

Sylwia KRUKOWSKA

Uniwersytet Łódzki

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7137-8738>

A COMMENTARY ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEO-LATIN VOCABULARY WITH REFERENCE TO RECENT LINGUISTIC STUDIES

The practical use of Latin is uncommon in the 21st century. Since the collapse of the Roman Empire, it has been considered a ‘dead language’. The main reason for this is that there is no nation for which Latin is a mother tongue. However, there are still people who can speak Latin fluently in everyday communication. Thus, we can ask ourselves where this idea originated and how it is possible to speak an ancient language in modern times. The aim of this paper is to briefly describe the history of Latin’s development, focusing on the coining of vocabulary related to breakthrough discoveries after the collapse of the Roman Empire. This should lead to answering the question of whether the continuous interest in Latin and its growth throughout the centuries was a natural evolution of the language or rather an artificial attempt to keep it alive. Furthermore, it is also worth considering whether it is appropriate to refer to Latin as a ‘dead language’ in every sense of the word. To support the thesis of Latin’s continuous growth, several lexical examples with word-formation analysis will be provided, demonstrating that the analogical processes observed within Latin also appear in modern languages.

EIN KOMMENTAR ZUR ENTWICKLUNG DES NEULATEINISCHEN VOKABULARS IM ZUSAMMENHANG MIT AKTUELLEN SPRACHWISSENSCHAFTLICHEN STUDIEN

Der praktische Gebrauch des Lateinischen ist im 21. Jahrhundert nicht weit verbreitet. Seit dem Untergang des Römischen Reiches gilt es als „tote Sprache“. Der Hauptgrund dafür ist, dass es keine Nation gibt, für die diese Sprache als Muttersprache dienen würde. Dennoch gibt es noch immer Menschen, die fließend Latein in der Alltagskommunikation sprechen können. Daher stellt man sich die Frage, woher diese Idee stammt und wie es möglich ist, eine antike Sprache in der



© by the author, licensee University of Lodz – Lodz University Press, Lodz, Poland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

Received: 07.11.2024. Verified: 22.11.2024. Revised: 27.04.2025. Accepted: 10.06.2025.

Funding information: University of Lodz. **Conflicts of interests:** None. **Ethical considerations:** The Authors assure of no violations of publication ethics and take full responsibility for the content of the publication. **Declaration regarding the use of GAI tools:** not used.

modernen Zeit zu sprechen. Ziel dieses Artikels ist es, die Geschichte der Entwicklung des Lateinischen kurz darzustellen, insbesondere im Hinblick auf die Wortschöpfung, die sich auf bahnbrechende Entdeckungen nach dem Untergang des Römischen Reiches bezieht. Dies soll zur Beantwortung der Frage führen, ob das kontinuierliche Interesse am Lateinischen und dessen Wachstum über die Jahrhunderte eine natürliche Entwicklung dieser Sprache war oder eher künstliche Versuche, sie am Leben zu erhalten. Darüber hinaus lohnt es sich zu überlegen, ob es angemessen ist, Latein als „tote Sprache“ im wahrsten Sinne des Wortes zu bezeichnen. Zur Unterstützung der These eines ständigen Wachstums des Lateinischen werden mehrere lexikalische Beispiele mit einer wortbildenden Analyse vorgestellt, die zeigen, dass die analogen Prozesse, die im Lateinischen auftreten, auch in modernen Sprachen beobachtet werden können.

Keywords: Latin, linguistics, word formation, Neo-Latin

Schlüsselwörter: Latein, Linguistik, Wortbildung, Neulatein

Słowa kluczowe: łacina, językoznawstwo, słowotwórstwo, neo-latin

Introduction

Active use of the Latin language is unique in our reality. For about a century, Latin has been considered a dead language dedicated only to specific branches of science. There are still people, however, who are able to speak this language fluently. It can be assumed that the currently developed and actively operating neo-Latin movement was initiated by the congress in Avignon on the initiative of Jean Capelle in 1956. Thus, we can ask ourselves whether it was an actual breakthrough that revived this language or, rather, it initiated a broader trend of returning to tradition. It is also worth considering whether it is appropriate to talk about Latin as a ‘dead language’ in every sense of the word. The aim of this article is to try to find an answer to these questions. To support the thesis of its continued development, an analysis of word-formative processes of the neo-Latin terms will be conducted. Due to the considerable size of the argument, semantic changes will be omitted. The examples provided are intended to give a general overview of the whole problem¹. The paper partially refers to a book I authored; therefore, some lexical examples are convergent (Krukowska 2014).

Latin has actively served as a language of diplomacy in Europe in past centuries. As a language of art, science and, above all, clergy, it was in common use until the end of the 19th century, or even to the beginning of the World War II. Ultimately, it faced a final blow because of the decisions of the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965) that introduced reform of the liturgy. As a consequence, Latin

¹ The examples provided in this paper are of different origine. They are mentioned for illustrative purposes in order to indicate that the Latin language has been expanding its lexical resources up till now. Some of the terms appear frequently in the dictionaries throughout the centuries, some are rare and have not been referred to in any of them but in other sources like articles, books, the Internet or in conversations.

was replaced by national languages even within the Church. Until then, interest in Latin continued unabated.

In order to challenge the tendency to consider Latin a dead language, we should look back and analyze its development since the collapse of the Roman Empire in the 5th century AD. Since, this point in time might have been considered a breakthrough in Latin history. The Western Empire lost its power over the region and started to be conquered by numerous tribes, and therefore, a considerable risk of the disappearance of the Latin language arose. However, that is not what happened. At the point when Latin was about to disappear, the Catholic Church took advantage of the existence of an ideal means of international communication to preach the Gospel. This masterstroke not only saved Latin as such but also made this language unchangeable in its grammatical form for over 15 centuries. Even though it was not necessary to provide any changes in the aspect of grammar, Latin, which remained a so-called *lingua franca*, constantly needed to adapt new concepts to its vocabulary if it was about to serve for generations.

Development of Latin from the collapse of the Roman Empire to the end of the Middle Ages

Together with the development of religious, scientific and technical concepts, new words started to appear, e.g. *ecclesia*, -ae [SŁŚPL, DMLBS] ('church') from the Greek noun ἐκκλησία ('gathering', 'Jewish commune', 'Christian Church'), *monac(h)us*, -i [SŁŚPL, DMLBS] ('monk') and *monacha*, -ae [SŁŚPL, DMLBS] ('nun') from the Greek adjective μοναχός, -ή, -όν ('solitary', 'lonely'), which comes from the adjective μόνος, -η, -ον ('alone', 'lonely'), *angelus*, -i [SŁŚPL, DMLBS] ('angel') from the Greek noun ἄγγελος ('messenger', 'envoy', 'one that announces'), *diabolus*, -i [SŁŚPL, DMLBS] or *diabulus*, -i [SŁŚPL] ('devil') derived from the Greek noun διάβολος ('accuser', 'slanderer'). The primary thing to pay attention to is that all the words quoted above have Greek origins and are basically only transliterated into the Latin alphabet. Their pronunciation, apart from matters related to accentuation, did not change substantially.

Considering changes in meaning of each new Latin lexeme, all examples show a narrowing (or clarification) of the semantic scope already taking place in the Greek words (as Greek was the first language of the New Testament), which were taken over by Latin in their basic, but especially, in new meanings. Their grammatical gender did not change either. The Greek ending of the masculine noun -ος was replaced by the Latin -us, characteristic of the II declination, and these words also have the same inflection. The feminine gender expressed in Greek forms with the endings -η and -α replaced the Latin suffix -a, which is characteristic of the I declination.

During medieval times, apart from religious terms, several other new words were provided in Latin vocabulary. Some of which were of Latin origin, e.g. a noun *distillatio*, -onis [SŁŚPL, MLW] or *destillatio*, -onis [SŁŚPL, DMLBS, MLW] ('distillation'), which comes from the verb *destillare* [SŁŚPL, DMLBS, MLW] or *distillare* [SŁŚPL] ('to drip', 'to drop') derived from the noun *stillā*, -ae ('drop') with the prefix *de*- (with the sense of 'down', 'from', 'off', as well as 'opposite of', 'apart' and 'away') attached. However, some lexemes, especially those referring to mathematics, had Arabic origins. The word motivating forms *algorismus*, -i [SŁŚPL, DMLBS, MLW], *algorithmus*, -i [SŁŚPL] and *allegorismus*, -i [SŁŚPL] ('calculation') appears to be a distorted surname of *Muhammad ibn Musa al-Khwarizmi*, which underwent a specific graphic-phonetic transformation into the Latin form: (according to various sources) *Alchorismi*, *Algorismi*, *Algorismus*, *Algoritmus*; this word was probably also to some extent influenced by the Greek noun ἀριθμός ('number') (Louridas 2020: 4–5; Długosz-Kurczabowa 2008: 13). Another example is the noun *algebra*, -ae [DMLBS, MLW] ('algebra'). The derivational basis of this lexeme is the Arabic word *al-jabr* or *al-jebr* written in the Latin alphabet, of uncertain meaning, mostly translated as 'reunion of broken parts'. The word appears in a book written by the mathematician mentioned above, under the Arabic title *Al-mukhtasar fi hisab al-jabr wa al-muqabala* (Eng. *The compendium on calculation by restoring and balancing*) (Harper 2023). Another word is the new Latin lexeme *zephirum*, -i (Leonard of Pisa 1202)² and its synonyms *cifra*, -ae [SŁŚPL, DMLBS, MLW], *ciffra*, -ae [SŁŚPL], *ciphra*, -ae [SŁŚPL]. Both came from the Arabic word *sifr*, which meant 'empty', as well as 'zero' and 'nothing'. The noun *cifra*, -ae in medieval Latin appeared in the meaning of 'zero sign' (which in Latin can also be expressed as *figura nihili*) (Smith, Karpinski 2023: 51–62) and – as a result of shifting the center of the meaning of the word – 'cipher sign', 'code', in turn, as a consequence of generalization, i.e. extension of the meaning, it took on a more general meaning – 'digit', 'number', 'numeric sign' (Turek 2002: 97).

Latin in the period of Great Discoveries of the late 15th– 20th/21st centuries

As Latin was still the main language of scientific communication for most of this time, it was necessary to coin terms referring to new discoveries and inventions in this language as well. Latin was able to keep abreast during the period of great geographical discoveries. Every country, land, mountain, or river in expanding western civilization was given a Latin name. The most obvious examples are here the proper names of the continents: *Europa*, -ae, *America*, -ae (which actually

² *Cum his itaque novem figuris, et cum hoc signo 0, quod arabice zephirum appellatur, scribitur quilibet numerus.*

stands for a modification of the name of Amerigo Vespucci, its alleged discoverer and the first to recognize it as a new continent) and *Terra Australis incognita* ('the Southern unknown land'), *Terra Australis* or simply *Australia*, -ae. Whereas the first British colony in North America – *Virginia*, -ae – was given a name to honor Elizabeth I, the Virgin Queen, from the Latin noun *virgo*, -inis ('virgin').

Curiosity led a man not only to the most distant places on Earth but also to outer space. Therefore, new inventions were created, such as *telescopium*, -i [DMLBS] ('telescope'), which is a noun of a Greek origin, combined from the adverb *τῆλε* ('far', 'long distanced') and the verb *σκοπεῖν* ('to watch', 'to observe'). The microworld was also no longer mysterious due to the invention of *microscopium*, -i [DMLBS] ('microscope'). The noun was formed from the Greek adjective *μικρός*, -ά, -όν ('small', 'little') and the already mentioned verb *σκοπεῖν*. Another noun in this context is 'vision correction device', i.e. 'glasses' – Lat. *perspicilla*, -orum [LLII].

With time, new methods of communication have been discovered, starting with *typographia*, -ae [DMLBS] – from the Greek nouns *τύπος* ('impact', 'dent', 'impression', 'mark') and *γραφή* ('drawing', 'picture', 'writing') – called synonymously *impressus*, -us [SŁŚPL] and *impressa*, -ae [SŁŚPL] ('printing') – from the Latin verb *premo*, -ere, -pressi, -pressum ('to press') with the prefix *in-* ('in', 'on', 'into'), which already in classical Latin created the verb form *imprimere* [SŁŚPL, DMLBS] ('to stamp', 'to incise') – in the 15th century, and next in the 19th century, with the mastery and use of 'electricity' (Lat. *electricitas*, -atis [LLH, DA, LL, IVL], *electris*, -idis [LRL] or *electrica vis* [LRL]) – *telegraphum*, -i [LLH, DA, LL], *telegraphium*, -i [DA], *instrumentum telegraphicum* [DA], *machina telegraphica* [DA], *filum aeneum* [N&Q, PCA], *filum telegraphicum* [PCA] or *filum electricum* [PCA], which all mean 'telegraph'. The 'telegram' itself was defined as *telegramma*, -atis [LLH, DA, LL, LRL], *nuntius telegraphicus* [LLH, DA, LL], *nuntium telegraphicum* [DA] and *telegraphema*, -atis [LLH, DA, LL, IVL]. The 'telephone' also got its Latin name, namely: *telephonum*, -i [LLH, DA, LL, LRL, IVL] or *telephonium*, -i [LLH, DA, LL, LRL]. The next breakthrough discovery in the period of industrial revolution of the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries was *radiophonum*, -i [LLH, DA, LL, LRL, IVL] also called *radiophonium*, -i [LLH, DA, LL, LRL], *instrumentum radiophonicum* [LLH, DA, LRL] or *capsella radiophonica* [DA, LRL] ('radio'), from the Latin noun *radius*, -ii ('ray') and Greek *φωνή* – ('voice', 'sound'), as well as 'cinema' called in Latin with a few synonyms: *cinematographeum*, -i [LLH, DA, LL, LRL, IVL], *cinemateum*, -i [LLH, DA, LL, IVL], *theatrum cinematicum* [LLH] or *cinema*, -atis [LLH, LL]. These nouns were built from Greek stem *κίνη-* existing in the nouns *κίνημα*, -ατος ('movement', 'motion'), *κίνησις*, -εως (of the same meanings in this context) and in the verb *κινεῖν* ('to move'). A 'film' was given the Latin names *pellicula*, -ae [LLH, DA, LL, LRL] based on the classic noun *pellis*, -is ('animal skin', 'integument', 'animal skin products'), as in Spanish [RAE 2023] and *taeniola*, -ae [DA,

LRL] from the noun *taenia*, -ae ('ribbon'). While the latest technology Bluetooth is called *caerulidens*, -tis [LLH].

Mass or interpersonal communication was not the only thing of concern for scientists of that time. New methods of transportation were also invented. First can be mentioned the simplest two-wheeled vehicle – *birota*, -ae [LLH, DA, LL, LRL, IVL] (*velocissima*) [LW] – 'bicycle' (first called as 'velocipede'). The noun was already known in classical Latin, where it had the meaning of 'two-wheeled cart'. It consists of the prefix *bi-* ('twice', 'double') and the noun *rota*, -ae ('circle'). The adjective *velox*, -ocis (in the superlative) appears optionally next to the noun *birota* and refers to its ancient meaning – 'fast', 'quick'. *Birota automataria* [LLH, DA, LL, LRL] or *autobirota*, -ae [LLH, LL, IVL] are the Latin names for a 'motor-cycle'. Both consist of the adjective *automatarius*, -a, -um or its stem, and come from the Greek form *αὐτόματος*, -η, -ον ('acting of one's own will', 'spontaneous', 'automatic'). At the beginning of the 19th century also 'railway' appeared, which was called *via ferrata* [DA, LL, LRL] or *ferrivia*, -ae [LLH, DA]. The Latin noun *via*, -ae ('road') and the adjective *ferratus*, -a, -um ('made of iron') derived from the word *ferrum*, -i ('iron') form the basis of this term. The most modern vehicle of that time was a 'car' – Lat. *autocinetum*, -i [LLH, DA, LRL, IVL] also known as *autoraeda*, -ae [LLH, DA, LL], *raeda automataria* [LLH, LL], *autocurrus*, -us [DA], *automobilis*, -is [DA], *automobile*, -is [DA], *automatum*, -i [DA], *currus motorius* [DA], *currus automobilis* [DA], *currus automatarius* [DA, LL], *automobilis vectura* [DA], *automobilis raeda* [DA], *automataria raeda* [DA, LRL] or *automatarium vehiculum* [DA]. In this case, Latin users again returned to the Greek language using the pronoun *αὐτός*, -ή, -ό ('self', 'one's own', 'by oneself') or the adjective *αὐτόματος*, -η, -ον and known to the Romans the adjective *mobilis*, -e ('mobile') as well as the nouns: *currus*, -us ('wagon'), *vectura*, -ae, *vehiculum*, -i ('vehicle') and *raeda*, -ae ('carriage') – a loanword from the Gallic. At the beginning of the 20th century first successful flight on a flying machine driven by an engine took place. It was given a few synonymic Latin names: *aëroplanum*, -i [LLH, DA, LL, LRL, IVL], *aërovehiculum*, -i [LLH, DA, LRL], *aëronavis*, -is [LLH, DA, LL, LRL], *aërinavis*, -is [DA], *aëronavigium*, -i [DA], *velivolum*, -i [DA, LL], *aëria navis* [DA, LL], *aërium navigium* [DA], *vehiculum aërium* [DA], *navis volans* [DA] and *navis aëroplanigera* [DA]. These terms are based on Latin nouns, namely: *aër*, *aëris* ('air'), *planum*, -i – 'flat surface', *navis*, -is, *navigium*, -i ('ship'), *vehiculum*, -i as well as the participle *volans*, -tis ('flying'). Another kind of flying machine, i.e. helicopter, got only one name – *helicopterum*, -i [LLH, DA, LL, LRL, IVL]. Since people also succeeded in building spacecrafts, Latin had to enrich its vocabulary with this new referent, namely: *rocheta*, -ae [LLH, DA], *rucheta*, -ae [DA IVL] and *missile*, -is [DA, LL, LRL]. The most modern and increasingly widely used flying machine is the drone, Lat. *aërofucus*, -i [LLH], *aërovehiculum inane* [LLH], *aëria navis sine gubernatore* [LL] ('pilotless aerial ship') or *teleplanum*, -i [Vici].

Richness of a language or chaos? The process of coining new terms in a language in the past centuries

Taking into consideration the process of constituting and accepting the new word forms, we can make some interesting observations. Namely, the lack of unanimity (which often resulted from the distance between the residence of Latin using experts or insufficient knowledge when it comes to Latin spelling) led not only to variations in the orthographical system, but also to parallel existing lexemes. The multitude of synonyms is noticeable. We can demonstrate this in many examples. As the first can be given eleven parallel existing nouns referring to a ‘sundial’, which differ only in spelling: *horologium*, -ii [SŁŚPL, DMLBS], *herrologium*, -i [SŁŚPL], *horalegium*, -i [SŁŚPL], *horalogium*, -i [SŁŚPL], *horelogium*, -i [SŁŚPL], *horilegium*, -i [SŁŚPL], *horilogium*, -i [SŁŚPL], *horolegium*, -i [SŁŚPL], *orilogium*, -i [SŁŚPL], *orlogium*, -i [SŁŚPL], *orologium*, -i [SŁŚPL], which all take origin from the Greek noun ὥρολόγιον (‘sundial’), which is a combination of two stems: ὥρα (Gr. ‘season’, Lat. *hora*, -ae – ‘hour’) and -log- or -leg- from λόγος (‘word’) or λέγειν ‘to tell’, ‘to speak’ (Lat. *legere* – ‘to read’). Our next example will be six synonymic terms used to determine a ‘telescope’, namely: *oculus artificialis tele-dioptricus* (Zahn 1685), *telescopium*, -i (Zahn 1685; Rogaliński 1776, 129) or *tubus opticus* (Rogaliński 1776, 129), *perspicillum*, -i, *specillum*, -i³ [DMLBS], *conspicillum*, -i⁴ – originally from Latin for ‘an instrument used for visual observation’, with the prefix *per-* (‘through’) and *con-* (‘with’). As mentioned above, ‘printing’ was given five following Latin names: *typographia*, -ae [DMLBS], *res typographica*, *impressus*, -us [SŁŚPL], *impressa*, -ae [SŁŚPL] and *impressura*, -ae [SŁŚPL]. Whereas a ‘print run’ in medieval Latin was defined in seven different ways, as: *impresio*, -onis [SŁŚPL], *inpressio*, -onis [SŁŚPL], *impressa*, -ae [SŁŚPL], *impressus*, -us [SŁŚPL], *inpressus*, -us [SŁŚPL], *typis excusus* and *actus typis excudendi* [SŁŚPL]. The ability to travel, trade and learn new cultures led a man to taste unusual flavors at that time. This is how the noun ‘coffee’ was introduced into Latin. Latin users borrowed the Turkish word *kahveh*, from Arabic *qahwah* (Harper 2023) and created twelve synonymic forms of *coffeum*, -i [DA, Vici], *cofeum*, -i [Vici], *caffaum*, -i [Vici], *cafeum*, -i [LLH, DA, LRL, Vici], *cafaeum*, -i [DA, LRL, Vici], *coffea*, -ae [LLH, DA, LL, Vici], *cafea*, -ae [LLH, DA, LL, Vici] *cafearia*, -ae [DA], *potio cafearia* [DA], *potio cafaearia* [LLH, DA, LRL] or pure Latin *potus Arabicus* [LLH, LL, Vici] and *potio Arabica* [LLH, DA, LL, LRL] (‘Arabic beverage’).

³ “Newton used both ‘perspicillum’ and ‘telescopium’ for ‘telescope’ in accordance with contemporary usage; for example, the Latin translation of Descartes’s *Dioptrique* used both of these terms as well as ‘specillum’” (Shapiro 1984: 46).

⁴ “Telescopium – the Lippershey model (1608) was developed by Galileo in 1609 and further refined by Andrea’s friend and correspondent Kepler. The name ‘telescopium’ was adopted in 1611 by the Accademia dei Lincei. Kepler referred to it as a ‘perspicillum’, ‘conspicillum’, ‘specillum’ or ‘penicillum’ in 1610, adopting ‘telescopium’ by 1613 (Andrea 1999: 215).

Apart from orthography: spelling with or without an *h*- at the beginning (e.g. *horologium*, -i / *orologium*, -i), alternation of forms which differ in the vowels: -o/-e- (e.g. *horologium* / *herrologium* or *orilogium* / *horolegium*), -o/-a- (e.g. *coffeum* / *caffaum*), -o/-a/-e/-i/-no vowel (e.g. *horologium* / *horalogium* / *horelogium* / *horilogium* / *orlogium*), -i/-e- (e.g. *imprimere* / *impremere*) and consonants: geminate usage versus non-usage (e.g. *herrologium* / *horologium* or *coffeum* / *cafea*), -m/-n- (e.g. *impressio* / *inpressio*), the parallel existing forms of grammatical gender (e.g. feminine: I decl. *impressa*, -ae; III decl. *impressio*, -onis; masculine: IV decl. *impressus*, -us, or feminine: I decl. *coffea*, -ae and neutral II decl. *cafaeum*, -i) as well as differences in etymology, can be observed. The given vocabulary mostly represents the group of words of Latin and Greek origin (with the exception of derivatives from Arab. *kahveh*). All these lexemes are codified in dictionaries, which was already mentioned.

After an initial analysis of the above-mentioned terms, several reflections arise. First of all, alternation of forms is a sign of the richness of a language, its constant development and an indicator of its survival inclinations, but such an expansion of so many word-forms disturbs the communication process and may lead to misunderstandings or accusation of misspelling (which in the case of Latin is an evident fact). Moreover, territorial differences can have an impact on forming dialects, in the long term (which did not happen in this case). In addition, the creation of homonyms in such a situation is almost inevitable. For example, *perspicilla*, -orum [LLII] and *conspicilla*, -orum [ML] (Nominative plural) in Latin dictionaries, apart from the 'telescope' (in singular: *perspicillum*, -i, *conspicillum*, -i) also refer to 'eyeglasses'. This phenomenon is not surprising, though, if we consider the whole territory where Latin as a language of science was used. Of course, word forms were well considered (scientists knew the basics of classical languages very well), analyzed (with the help of dictionaries) and discussed (for example, during congresses or by publications), but in many cases, they were created similarly to modern languages of that time, where professional terms differed from each other even in the same country, and the specialists sometimes needed to guess from the context the meaning of specific word and its connection to the given referent.

Referring to the analogical situation in modern languages, we can give a few examples of the development of Polish medical terms in the second half of the 19th century, where the richness of homonyms is conspicuous: *blona wrzekoma*, *blona rzekoma*, *nibyblona*, *pokład* ('pseudomembrane'); *biegunka krwawa*, *dysenteryja*, *czerwonka* ('dysentery'); *letarg*, *śpiączka zamartwa*, *zachwat*, *śpiik* ('morbid drowsiness', 'morbid, sound sleep'); *niedomiarowość*, *oko niedomiarowe*, *krótkowidztwo*, *oko krótkowidzące*, *krótkowidzenie*, *krótki wzrok* ('myopia'); *nakłucie*, *kropka*, *znamię*, *piętno* ('birthmark'); *pasożyt wewnętrzny*, *robaki*, *czerw*, *wnętrzak*, *wnętrzaki*, *robaki wewnętrzne* ('parasite in the body'); *rażenie*, *raz*, *apopleksja*, *udar* ('stroke'), *sapka*, *nieżyt*, *nieżyt nosa*, *katar*, *uciążliwość* ('runny

nose’); *nudności*, *nudność*, *mierziączka*, *ckliwość*, *brzydzenie*, *mdlenie*, *mdłości*, *mierźliwość* (‘nausea’); *wyprzenie*, *odparzenie*, *zaprzzenie*, *otręt*, *wilk*, *starcie* (‘dermatitis’, ‘skin damage, e.g. as a result of rubbing, especially in children’, e.g. around the anus, genital parts, in the crook of the thigh, ‘a callus or ulcer on the leg’, ‘abrasion’) (Jankowiak 2015: 283–358).

Several of these words survived and are still used in the Polish professional and/or colloquial language. However, some of them have now and had back in the 19th century more than one meaning, which might have been confusing. In addition, some of them are similar in form, others are more distant, having different stems. Which, as already mentioned, happens often by creating up-to-date vocabulary. According to Jankowiak, “only since the 19th century can we talk about scientific medicine” (Jankowiak 2015: 21). In this period, new concepts about physiology and pathology have been created, and new therapy methods have also been invented, while the anatomy of the human body has not been fully discovered. To understand the phenomenon of synonymy in Polish medical terms of the 19th century, one needs to know the history of Poland, as the Polish history of this period had a great impact on establishing new terminology. As a result of the annexations, the country was divided into three parts controlled by Prussia, Austria, and Russia. Therefore, these languages participated in the creation of Polish scientific terms, including medical vocabulary. French, which enjoyed considerable prestige during that period, exerted a noticeable influence on the Polish language – an influence that persists to this day. In addition, the Polish culture has never died. Therefore, also this language itself has been used regularly and overcame transformations comparable to other European languages. Thus, at least six languages, namely: Polish, Russian, German, Latin, Greek, and French influenced the decisions of the Polish medical society when it comes to establishing new terminology.

The analogical processes can be observed in Latin. Not only was this language used in separated countries, which made almost impossible to avoid local language influences on it, but the limited possibilities of sharing knowledge and exchanging ideas as well as insufficient fluency in Latin resulted in the use of specific terms in a certain region, the parallel development of synonymous words and orthographic errors. Nevertheless, the Latinists managed to keep this language homogeneous.

Contemporary attitude towards Latin in the context of a recent linguistic study

Although modern languages by coining new terminology still refer to classical lexical sources, Latin is not a language of science anymore. However, it does not mean that Latin lovers stopped to make effort to keep this language efficient enough to meet the needs of its contemporary user. The process of coining new terms is taking place before our eyes, as has been happening throughout the

centuries. The vocabulary introduced is constantly discussed and undergoes constructive critique. The discussion takes place in different fields. However, some issues seem to be more important and others less important for Latin lovers. The problem of grammar apparently does not bother them too much. The reason for this seems to be clear. That is, classical Latin grammar is complex enough to meet the needs of its speakers. Naturally, the spoken language may differ from its written form, as happens in every language, and speech varies among specific people depending on their level of linguistic skills. Therefore, simplifying and rationalizing grammar seems to be a secondary problem. Also, pronunciation does not occupy Latin lovers as much. Although from time to time there are voices saying that the pronunciation should be standardized, surprisingly, it has been accepted by many that in European countries and in the United States the pronunciation is a bit different. The reason for this is probably that it does not cause major communication problems and therefore does not have to be changed or unified. Moreover, for some countries like Poland, which have gotten used to their model over the centuries, it would be difficult to switch to another type of pronunciation, and maybe even not as much for professional philologists, but especially for the whole nation, to whom still clang sounds of Jan Kochanowski's or Mikołaj Sęp-Szarzyński's Renaissance poetry as well as Latin expressions and phrases (like: *curriculum vitae* or *Veni, vidi, vici*) often quoted unchangingly according to the medieval pronunciation system. Although increasingly less Poles understand them, many recognize Latin only from hearing.

Variations in pronunciation refer to few specific sounds, for example: *c* – spelled as [c] or [k], sometimes even as [č], *v* – spelled as [w] or [u], blend of letters: *qu* – spelled as [k^w] or [k^u], and analogously *ngu* – spelled as [ng^w] or [ng^u], diphthongs: *ae*, *oe* – spelled as [e] or [aⁱ] and [oⁱ]⁵. The reasons for the different types of pronunciation of Latin words, varied territorially, have a historical background and later accretions from foreign languages. For instance, the type of pronunciation in Poland has been influenced since the Middle Ages by Latin propagated by the Catholic Church, which changed it for its own purposes. On the contrary, many western countries have returned to the so-called *lingua Latina restituta* ('restored Latin'), which is intended to bring pronunciation closer to the original classical articulation, while characteristic Italian influences on spelling are observed on the Apennine Peninsula.

Therefore, the changes needed refer to the vocabulary itself. Having in mind that Latin is no longer the mother tongue of anyone, if we want to present it as a potentially spoken language, it is necessary to describe it as any other living language, referring to the processes occurring within Latin to modern linguistic

⁵ For example: the name of Julius Cesar (Lat. *Caesar*) is pronounced as: [Cezar] by Poles, [Ka'zar] by many other western citizens, and [Čezar] by Italians; the word *lingua* ('language') is pronounced as [ling^wa] in Poland, and as [ling^ua] in many other countries, similarly the nouns *aqua* ('water') – respectively as [ak^wa] and [ak^ua], and *vita* ('life') – as [wita] and [uita].

theories describing lexicogenesis, which “is defined with reference to the operations involved in creating words” (Miller 2014: 83). We will try to answer the question of whether the processes of coining novel words occur in an artificial or natural way. Therefore, Latin examples will be given by illustrating each of them.

According to John R. Taylor (2015: 419), in “lexicogenetic mechanisms (...) four basic types may be distinguished: morphological word formation, transformation of existing words, pure neologisms, and borrowing.” The first thing he mentions is that new words may be coined “through the combination of existing words, or through the combination of existing words and affixes”. The first is related to the so-called “composition”, i.e. the process of combination of two or more stems (e.g. nouns *aeroplanum*, -i [LLH, DA, LL, LRL, IVL] – ‘airplane’ [from Lat. *aër*, *aëris* – ‘air’ and *planum*, -i – ‘flat surface’]; *agoraphobia*, -ae [LLH, DA, LRL] – ‘agoraphobia’ [from Gr. *ἀγορά* – ‘square’, ‘market square’, ‘place of citizen gathering’ and *φόβος* – ‘fear’]; *birota*, -ae [LLH, DA, LL, LRL, IVL] – ‘bicycle’ [from Lat. *bis* – ‘twice’, ‘double’ and *rota*, -ae ‘circle’]). In the latter, which is related to the derivation, the affixes are conjoined to the stem (e.g. noun *autophotographema*, -atis [LLH] – ‘selfie’ [here is used a Gr. pronoun αὐτός – ‘self’, ‘one’s own’, ‘by oneself’ as a prefixoid⁶, as well as Gr. nouns *φῶς*, *φωτός* – ‘light’ and *γράφημα* – ‘picture’, from the verb *γράφειν* – ‘to write’], adjective *autocineticus*, -a, -um [LLH, DA, LL] – ‘referring to a car’ [a compositum of the already mentioned prefixoid αὐτός, a stem κίνημα, -ατος described above, and suffix -us characteristic for adjectives of the II decl.], noun *automatizatio*, -onis [LLH, DA] – ‘automatization’ [from Lat. adj. *automatus*, -a, -um [LLH, DA, LL], originally Gr. ‘a self-acting machine’, with a noun suffix -tio referring to an action or state], verb *supraordinare* [LLH] – ‘to give sth. precedence over sth.’ [from Lat. prep. *supra* – ‘above’, ‘beyond’, ‘over’ and a verb *ordinare* – ‘to order’, ‘to count’], noun *intercommunicarium*, -i [LLH] – ‘intercom’ [from Lat. prep. *inter* – ‘between’, stem *communicare* – ‘to communicate’ and suffix -arium as a neuter noun ending]).

The second type is “the transformation of existing words, for instance through clipping or blending”, which, according to Taylor (2015: 419–420), is the most productive in media and computer speech. Both processes have also been very common in colloquial speech and jargons. However, if we intend to refer to them for the development of Latin, they require some explanation. According to Bakradze, three types of clipping can be distinguished, depending on which part of the word was clipped: “1. apocoptation – clipping of the final syllable; 2. syncope

⁶ According to Norde and Morris, “prefixoids are bound morphemes that are not yet affixes because they correspond to lexemes, that is, unbound forms, but their meaning differs from that when is used as independent lexemes” (2018: 47). Götzsche (2018: 167) describes prefixoids as “items that have been grammaticalized from independent words”. In this article, morphemes coming from independent words which repeatably take part in creating new terms (such as: *cyber-*, *electro-*, *cine-*) are considered as prefixoids; in accordance with it, after H. Jadacka (2001: 97) similarly are described forms such as Gr. *auto-* (equivalent to Pol. *samo-*).

– clipping of the middle syllable; 3. aphaeresis – clipping of the initial syllable.” As mentioned above, these kinds of neologisms are often coined, especially in colloquial languages and slangs. “Newly created shortened forms of the words are more emotional and stylistically colorful, they belong to spoken language, but some of them enter the language vocabulary and are not recognized as clipped words⁷” (Bakaradze 2016: 430). It seems that the more free and certain people feel in their communication process, and the closer together they live, the easier clipping, abbreviations and any other forms of shortenings (verbal or sentential) are created. In addition, any kind of shortening is formed in words or phrases that are frequently used by a certain group of people, so that they do not cause any misunderstanding in the communication process. In fact, it is quite the opposite; they make it shorter and simpler. In other words, if one wants to use clippings, he should be sure that he will be easily understood. For this reason, Latin appears to be quite poor compared to other spoken languages in this respect. There are still too few Neo-Latinists to create jargon; furthermore, they are dispersed across the globe, so their contacts and interactions are limited. For this reason, Latin lovers use well-known, full in-form vocabulary, and sometimes even longer, descriptive forms, especially while talking about things that the recipient might be unfamiliar with, referring, for instance, to social networks or modern technology. Although, there are obviously some examples of clipped words in Latin, like *rete*, -is – ‘net’ (from Lat. *interrete* – ‘Internet’), the Latin vocabulary is much richer in composita. Referring to the phenomenon of blending, which may also be considered as univerbation, the situation looks alike; nevertheless, there are several examples of such a process in Latin. “According to Andersen (1987), univerbation can be observed on three different levels: (i) the morphological level (loss of morpheme boundaries), (ii) the prosodic level (e.g. stress shifts), and (iii) the segmental level (phonological reduction). Univerbation usually takes place at the *morphological* and the prosodic level, but not necessarily on the segmental level” (Norde 2009, 77). As already mentioned, there are only a few examples of this phenomenon in modern Latin vocabulary, for instance: *altisonum*, -i [DA] or *altiloquium*, -i [DA] (‘speaker’) – from the Lat. adjective *altus*, -a, -um (‘high’, ‘deep’, ‘loud’) or the noun *sonus*, -i (‘sound’) and the verb *loqui* (‘to say’, ‘to speak’), *brevinuntiare* [LLH] (‘to text’) – from the Lat. adjective *brevis*, -e (‘short’) and the verb *nuntiare* (‘to announce’, ‘to inform’, ‘to report’), as well as the noun *vultuliber*, -bri [LLH] – a calque⁸ from Eng. ‘Facebook’ (from Lat. *vultus*, -us – ‘face’ and *liber*, -bri – ‘book’). Examples of “acronyms, i.e. abbreviations formed by using the initial elements of a compound word or phrase, can also be included here” (Taylor 2015: 420). Only a few examples of this phenomenon exist in Latin, some of which have been created as early as in ancient Rome, such as the following: *S.P.Q.R.*

⁷ “e.g. *pants* from the word *pantaloons*, *bus* < *omnibus*, *bike* < *bicycle*”.

⁸ In linguistics calque may be defined shortly as a ‘loan translation’ (Winters 2020: 49).

(*Senatus Populusque Romanus* – ‘The Senate and People of Rome’), *S.P.D.* (*Salutem Plurimam Dicit* – in salutation X ‘says [wishes] as much health as possible’), or more recent *TTT* (*Tela Totius Terrae* [DA] – ‘World Wide Web’, ‘www’) and *RIV* [LL], *IRV* [DA] or *RVI* [LLH] (*Res Inexplicata Volans, Inexplicata Res Volans* or *Res Volans Inexplicata* – ‘Unidentified Flying Object’, ‘UFO’). “In recent years, the use of initials (the first element of a word) has been very frequent in compounds and blends with the characters *e* for *electronic* and *i* for *internet*” (Taylor 2015: 420). Latin has also adopted this model, for instance: *i-diarium,-i* [spok.] (‘blog’) – where *i-* stands for ‘referring to the Internet’ (from Lat. adjective *interreticus,-a,-um* of the noun *interrete*) and is attached to the noun *diarium,-i* (‘diary’). Although Latin does not accept as freely this kind of forms, there are several borrowings from English representing the above-mentioned processes, which undergo inflection within Latin itself (some stay in indeclinable form) and are treated in this language as regular nouns, such as: *laser,-eris* [Vici], *laser* indecl. [DA, LL] (from Eng. acronym ‘laser’ that stands for ‘Light Amplification by Stimulated Emission of Radiation’), *bloga,-ae* [spok.], *blogum,-i* [Vici], also *blog* indecl. [LLH, Vici] – ‘blog’ (from Eng. ‘web’ and ‘log’), *podcast,-is* [spok.], *podcast* indecl. [Vici] – ‘podcast’ (from Eng. ‘iPod’ and ‘broadcast’), *ipodium,-i* [Vici], also *iPod* indecl. [Vici] – ‘iPod’, *memum,-i* [Vici] – ‘meme’ (“coined from Greek sources, such as *mimēsthai* ‘to imitate’, and intended to echo *gene*” [Harper 2023]), *taxium,-i* [LLH] or *taxiraeda,-ae* [LLH] – ‘taxi’ (“from taximeter ‘automatic meter to record the distance and fare’, (...) from Medieval Latin *taxa,-ae* ‘tax, charge’” [Harper 2023]) and the above mentioned noun *raeda,-ae*).

The third phenomenon distinguished by Taylor are the so-called neologisms, which “may be created out of the blue, without starting from existing words or word formation rules” (Taylor 2015: 420). In modern Latin, such words are rare. For, all word formation processes are supervised and controlled. However, when we consider neologism in the boarder sense as “any type of lexical innovation” (Geeraerts 1997: 120), we can give plenty of examples, such as *album,-i* [LLH, DA, LL, LRL] – ‘screen’ (from Lat. adjective *albus,-a,-um* – ‘white’), *auscultabulum,-i* [DA, LL, IVL] – ‘telephone receiver’ (from Lat. noun *auscultare* – ‘to listen’) and *exceptaculum,-i* – [LLH, DA, LL] 1. ‘receiver’, [LL] 2. ‘telephone receiver’ (from Lat. *excipere* – ‘to receive’).

Finally, as the fourth type, new vocabulary “borrowed from another languages” is mentioned. It is worth remembering that only words or word-structures will be discussed here, while the issue of semantic calques i.e. “loan translations, when each of the composite elements of a foreign word or phrase is translated into the receptor language” (Taylor 2015: 421), will be omitted. Latin derives new vocabulary from many languages, such as: Polish – *narta,-ae* [LLH, DA, LL, LRL, IVL] (‘ski’), German – *cobaltum,-i* [LLH, DA, LL, LRL] (‘cobalt’), English – *Google,-is* [LLH] or *Gugula,-ae* [Vici] (‘Google’), Italian – *violoncellum,-i* [LLH, DA, LL] (‘cello’), Spanish – *sigarum,-i* [LLH, DA, LL] (‘cigar’),

Mexican Spanish, from Mayan – *socolata*, -ae [LLH, DA, LL, LRL, IVL] (‘chocolate’), Japanese – *karate* indecl. [Vici], Turkish – *cafaea*, -ae (‘coffee’) etc. The discussion about borrowings in modern Latin is not simple, though, since many European (and, as a consequence, also American) languages have been crating their vocabulary on the basis of Latin (or Greek) roots. Therefore, an interesting process occurs in the area of Latin loanwords, that is, the case of the process of returning of loan words, where “a source language may borrow back a word after it was developed independently by the receptor language” (Taylor 2015: 421). This topic, however, represents in most cases, apart from morphological changes, also semantic development of Latin vocabulary; therefore, it will not be discussed in this paper.

Summary

Based on the examples above, it can be concluded that Latin, after the collapse of the Roman Empire, never stopped developing. Moreover, its development can be compared with other European languages of a specific period. Due to its universality and flexibility, it could perfectly meet the communicational needs of a man in every epoch. The fossilized form has not been Latin’s fault, but its incredible weapon. As W. Stroh states, “Only through its ‘death’ could Latin become immortal” (Stroh 2007: 111). For all the reasons mentioned above, unlike other languages, Latin survived unchanged throughout the centuries. The process of creating new vocabulary in Latin was controlled, but not artificial. The perfect evidence for this is the fact that many European languages have been loaning Latin vocabulary from the very beginning of their existence. Latin not only survived itself but also lives in other languages. Classical morphemes have been easily adopted, well recognized and communicative. No wonder they are still a great resource for every person who deals with coining new terminology. Classical-origin internationalisms are entering modern languages today, often “in English disguise” (Janson 2006: 161). In case of the development of Latin, neologisms that are based mostly on classical morphemes too, are discussed continuously as has been throughout the ages, with the only difference that lately new methods of communication have emerged, such as the Internet or mobile telephony. There are many forums and discussion groups on social networks where such conversations take place. People ask questions if they are not sure how to use or create a specific term.

The results of mutual exchanges of thoughts and ideas are satisfactory and comparable to those of many years ago. However, surprisingly, Latin lovers not always manage to avoid resorting to the less appropriate patterns; for example, there are still some cases of synonyms for the same referent, where one of the differences is spelling or the noun’s affiliation with a specific declension, such as: sixteen terms for the noun ‘Internet’ – *internet*, -is [spok.], *internetum*, -i [DA,

LL, CVC], *interreticulum*, -i [DA], *interrete*, -is [LLH, DA, LL, CVC, Vici], *intra-rete*, -is [LLH], *internexus*, -us [Vici], *intextus*, -us [spok.], *rete*, -is [DA], *tela*, -ae [DA, CVC], *interrete internationale* [DA], *rete internationale* [DA], *rete globale* [spok.], *rete electronicum globale* [spok.], *intertextus internationalis instrumentorum computatoriorum* [LL], *intextus internationalis instrumentorum computatoriorum* [DA], *Tela Totius Terrae (TTT)* [DA, LL, CVC], six synonyms for the adjective ‘referring to the Internet’ – *interneticus*, -a, -um [LL], *interreticus*, -a, -um [LL], *internetalis*, -e [DA, CVC], *interretialis*, -e [LLH, DA, LL, CVC], *intraretialis*, -e [LLH], *retialis*, -e [spok.] or thirteen terms for the noun ‘blog’ *diarium interretiale* [LLH], *i-diarium*, -i [spok.], *diarium retiale* [spok.], *diarium*, -i [spok.], *diarium nauticum* [spok.], *ephemeris*, -idis [Vici, spok.], *ephemeris interretialis* [Vici, spok.], *commentarii interretiales* [LLH, Vici], *blogum*, -i [Vici], *bloga*, -ae [spok.], *blog*, -is [spok.], *blog*, -is [spok.], *blog*, indecl. [LLH, Vici]. Nevertheless, parallel forms exist also in other languages, which is at times confusing for their users, but does not create communication problems or misunderstandings, for example: the nominative plural form of Pl. *postać* (‘character’) may be *postaci* and *postacie*, the same form of *psycholog* (‘psychologist’) may be *psychologowie* and *psycholodzy*, another example is *chłopak* (‘boy’) that takes pl. form of *chłopaki* (non-masculine personal gender) or *chłopacy* (masculine personal gender), the noun *sanie* (‘sleigh’) takes the instrumental form of *saniami* and *sahnmi*, while the masculine adjective form of an English ‘curious’ – in Polish is *ciekaw* and *ciekawyy*, ‘ready’ – *gotów* and *gotowy*, ‘full’ or ‘complete’ – *pelen* and *pełny*. In this respect, Latin acts in a similar way.

Many examples show that Latin acts as many other languages; this is why it is easy to describe it according to modern theories. Therefore, Latin does not appear to be a peculiar language that acts on its own principles. It easily adopts the new vocabulary needed for communication purposes of a specific period. Nevertheless, the form of this language still seems to be a little bit rigid, unwilling to accept characteristic to the 21st century speech shortenings. In return, Latin becomes reach in neologisms that are created on the basis of classical as well as loaned morphemes.

In the aspect of borrowings, an interesting thing can be observed. Latin, not differently from other languages, copies foreign structures as a consequence of international contacts. It is not surprising then that Latin accepts new words or word-formative structures of a foreign origin (for example: Lat. *altiloquium* from Sp. *altavoz* – ‘loudspeaker’; from Lat. *altus* and Sp. *alto* – ‘high’, ‘tall’ and Lat. *loquium* from the verb *loqui* – ‘to speak’ and Sp. *voz* – ‘voice’). However, many more examples show the tendency to adopt its native vocabulary back from modern languages, which makes this language absolutely unique. This leads to the conclusion that we should reconsider our way of thinking of Latin as a ‘dead language’ in the fullest sense of the word. Despite of the fact that even some classical philologists and Latin experts, who often are distinguished scholars and Latin propagators, take

this stand, which manifests itself, for instance, in a title of an article *Latin's Life After Death* (Tekieli 2004), it is good to bear in mind a sentence by Julian Tuwim: *What kind of dead language is it if, without withering, it has survived for millennia?* as an inspirational motto for efforts in promoting this language.

Bibliography

- Andreä, J.V. (1999). *Christianopolis*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Geeraerts, D. (1997). *Diachronic Prototype Semantics A Contribution to Historical Lexicology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press Publication.
- Götsche, H. (2018). *The Meaning of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Jadacka, H. (2001). *System słowotwórczy polszczyzny (1945–2000)*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Jankowiak, L. (2015). *Synonimia w polskiej terminologii medycznej drugiej połowy XIX wieku*. Warszawa: PAN.
- Janson, T. (2006). *Latein: Die Erfolgsgeschichte einer Sprache*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag GmbH.
- Krukowska, S. (2017). *Łacina jako środek komunikowania treści związanych z osiągnięciami współczesnej myśli technicznej. Łacińskojęzyczne słownictwo z zakresu elektroniki, informatyki i Internetu*. Warszawa: Wszechnica Polska Szkoła Wyższa w Warszawie.
- Leonardo Pisano. (1202). *Liber Abaci*. Herbipolis (Würzburg): Sumptibus Quirini Heyl. In: B. Boncompagni. (1857). *Scritti di Leonardo Pisano matematico del secolo decimoterzo*. Badia Fiorentina: Tipografia delle scienze matematiche e fisiche. s. 2. https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_Cr-dUBgtAZFoC/page/n7/mode/2up?q=scribitur+quilibet+numerus [20.10.2024].
- Machado, S. *Real Academia Española*. <https://www.rae.es> [05.01.2024].
- Miller, D. (2014). *English Lexicogenesis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nodge, M. (2009). Oxford: OUP Oxford.
- Norde, M., Morris, C. (2018). *Derivation without category change*. In: K. Van Goethem (ed.). *Category Change from a Constructional Perspective Category Change from a Constructional Perspective*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 47–90.
- Panos, L. (2020). *Algorithms*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Rogaliński, J. (1776). *Doświadczenia skutków rzeczy pod zmysły podpadających na publicznych posiedzeniach w szkołach poznańskich Societatis Jesu na widok wystawione y wykładane, Jego Królewskiej Mości Panu naszemu Miłościwemu ofiarowane*. J.K.M. Soc. Jesu.
- Shapiro, A.E. (1984). *The Optical Papers of Isaac Newton: Volume I, The Optical Lectures 1670–1672*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, D., Karpinski, L. (2023). *The Hindu-Arabic Numerals*. New York: Legare Street Press.
- Stroh, W. (2007). *Latein ist tot. Es lebe Latein! (Kleine Geschichte einer grossen Sprache)*. Berlin: Ullstein Buchverlage.
- Taylor, J. (2015). *The Oxford Handbook of the Word*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tekieli, S. (2004). *Łaciny życie po życiu. Życie*. 28–29.02.
- Turek, W. (2002). *Zmiany wyrazów arabskich zapożyczonych do polszczyzny za pośrednictwem innych języków. Język polski* 82/2.
- Tuwim, J. *Łacina*. <https://repozytorium.uni.lodz.pl/bitstream/handle/11089/53708/przek%C5%82ady%20Tuwima.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y> [20.10.2024].
- Winters, M. (2020). *Historical Linguistics. A Cognitive Grammar. Introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Zahn, J. (1685). *Oculus artificialis teledioptricus sive telescopium*. Würzburg: Heyl.

Dictionaries and other sources of Latin terminology

- [CVC] *Centum vocabula computatralia*. (1996, 1999). K. Kokoszkiwicz (ed.). <http://www.obta.uw.edu.pl/~draco/docs/vocomp.html> [05.01.2024].
- [DA] *Diccionario auxiliar Español-Latino para el uso moderno del Latin*. (2007). J.J. Del Col (ed.). Bahía Blanca: Instituto Superior “Juan XXIII”.
- [DMLBS] *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, <https://logeion.uchicago.edu/%CE%B-B%CF%8C%CE%B3%CE%BF%CF%82> [08.10.2024].
- [IVL] *Imaginum vocabularium Latinum*. (1998). S. Albert (ed.). Saarbrücken: Societas Latina.
- [LL] *Lexicon Latinum*. D. Morgan (ed.). https://www.culturaclasica.com/lingualatina/lexicon_latinum_morgan.pdf [05.01.2024].
- [LLH] *Lexicon Latinum Hodiernum*. P. Lichtenberger (ed.). <http://www.lateinlexikon.com/download.htm> [05.01.2024].
- [LLII] *Joachimi Stulli Lexicon Latino-Italico-Illyricum ditissimum, ac locupletissimum, in quo adferuntur usitatiores, elegantiores, difficiliores earundem linguarum phrases, loquendi formulæ, ac proverbia* (1806).
- [LRL] *Neues Latein-Lexikon: Lexicon recentis latinitatis*. (1998). Libreria Editoria Vaticana 1992: Edition Lempertz.
- [LW] Carman B. et al. (1899). *The Literary World. A Monthly Review of Current Literature*.
- [ML] *Medical Lexicon*. (1848). R. Dunglison (ed.). Harvard: Harvard University.
- [MLW] *Mittelateinisches Wörterbuch*. Bayern: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. <https://mlw.badw.de/mlw-digital/zum-woerterbuchportal.html> [20.10.2024].
- [N&Q] White, W. (1920). *Notes and Queries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Online Etymology Dictionary*. (2023). D. Harper (ed.). <https://www.etymonline.com> [27.12.2023].
- [PCA] *Proceedings of the Classical Association*. (1913). Classical Association. https://archive.org/stream/proceedings10clasuoft/proceedings10clasuoft_djvu.txt [20.10.2024].
- [SŁŚPL] *Słownik łaciny średniowiecznej w Polsce*. M. Plezia (red.). Warszawa: PAN.
- [Vici] *Vicipaedia*. https://la.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vicipaedia:Pagina_prima [20.10.2024].
- Wielki Słownik etymologiczno-historyczny języka polskiego*. (2008). K. Długosz-Kurczabowa (red.). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Dr Sylwia Krukowska – is a graduate of the University of Lodz, where she completed her master’s studies and defended her doctoral thesis in the field of general linguistics. However, her interests include not only issues related to the development of modern languages, but also interpersonal communication, especially interpersonal relationships in the medical field. Dr Krukowska is the author of a scientific book and papers devoted to the above-mentioned issues. Several times a year, she also participates in national and international conferences as a speaker and organizer. She is an academic teacher.

e-mail: sylwia.krukowska@filologia.uni.lodz.pl

