny*.

Besides, some presented above phrases deserve a particular interest due to their etymology or application resulting from specific meanings confined to the language of librarianship. For example *bibliographic description* was coined in Edinburgh, Scotland, in 1927 at an international conference during which a bibliographic description (set of rules) was agreed on. It was to form a standard human–readable format especially meant for use in bibliography or a library catalogue. The Polish literal translation of the phrase is *opis bibliograficzny*. Another etymologically intriguing item is *subject cataloguing*, in which the first word *subject* might refer both to *przedmiot* or *temat* but in some rarer contexts it is synonymous with the item *rzecz* (eng. "thing"). It seems that in the term's translation as *katalogowanie rzeczowe* it seems that this rare equivalent was selected in the term's translation as *katalogowanie rzeczowe*. The same is true of *retrieval system*. The literal counterpart of the term into Polish would be a *system wyszukiwania* (a searching system). Both differ in their application. If one does a web search, then they apply *Information Retrieval* (IR) techniques. Otherwise, IR has a broader meaning as it "encompasses a range of techniques that help with web search, but also other related topics, such as information detection, extraction and summarization" (Weir 2011).

Similar processes took place when other Polish equivalents from Table 3 were borrowed. Individual words (roots) that make up the terms of librarianship come from Latin, Greek, Old French or Old English. Still, in the sense used in the field of librarianship today, they have been adopted from English. This situation, for example, applies to the terminology labelling new phenomena as *scientific production*, *bibliometric analysis*, *electronic resource* or *user*. In the case of older terms known since antiquity such as *catalogue* or *collection*, direct influence from Latin or Greek is preserved.

All the above examples represent popular concepts in librarianship and have their respective counterparts in Polish. This is in contra to the key items such as *Impact Factor* or *Open Access* that are widely used in Polish.

The next category of terms feeding the existing system of terms are semanticisms, arising from the already existing items in new broadened meanings. As indicated above, they are predominantly visible in subsidiary items relating, for example, to words and expressions in information technology. Table 4. lists some common examples of semanticisms in the field of librarianship.

Tab. 4) Semanicisms in the librarianship jargon

	Source language – English	Target language – Polish	Frequency of use in iWeb	Origin of the words forming the term
1.	subject heading	hasło przedmiotowe	1398	Subject Old French suget, subject Latin subiectus Heading Old English heafod
2.	qualifier	dopowiedzenie	36042	Qualify French Medieval, Latin qualificare, Latin qualis
3.	copyright (legal) deposit	egzemplarz obowiązkowy	73	Copyright copy (v.) + right (n.) copy Old French, Medieval Latin copiare, Latin copia Right Old English riht Deposit Latin depositum,
4.	descriptive cataloguing	katalogowanie formalne	8	Descriptive Late Latin descriptivus,
5.	monograph	wydawnictwo zwarte	10712	Monograph Mono– "single" + –graph Mono– Greek monos –graph Greek –graphos
6.	subdivision	określnik	67245	Subdivision subdivide Late Latin subdividere, Latin dividere
7.	serial	wydawnictwo ciągłe	227037	Serial series + –al Serial number, indicating position in a series, first recorded 1866, originally of papers, packages
8.	reference	odsyłacz	948576	Reference Medieval Latin referentia, Latin referentem
9.	circulation department	wypożyczalnia	343	Circulation Latin circulationem department Old French departement Late Latin departire

	Source language – English	Target language – Polish	Frequency of use in iWeb	Origin of the words forming the term
10.	reading room	czytelnia	7147	Reading Middle English reding, Old English ræding, Room Middle English roum, from Old English rum
11.	periodical	czasopismo	13125	French périodique (14c.), Late Latin periodicus, Latin periodus
12.	services	usługi	5050162	Old French servise, Latin servitium
13.	closed stacks	magazyn	98	Close from Latin clausus Stack Old Norse stakkr Proto– Germanic *stakon, Russian stog

When analysed carefully, the items exhibit several different trends. For example, the term *subject heading* consists of two words. The first one – *subject*, has several meanings in English, including *theme*, *topic*, *subject matter* or *point*, whereas in Polish, above all, it denotes *temat* (topic). Similarly, the word *heading* can have its own set of polysemic denotations, *e.g. title*, *degree*, *rubric* or *claim*, which in Polish would denote *tytuł* or *nagłówek*. A literal or a word–for–word translation in this case would be *temat tytułowy/nagłówkowy*. However, the phrase is adapted into Polish as *hasło przedmiotowe* (Tomaszczyk 2009: 195), implying that it points to the most specific word or phrase that expresses a subject, or one of the subjects of a work, selected from a list of preferred terms (controlled vocabulary). Accordingly, it is assigned as an added entry in the bibliographic record and serves as an access point in the library catalogue (Reitz 2004–2014). The word *heading* in turn comes from the word item *head*, denoting the most important part of a body and, together with brain, a principal organ. In librarianship, the *subject heading* describes the most important theme in a text, the main subject and the library sites use the term in their respective language versions as *hasło przedmiotowe* or *subject heading*.

In turn, the item *qualifier*, which in Polish takes the form of *dopowiedzenie*, should literally be rendered as *wyraz określający*. The item denotes a content word that qualifies the meaning of a noun or verb. Hence, *dopowiedzenie* implies some sort of supplementary information, while *wyraz określający* appears too precise. The wider term refers to information defining the scope of the word's use or a character usually in the form of a shortcut. Accordingly, the counterpart *dopowiedzenie* seems to be a better choice in Polish for the English *qualifier*. Similarly, the term, *copyright (legal) deposit*, denotes a book or periodical that a publishing house submits to a library. The Polish counterpart is *egzemplarz obowiązkowy*. A literal counterpart in Polish would read *prawny depozyt*, which implies some sort of obligation on the part of the publisher. Again, the use of a different equivalent renders the semantic context properly.

Also the English expression *descriptive cataloguing* has a modified Polish counterpart *katalogowanie formalne* and is connected with a library's procedure by which a book or other item is identified and described by recording such features as author, title, imprint, pages or size (Gove 1961: 610). A literal

translation into Polish would be *katalogowanie opisowe*. The word *formalne* draws on the English *formal*, which in Polish comes from the item *forma* but in the particular phrase assumes the adjectival form *formalne*. Perhaps the word *formalne* and not *opisowe* is used in the Polish counterpart as it describes elements connected with the form of publication, for example, pages or size. The same elements are described in the English descriptive cataloguing.

The next term, the English *monograph*, might cause some confusion, because the Polish counterpart is *wydawnictwo zwarte*. *Monografia*, unlike its English counterpart, stands for a research paper that discusses an issue in a comprehensive manner, whereas the English *monograph* has a broader meaning, as it points to a non–serial publication completed in one volume (book) or a finite number of volume (Arms 2001: 40). Thus, it differs from a serial publication such as a magazine, journal or newspaper, which might explain why the Polish equivalent of the English *monograph* is *wydawnictwo zwarte*, a publication assembled in one volume – a book. In turn, the English word *serial* is expressed in Polish as *wydawnictwo ciągłe*. The term is applied to a publication in "any medium issued under the same title in a succession of discrete parts, usually numbered (or dated) and appearing at regular or irregular intervals with no predetermined conclusion" (Reitz 2004–2014). Respectively, the Polish adjective *ciągłe* produces associations linked with successive appearance.

The last example to discuss is the English word *reference,* rendered in Polish as *odsyłacz.* It refers to a relation between objects in which one object designates or acts to connect or link to another object. Thus, the object to which something refers to is called a referent. The Polish *odsyłacz* implies the use of some note referring to another text; bibliography, encyclopaedia, etc., or entry referring to another entry. The exact translation of the English *reference* would be too confusing or elusive, as the term has numerous counterparts in Polish, *i.e. referencje, odniesienie, wzmianka, nawiązanie, odwołanie się,* etc. The selected counterpart, *odsyłacz*, seems univocal and precise.

All in all, the use of semanticisms helps in introducing numerous items into the field in newly created applications or entities, which aims at achieving situational appropriateness of specialised meanings. As shown above, particular terms (words and phrases) do not blindly render the English items. Broader or narrower counterparts of the original words are chosen, or other items are selected which in the Polish context make more sense.

All the analysed above terms in their respective language versions, *i.e.* English as the source language and Polish as the target one, are compiled in Table 5. As the compilation shows, the Polish terms denoting new phrases such as *Impact Factor* or *Open Access* are incorporated into the Polish language and used on both Polish and English–language websites in an identical form. The same refers to acronyms, *e.g. ISBN, MARC,* etc., the names originating from English and then successively adopted into other languages. These appear in identical forms in both versions of the library web pages. Many other terms such as *databases* or *keywords* become loans and are increasingly popular in the target language. As for semanticisms, several items such as *descriptive cataloguing* (*katalogowanie formalne*), *serial* (*wydawnictwo ciągłe*) or *monograph* (*wydawnictwo zwarte*) employ the existing words and their combinations in newly devised meanings. Such usage facilitates precision and communication.

Among the 50 analysed terms, the dominant category were loans, which accounted for 9 originally adopted items (borrowings and abbreviations), 28 calques accepted in the form of direct translations, as well as 13 semanticisms. Most have been adopted from English in the present–day meanings although some derive from antiquity, as for example *catalogue, collection, selection, inventory* or *conservation*, which

are Latin or Greek loans. In case of phrases, individual elements that make up the terms derived from Greek, Latin and Old French, or are of mixed origin – Latin, Old French and Old English origin (OED 2022). Thus, conducting the etymological research turned out to be the more problematic than initially assumed as there are several popular librarianship phrases with two or more items whose elements come from different languages and periods. An good illustration of the case would be the term *reference*, originally a Latin item *referentia*, brought to French in the 16th c., and incorporated into the English language in the 19th c.

As the analysis shows, it is the English language, the modern lingua franca, that exerts the greatest influence on the Polish librarianship domain. Even in the case of items of mixed etymology, it seems safe to say that they enriched the Polish librarianship lexicon getting there from English, after having been accommodated in the language in the 19th or 20th centuries.

Tab. 5) Librarianship terminology used on Polish and English–language websites

Word/phrase	Biblioteka Uniwersytecka w Warszawie/ University of Warsaw Library https://www.buw.uw.edu.pl/en/	Biblioteka Główna Politechniki Warszawskiej/ Library of Warsaw University of Technology https://bg.pw.edu.pl/index.php/en/	Biblioteka Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego https://bj.uj.edu.pl/	Biblioteka Uniwersytecka w Poznaniu http://lib.amu.edu.pl/?lang=en	Biblioteka Akademii Górniczo–Hutniczej/The Main Library of AGH University of Science and Technology http://bg.agh.edu.pl/en
Impact Factor	Impact Factor	Impact factor	Impact Factor	Impact Factor	Impact Factor
open access	open access	open access	open access	open access	open access
mikroforma	microform	–	microform	microform	–
katalog	catalogue	catalogue	catalogue	catalogue	catalogue
repozytorium	repository	repository	repository	repository	repository
MARC	MARC	–	–	MARC	–
ISSN	ISSN	ISSN	ISSN	ISSN	ISSN
ISBN	ISBN	ISBN	ISBN	ISBN	ISBN
OPAC	OPAC	OPAC	–	–	OPAC
bazy danych	databases	databases	databases	databases	databases
słowo kluczowe	keyword	keyword	–	keyword	keyword
układ alfabetyczny	alphabetical order		alphabetical order	alphabetical order	alphabetical order
opis bibliograficzny	bibliographic description	bibliographic description	bibliographic description	bibliographic description	–
miejsce wydania	place of publication	–	–	–	–

Word/phrase	Biblioteka Uniwersytecka w Warszawie/ University of Warsaw Library https://www.buw.uw.edu.pl/en/	Biblioteka Główna Politechniki Warszawskiej/ Library of Warsaw University of Technology https://bg.pw.edu.pl/index.php/en/	Biblioteka Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego https://bj.uj.edu.pl/	Biblioteka Uniwersytecka w Poznaniu http://lib.amu.edu.pl/?lang=en	Biblioteka Akademii Górniczo–Hutniczej/The Main Library of AGH University of Science and Technology http://bg.agh.edu.pl/en
katalogowanie rzeczowe	–	–	–	–	–
oznaczenie wydania	–	–	–	–	–
strona tytułowa	–	title page	–	–	–
hasło przedmiotowe	subject heading	–	–	subject heading	–
katalogowanie formalne	–	–	–	–	–
wydawnictwo zwarte	–	–	monograph	monograph	monograph
karta biblioteczna	library card	library card	library card	library card	library card
zbiory	collections	collections	collections	collections	collections
konto biblioteczne	library account	library account	library account	library account	library account
otwarty dostęp	open stacks	open stacks	open stacks	–	open stacks
magazyn	closed stacks	–	closed stacks	–	–
wypożyczalnia	circulation department	circulation department	circulation department	circulation department	circulation department
użytkownik	user	user	user	user	user
czytelnia	reading room	reading room	reading room	reading room	reading room
czasopismo	periodical	periodical	periodical	periodical	–
selekcja	selecton	selection	–	selection	selection
inwentarz	inventory	–	–	inventory	inventory
konserwacja	conservation	conservation	conservation	conservation	conservation
usługi	services	services	services	services	services
źródła elektroniczne	E–resources	E–resources	–	electronic resources	electronic resources
szkolenie biblioteczne	library training	library training	library training	library training	library training
rejestracja	registration	registration	registration	registration	registration
wypożyczalnia międzybiblioteczna	interlibrary loan	–	–	interlibrary loan	interlibrary loan

Word/phrase	Biblioteka Uniwersytecka w Warszawie/ University of Warsaw Library https://www.buw.uw.edu.pl/en/	Biblioteka Główna Politechniki Warszawskiej/ Library of Warsaw University of Technology https://bg.pw.edu.pl/index.php/en/	Biblioteka Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego https://bj.uj.edu.pl/	Biblioteka Uniwersytecka w Poznaniu http://lib.amu.edu.pl/?lang=en	Biblioteka Akademii Górniczo–Hutniczej/The Main Library of AGH University of Science and Technology http://bg.agh.edu.pl/en
analiza bibliometryczna	bibliometric analysis	bibliometric analysis	–	bibliometric analysis	bibliometric analyses
dorobek naukowy	scientific production	scientific production	–	–	–
prawo autorskie	copyright	copyright	–	copyright	copyright
licencje Creative Commons	CC – Creative Commons	–	–	Creative Commons	Creative Commons

7. Conclusions

The Polish librarianship terminology, as many other scientific domains, has been considerably influenced by the English language. It is due to the fact that the contemporary world is no longer divided into self–contained territories or social domains. It seems impossible to imagine the development of any branch of science without international relationships and common means of communication. Consequently, many terms from librarianship and information technology come from English, some of which being difficult or even impossible to render into Polish. This results in numerous borrowings that appear significantly more convenient to use because of their international character. The examples presented in the study seem to confirm this observation as they demonstrate frequent use of borrowings, authentic abbreviations and calques/loans in the resource of librarianship terminology. An extensive reliance on such items is related to the internationalisation of the terminology and the need for precise communication.

Another conclusion concerning linguistic choices in specialised terminology is an influx of semanticisms, whose numbers are constantly growing. Although they can be labelled as insidious, since most of them are noticed only by the people trained in linguistics, their application seems inevitable. They are willingly employed as they provide the same references to the librarianship elements and activities as the original expressions in other parts of the world. Accordingly, the most significant factor that seems to determine the use of such terms is their pragmatic adequacy.

References

Arms, William Y. (2001) *Digital Libraries.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
Arnold, Irina Vladimirovna (1986) *The English World*. Moscow: Vyssaja Skola.

Bhardwaj, Raj Kumar (2014) "Institutional Repository Literature: A Bibliometric Analysis." [In:] *Science & Technology Libraries* 33 (2); 1–18.

Bordonaro, Karen (2017) *International Librarianship at Home and Abroad*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Chandos Publishing.

Bradley, Philip (1992) "Book Numbering: the Importance of the ISBN." [In:] *The Indexer* 18 (1); 25–26.

Cabré, Teresa Maria (1999) "Terminology. Theory, Methods and Applications." [In:] Helmi Sonneveld, Sue Ellen Wright (eds.) *Terminology and Lexicography Research and Practice*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Cheong, Choy Fatt (2008) "Librarianship: What Is it About Now?" [In:] *LAS CONFERENCE 2008: Innovate to Serve. 8–9 May 2008*. Singapore: Library Association of Singapore; 1–10.

Faber, Benítez Pamela (2009) "The Cognitive Shift in Terminology and Specialised Translation." [In:] *MonTI. Monografías De Traducción E Interpretación* (1); 107–134.

Felber, Helmut, Budin Gerhard (1994) *Teoria i praktyka terminologii*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Gaudin, François (1993) "Pour une socioterminologie. Des problèmes sémantiques aux pratiques institutionnelles, coll." [In:] *Publications de l'Université de Rouen*. Rouen: Université de Rouen; 182.

Haguen, Einar (1950) "The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing." [In:] *Language* 26; 210–231.

McCullough Millward, Celia (1996) *A Biography of the English Language.* Marceline: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Miller, Frederic P., Agnes F. Vandome, John McBrewster (2010) *Calque*. Saarbrücken: VDM Publishing.

Palil, Mohd Rizal (2020) *Useful Abbreviations for Library Science*. Raleigh, North Carolina: Lulu Pubications.

Pettegree, Andrew Arthur der Weduwen (2021) *Library. A Fragile History*. London: Basic Books; 19–22.

Roberts, Bob (2012) "We Build Communities through Knowledge: Demonstrating the Value of the Professional Public Librarian." [In:] Bill Crowley (ed.) *Defending Professionalism. A Resource for Librarians, Information Specialists, Knowledge Managers and Archivists*. Santa Barbara, Denver, Oxford: Libraries Unlimited.

Scarpa, Federica (2020) *Research in Professional Practice in Specialised Translation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Temmerman, Rita (2000) *Towards New Ways of Terminology Description: The Sociocognitive Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Tomaszczyk, Jacek (2014) *Model systemu informacji terminologicznej*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Tripathy, Priyanka, Kumar Tripathy (2017) *Fundamentals of Research. A Dissective View*. New York: Anchor Academic Publishing.

Zabawa, Marcin (2014) *English Lexical And Semantic Loans in Informal Spoken Polish*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Dictionaries consulted

Oxford English Dictionary. [At:] https://www.oed.com/ [date of access: 02 May 2022].

Gove, Philip Babcock (1961) *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged: Utilizing All the Experience and Resources of More Than One Hundred Years of Merriam–Webster Dictionaries.* Cologne: Merriam Webster.

Tomaszczyk, Jacek (2009) *Angielsko-polski słownik informacji naukowej i bibliotekoznawstwa*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego: https://www.sbc.org.pl/dlibra/docmetadata?id=16671 [date of access: 14 Nov. 2022].

Online sources

Biblioteka Uniwersytecka w Warszawie/University of Warsaw Library. [At:] https://www.buw.uw.edu.pl/en/ [date of access: 02 May 2022].

Biblioteka Główna Politechniki Warszawskiej/Library of Warsaw University of Technology. [At:] https://bg.pw.edu.pl/index.php/en/ [date of access: 05 May 2022].

Biblioteka Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. [At:] https://bj.uj.edu.pl/ [date of access: 04 May 2022].

Biblioteka Uniwersytecka w Poznaniu. [At:] http://lib.amu.edu.pl/?lang=en [date of access: 03 May 2022].

Biblioteka Akademii Górniczo–Hutniczzej/The Main Library of AGH University of Science and Technology. [At:] http://bg.agh.edu.pl/en [date of access: 05 May 2022].

Faber Benítez Pamela, Márquez Linares Carlos Francisco, Vega Expósito Miguel (2005) "Framing Terminology: a Process-Oriented Approach." Retrieved from *Meta: Journal des traducteurs*; 50 (4). [At:] http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/2005/v50/n4/019916ar.html [date of access: 27 Sep. 2021].

Hjørland, Birger (2005) "Domain Analysis: A Socio–Cognitive Orientation for Information Science Research." Retrieved from *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*; 17–21. [At:] https://doi.org/10.1002/bult.312 [date of access: 25 Nov. 2022].

MARC Standards. [At:] https://www.loc.gov/marc/marcdocz.html [date of access: 02 Jun. 2021].

OPAC. [At:] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Online_public_access_catalog [date of access: 02 Jun.2021].

Reitz, Joan Marcile (2004–2014) *Online Dictionary for Library and Information Science*. [At:] http://www.abc–clio.com/ODLIS/odlis_A.aspx [date of access: 02 Jun.2021].

Shergill, Sanjeet (2018) "The Teacher's Guide to Creative Commons Licenses". [At:] *Open Education Europa. Archived.* [At:] https://web.archive.org/web/20180626111219/https://www.openeducationeuropa.eu/en/blogs/teachers–guide–creative–commons–licenses [date of access: 15 Mar. 2022].

Weir, Rob (2011) "What is the Difference between Information Retrieval and Search?" [At:] *Quora*: https://www.quora.com/What–is–the–difference–between–Information–Retrieval–and–Search [date of access: 02 Jun. 2021].