

Received January 31, 2018

Date of publication: 6 February, 2018

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.2528862](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2528862)

DERIVATIONAL POTENTIAL OF THE LATIN VOCABULARY THROUGH SPACE AND TIME: WHERE SYSTEM MEETS CREATIVITY

Timur A. Logunov¹, Larisa I. Yurieva², Svetlana A. Zolotareva³

¹Kemerovo State University, Kemerovo, Russia

²Kemerovo State University, Kemerovo, Russia

³Kemerovo State Institute of Culture and Arts, Kemerovo, Russia

Abstract

The creation of real texts in Latin can be regarded not only as the intellectual activity of the pastime of a limited number of enthusiasts, but also a long linguistic experiment. In this study, the product of such linguistic activity serves as a source of materials, primarily lexical and derivational innovations, for analyzing events that may arise in a "restored" language system. To reveal trends in the development of linguistic material and its potential, the data obtained from new Latin texts were compared with the results of studying Latin borrowings in English (in the natural conditions of a living language).

Obviously, the choice of vocabulary and new terms to denote modern realities in these new Latin news texts are subject to the preferences of individual researchers and are sometimes arbitrary to a greater extent than in the case of creating text in a naturally developing language, where the speaker / user strongly dominates the usage norms. In addition, when developing innovations, the authors of the texts in question inevitably follow their native language of the L2 experience.

As a result of innovation, the "New Latin Scheme" shows some features more typical of modern European languages, in addition, the main development trends in the group of Latin borrowings in English were different from those found in the lexicon of the new Latin.

Keywords: Latin, Latin borrowings, word formation, derivation, language system, English, semantic development, chasing, dictionary.

I. INTRODUCTION

Preserving interest in classical languages in the academic environment of some European and non-European countries, in particular, the production of new texts with the means of language systems that have long been abandoned in 'natural' communication is a vivid example of the policy encouraging multiculturalism and the multilingualism in modern society.

Newly produced texts in Latin (hereinafter referred to as "new Latin") are the creations of a limited circle of persons, connoisseurs and enthusiasts of classical philology, whose linguistic creativity range is very wide and varied both in terms of genre and in themes.

However, it is the most intriguing fact that there is a certain sphere that allows the Latin language to function outside instructional and academic applications, as a means of communicating the most relevant information. This primarily includes news texts that cover current and urgent events (both national and global) and are published on the Internet sites of several European mass media. The number of authors of such texts is very limited, and the authorship is mandatory.

One of the most curious phenomena in this regard is coining innovations to denote modern realities using the repertory of the classical language. While being a remarkable example of the actualization of the linguistic system potential, such creativity within system and means of the extinct languages raises a number of questions in the aspect of theoretical linguistics. And if the very phenomenon of generating new linguistic units semasiologically and morphologically only confirms postulates concerning the possibilities of developing a linguistic system in conditions of a communicative need, i.e. when the language performs its primary functions, the question of the "legitimacy" of these newly coined units, their adaptation in the system, and their fixation as stable elements of the inventory of linguistic units makes us recall the artificial conditions of such a linguistic experiment. Thus, the question of the relationship between the natural and the artificial in this language creativity act becomes the key issue. One of the aspects in considering it is the interaction of the individual and systemic vectors, that is free creativity (of an individual author) and constraints in the process of generating new vocabulary units.

The impulse of linguistic creativity in the prevailing extralinguistic conditions is inevitably guided by the reflection of the author-creator (or group of authors). Alongside with the obvious considerations of communicative (the expected result is the message delivered to the addressee) and the semantic (the result is the most precise term and meaning) dimensions, the considerable importance in this case is attached to such subjectively significant characteristics as "prestige" and euphony of the expression.

One can treat such a phenomenon as "new Latin" differently, regarding it as the activity of a group of enthusiasts who construct texts with actual content utilizing the material of an ancient language. Whether it is a curiosity, an intellectual hobby, a language simulation game, or just a game for fun, in this study we approach this unique material as an interesting phenomenon and peculiar linguistic experiment that reveals the potential of the language and allows us to compare the development of a language under natural (as it were) conditions and a language that is "revived" as a result of artificial reconstruction and simulation of speech activity with the means of "mothballed" material of the Latin language. For the linguist, it opens up the possibility of interesting theoretical generalizations, testing hypotheses about the specific features of the development of various language subsystems.

The topic of Latin heritage in English cannot be avoided in any comprehensive study on the history of English, a number of researches in historical lexicology being devoted specifically to Latin loanwords. Given the considerable number of papers on the peculiarities of penetration, adaptation and further development of the borrowed Latin vocabulary in English, observations on this issue will only by summarized further with regard to Modern English.

If the earliest borrowings from Latin into English occurred as a result of direct contacts between the speakers of the two languages, then starting from around the early 14th century, Latin words began to enter English in a completely different way – through the translation of texts (primarily religious ones). It is well known when the translator was not able to find an adequate unit in the English lexicon, he transferred a Latin word in the "anglicized" form the translated text into the target language. Later, in the 15th and 16th centuries it became a common practice among many translators of academic works, as well as authors of new texts already in English.

It is on the period of the New Time and the Renaissance of the 15th – 17th centuries that the peak of borrowing fell, when the English vocabulary was enriched with immense number of borrowings in the sphere of science and humanities. The authors of this time could not help but feel the influence of the centuries-old tradition of medieval Latin as the language of science. A very important feature of this broad, however, indirect and "bookish", stream of contacts of the two languages was the borrowing of word-formation elements. Word-formation models as such are known to be borrowed very rarely, but such a massive intervention in English vocabulary, both directly from Latin and from French, led to the fact that the affixes in borrowings were perceived as a separate morpheme and clearly distinguished already in a new language the material.

Words were often borrowed not in isolation, but in the form of word-building nests, "due to this, a certain formal order was created" for the newly borrowed words in the borrowing language.

Thus, easily identifiable derivational affixes gave new formations now with English stems, the so-called hybrids: read-able, talk-ative, false-hood, use-less, merci-ful (Latin root - Germanic suffix); mis-creant (German prefix with Latin root). It was during the Middle and Early English periods in English that most of the models that are productive now were widely distributed and actively developed (see more detailed in Logunov).

II. METHODOLOGY

This paper considers the derivational development of Latin vocabulary items in the course of functioning of linguistic material both in the "new Latin" discourse and after their borrowing in the new European languages. The Latin lexical innovations proper and the peculiarities of further semantic derivational development and word formation in the vocabulary items borrowed from Latin are compared and discussed. These processes will be analyzed in terms of the complex interaction of the systemic language development and individual language creativity. To identify the developments taking place in the examined category of lexis we have to resort to the dictionaries reflecting various historical stages of material and semantic "life" of Latin roots, affixes and complete lexemes. The first reference is made to the forms and meanings as they are recorded in the dictionaries of classical Latin (occasionally involving material from the late Latin period), mostly, Oxford Latin Dictionary Online (OLDo) and Dvoretsky.

In order to correlate the material of the source languages as it existed before exiting a new language (English, in the case) with already borrowed words/roots as they now function in the borrower language, the comparison of semantics and forms of classical Latin vocabulary units with borrowed English ones was performed based on the data of English dictionaries providing necessary information of historical aspect (first appearance/recording date, contexts, obsolete meanings, etc.): Shorter Oxford English Dictionary (SOED) and Webster's Third New International Dictionary of English (Webster's). This procedure allowed us to trace the mainstream trends of assimilation and development of abundant Latin heritage in Modern English, with the emphasis laid on the ways of derivation (both in terms of word form and semantic development). At the same time, the data of classical Latin dictionaries were used to find the cases of semantic variations in the New Latin lexicon.

The results may serve as a reference for considering developments occurring within the scope of New Latin material. The vocabulary for analyses was obtained by continuous sampling from the texts of aforementioned web resources. In the cases where the meaning of a word or phrase in such newly created texts was hard to define contextual analyses with reference to extralinguistic realia was applied. Thus, the innovations identified in the New Latin lexicon could be compared with the products of development of the Latin borrowed elements in English under natural conditions.

III. RESULTS

This paper does not cover the words which entered English as a result of direct contact between the speakers of the Old German dialects and the Late Latin, and the words borrowed through the mediation of French. The focus of our interest is, primarily, the results of "book bilingualism" leading to the conscious and reflected, to some extent, processes of interaction between new and classical languages. The cases of such realized conscious borrowings, filling lacunae of the language (including stylistically, with the replacement of lexical units from the layers of everyday vocabulary with the words of a "prestigious" classical language) are of special significance as they represent a process of systematic knowledge categorization. The lexical subsystem of language responds most flexibly to the needs of speakers for the expression of developing concepts, this process involving the word-formation potential of the system.

The bookish nature of borrowing often leads to the borrowing of the word not in a single isolated meaning, but to the “systemic” borrowing of both the basic and figurative meanings of words. For example, the noun *auditio*, when borrowed into English, retains the meaning of the act or process of ‘hearing’ and the importance of possessing ‘sense of hearing’. Obviously, borrowings acquire new combinatory characteristics when they are used to describe new relevant concepts and phenomena, for example, the adjective *equable* (from *Latinaequabilis*, e) in English is collocated with the noun *temperature*, characterizing this parameter with a property of constancy.

It might be presumed that in adapting to the English vocabulary Latin borrowings would have retained specific meanings, since these lexemes were borrowed for using within specific conceptual fields of communication, whereas the most basic, primary meanings would not have been transferred into the new language. However, this is not always the case. It was not uncommon for a borrowed unit to preserve and develop precisely the primary meaning that was relevant for the general core of the vocabulary, terminological meanings due to the change of denotation becoming irrelevant (for example, due to differences in the norms of the Roman and the new national law, as well as in connection with the change in the scientific picture of the world). For instance, the Latin nouns *aequatio* and *exclusio* had special meanings in the legal sphere: “uniform distribution (as of property, income)” and “refusal to accept a claim” respectively. Sometimes only a concrete, material meaning was borrowed, while the abstract ones existing in Latin turned out to be irrelevant for the new language: cf. *corpulent* - ‘burly, fat, fat, fat’ from the Lat. *corpulentus* – “1) corpulent, fat, full; 4) corporeal, physical” or *procreate* - ‘spawn’ from the Lat. *procreo* – “1) to bring into existence; 2) to produce, create”.

Numerous borrowings are fully assimilated by the English language, which proves their considerable potential in the development of semantics. The new meanings of the borrowed Latinisms developed both metonymically (English armaments from the Latin *armamentum* received, in addition to the former meaning of ‘weapons, arming’ the new meaning ‘armed forces’), and metaphorically (for example, the adjective *arbitrary* based on the meaning ‘whimsical’ developed the meaning ‘capricious’ and ‘despotic’).

As was noted above, the massive introduction of Latin vocabulary into English resulted in enriching the latter with world-formation nests; however the composition of these nests is often heterogeneous in the direct source of lexical units and in the time of their borrowing. This fact also prompts some interesting assumptions.

Such a systematization of newly borrowed and previously adopted elements leads to cases of “reverse” word formation, when the composition of a previously borrowed (from French) word was then changed by analogy with later borrowings (from Latin), in such cases the sounds subjected to the norms of the French language changed in accordance with the Latin written tradition. Cf. *concentrate* *concenter* (French *concentrer*).

In their further derivational development in the new European language, bookish (derivative) borrowings from Latin demonstrate a number of the most productive models. Our material shows that, most often, adjectives and, to a lesser extent, nouns and verbs act as producers, and the most common derivatives (with a high degree of regularity) are (1) adjective-based nouns with the meaning of an abstract attribute ending in *-ity* element, which was also borrowed from Latin (nouns ending in *-itas*), probably through French *-ité* (*amicability*, *accessibility*, *credibility*, *calculability*, *circularity*, *cordiality*, *criminality*, *perceptibility*, etc.); (2) adjectives ending in *-ive* from the Latin *Supinum* base (*calculative*, *consultative*, *corporative*, *creative*, *incubative*, *participative*, *perceptive*, *recessive*, etc.); (3) formed from the latter nouns with a German formant *-ness*, denoting abstract quality (*concessiveness*, *exclusiveness*, *perceptiveness*, etc., as well as from adjectives of another composition such as *conconciseness*, *rebelliousness*, etc.). The use of such primordial suffixes as *-less* and *-ful* is much less regular (*accentless*, *artful*, etc.). In addition, from adjectives of Latin origin are regularly formed “hybrid” adverbs with the English formant *-ly*, since neither the suffixes that form adverbs nor the actual adverbs were actually borrowed from classical languages.

In a new language, the process of simplification of the morphological composition in borrowings, that is de-etymology and rethinking of the word form and structure naturally takes place. These result in a partial loss of motivation and loss of the primary meaning, as well as a semantic development not specified by certain components of the word composition, which are motivating in the source language. Cf., in English, the noun *rebellion* does not preserve the meaning of the ‘renewal of the war’, which was unambiguously motivated for Latin speakers; the verb *to circulate* in English has new meanings not related to the idea conferred in the prefix (‘spread, pass, transmit’, i.e. the idea of movement in a certain direction was lost

during the semantic expansion).

In observing and discussing the peculiarities of functioning and development of Latin vocabulary in New Latin texts the emphasis is made on derivational innovations and semantic variation as they vividly demonstrate the potential and flexibility of already existing linguistic repertory within the systemic norms. Therefore, the newly coined units or derivatives to name a new realia will be of primary interest.

1) Morphological derivation proper in the examined corpus is represented mostly with derived nominal parts of speech utilizing standard affixes and roots; cases of compound word-building being relatively rare (hereinafter the contexts for the cited lexemes or phrases are included in the Appendix unless given in the text): *interretialis*, e (<rete) – ‘of networks, pertaining to Internet’: *scriptor est ephemeridis interretialis qua numerat narratque de rebus et naufragiis migrantium*; *locus interreticus* – ‘website, online resource’: *Insidiae terroristicae in ferrivia inferna. XIV perierunt, ut a loco interretico “Fontanka.ru” refertur*; *telefonice* (t. dixit ...) - adv. ‘over the phone’: *Telephonice dixit se bene valere...*; *videogramma* – ‘video recording, footage, clip’: *Nuperrime videogramma L minutorum divulgavit, ex quo appareret Demetrium Medwedev, primum ministrum, per rete obscurum opes publicas peregre collocasse.*

2) Compound terms are commonly used with the purpose of specification of meaning by forming a complex two-word unit based on standard syntactic models instead of univert term:

currus ferreus – carriage (in the underground railway): *Secretus pyrobolus pulveris incendiariae DC librarum in curru ferreo paratus erat*; *militia civilis* – police; *administer (negotiis exteris) praepositus* – ‘minister, secretary (of foreign affairs)’ (as head of a government department).

3) Lexical-semantic development (variation) demonstrates several directions of development.

(a) Variation towards specialization of concepts: *rete obscurum* – (criminal) ploy, criminal network; *historicus (rerum recentiorum)* – columnist, commentator, blogger ...*diurnarius et historicus rerum recentiorum Gabriele Del Grande*; *exercitatio navalis* – naval exercise, maritime training; *officina*, ae – enterprise, business (derived from original meaning ‘workshop’, ‘grocery’); *praefectus*, i – mayor (specialization from the more general ‘person in charge’); *Dispensator Facieslibri* – Facebook editor (further development of its original meaning ‘attendant’).

b) Variation towards generalization of meaning: *dux seditionis* (as of a Russian opposition activist, see in) – opposition leader (*seditio*, *ionis* – riot, mutiny, dissention); *procuratrix nuntiorum* – news agency (*procuratrix*, *icis* – ‘agent, manager’): *KCNA, procuratrix nuntiorum Boreocoreana, Martis die scripsit adventum navium pro argumento sibi esse, quanta insolentia Americani Coream Borealem aggredi vellent.*

4) Linguistic calque or loanwords (semantic borrowing):

symbola, ae – share, participation (*Scripsit symbolas in actis sinistrarum partium...*) based on the semantics of Eng. to contribute (as «to contribute a product of one’s intellectual or creative activity»); *resolutio*, *ionis* – ‘resolution, decision’, (while this meaning not recorded in classical Latin period, it appeared as a loan translation from a modern language, exemplifying a phenomenon of reverse borrowing, see discussion further): *Russi resolutioni Consilii Securitatis Nationum Unitarum intercesserunt...*; *identitas*, *atis* – profile, account (e.g. in social networks), which in the classical Latin was not registered in the meaning ‘identity’: *Inscriptionibus in identitate telegrafica (=Telegram)...*; *vis atomica* – an exact translation from English ‘nuclear power’; *automota birota* – two-wheel scooter/moped (a type of vehicle), a morphological calque following the Latin syntactic model.

5) The last and the smallest group of innovations is represented with variation of grammar characteristics of some vocabulary units, which occurs occasionally: *mercor* – as ‘trade, deal in’ (< classical Latin ‘buy’), cf. *rebus publicis popularibus ... mercarentur*. Consider the following context: *Gubernatores suos in eo vituperaverunt, quod in ipso belli tempore cum seditiosis negotiarentur ... cum rebus publicis popularibus ... mercarentur*; *pereo* – ‘to die, to be killed’ (*Militem civilem periiit*) as a case of variation of verb transitivity characteristic (intransitive for transitive).

IV. DISCUSSION: BASIC TRENDS IN COINING «NEW LATIN LEXICON»

The discussion below is based on identified changes of form and shifts in meaning which probably manifest a number of tendencies of subjective nature followed by the authors within the examined New Latin corpus.

In this respect, it is worth starting with the manifestation of the tendency to splitting the term, that is to analytic development, characteristic of many new languages, when the single word term (*univerbum*) is replaced by a compound name or descriptive phrases, cf. an expert, specialist is termed as *peritus rerum* (lit. “experienced in business”). Obviously, in such descriptive innovations the authors rely on stable morphological (syntactic) models. For example, disciplines of primary education in one of the texts were descriptively rendered as *disciplina, qua prima litterarum initia traduntur*, the classical Latin *trivium* in this case was not avoided, probably, because of its undesirable connotative load.

One of the observed ways of denoting new *realia* is a combination of neologism and a unit of “primordial” Latin vocabulary. It should be noted that, attributive combination has become the most common model for constructing such descriptive names, and in such cases it is the classical Latin adjective retaining its direct meaning, in which it was recorded in dictionaries, that becomes the guarantor of the referential “success” of the whole term, including less stable neologisms, cf. newly coined *autocarrum onerarium* for ‘a lorry, truck’ (*onerarius, a, um* was previously recorded in combination with *navis*). Some redundancy of such combinations is explained by the need to specify the referent by way of adding extra reference to its distinctive features and, thus, by linking it to a new, previously non-existing, fragment of reality.

Thus, the reason why the authors of the new Latin texts often prefer descriptive translation instead of using ready-made units of the classical lexicon can probably be the desire to express the content as accurately as possible with the limited means of the language originally developing in another extralinguistic reality which factor may lead the readers to challenge their referential “feasibility”. This circumstance pushes the author to redundancy and verbosity in describing contemporary *realias* and concepts, furthermore, the requirement of unambiguity and completeness in the presentation of news governs the selection of contextual variants of translation from new languages when creating a new Latin text. For example, despite already existing single-word terms *magistratus, us* and *officialis, is*, officials are termed with the phrase *Magistratus publicus*. In the reports about the events in Egypt, during which local emergency forces used the heavy machinery to clear the square after opposition rallies, the author used the name *machina tractoria*, instead of a more concise *univerbum*. Probably, the author thus expanded the reference of this noun, indicating various specific types of modern vehicles used by the police, which can hardly be termed with lexemes of classical Latin.

A similar mechanism seems to work when the calque technique is used in coining names for new things: in such loan translation a noun with a similar meaning is used to translate the main component of the phrase from a modern language into Latin, but reinterpreted in the new reality, while the extending attributive component is selected in the target language in its direct meaning: *caupona nocturna* – nightclub (where *caupona, ae* is an equivalent of ‘tavern, inn’), *communes exercitationes bellicae* – joint military exercises (where *exercitatio, ionis* is ‘an exercise, training, experience’). It has to be noted that, along with exact loan translation (*speculatio externa* – ‘external intelligence’, *cuniculus submarinus* – ‘channel under the sea’, *via serica* – ‘the Silk Way’), combinations with the attribute in genitive are also common, for example, *ministerium a rebus exteris* – the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (please, note the specialization of the meaning of *ministerium, i* – ‘service, position’ in classical Latin).

When naming fundamentally new *realias*, authors often resort to the morphological method of formation of new lexemes following the classical models, which is naturally accompanied by conceptual rethinking of semantics. Berry picker as an occupation in one of the texts is termed *decerptor* from *decerpo, decerpsi, decerptum* 3 – ‘1) to catch; 3) pluck; 4) reap/gather’, and smoking – *fumificatio* from *fumifico* 1 – ‘to emit fumes’.

Finally, a couple of opposites tendencies should be analyzed which the authors of this study believe to be based on personal attitudes and linguistic sense of taste rather than the requirements of system norm or communication efficiency.

The first one is the tendency of deliberate “aging” the terminology of Internet news which may occur due to the desire of the New Latin authors to distance themselves as much as possible from new European languages that have largely accepted the Latin general scientific terminology and included in their vocabulary those roots and even whole lexemes that could be used to denote new realities, albeit with inevitable semantic shifts. Instead, the authors translating modern realia in many cases persistently construct new terms and term combinations in place of potentially or even really existing ones, thus departing from the modern material in search for alternatives in classical Latin.

Thus, in the text dedicated to a ceremony of national art awards, sculpture as one of categories is termed *ars figurativa*, while the classical lexicon could suggest a number of lexemes: *sculptura*, *ars fingendi*, given the quoted combination is not entered in dictionaries.

Nevertheless, the cases of “modernization”, the convergence of the vocabulary of new Latin texts and modern languages are also frequent. Composing a Latin text authors use lexemes with roots that were once borrowed into modern languages, have been semantically developing in it but are still close in meaning (and in form) to the words of a modern language: *periodicum*, *interrogantus*, *nuntium electronicum* – an electronic newsletter / magazine, *usurpator*, *nuclearius*, *bellator*, *orator* – militant, *thug* (in classical Latin – ‘soldier, warrior’) in the following context: *Ordobellatorum in Columbia clandestinorum nomine Fare ducem suum amisit, cum Alfonso Cano, caput eius, impetu militari occisus est*. In some respects, it is possible to distinguish a trend of borrowing in the “reverse” direction – from new languages into New Latin, or back borrowing: in the course of such a process, elements borrowed once from classical or late Latin into new European languages or being the product of the historical development of Latin material in Romance languages are used in the new Latin text as units of the Latin vocabulary, formed in accordance with the structural norms of Latin and included in the syntagmatic relationships.

For example, the phrase “security service” – *procuratoria securitatis* (Cf., *Nationales Securitatis Procuratoria Americanorum* (NSA)) is based on the noun and adjective with Latin roots and word-formation elements (*procurator-*), which in this combination function, for example, in modern Portuguese.

If the above examples, based on such international stems, bring the classical text as close as possible to the modern language, which facilitates the perception of news in Latin, in some other cases it is difficult to find an explanation for such a build-up of the dictionary in addition to the established and sufficient classical lexicon. So, in the text of the news reporting on fires in the vicinity of San Francisco, the neighborhoods are termed as *circumiectus*, and firemen – as *vigiles*. Given that the author of these texts is the same person, we can assume that the decisive factor here is the language personality with its individual preferences, language taste and subjectivity of vocabulary selection. Moreover, the realization of these preferences and the implementation of the choice are probably not accidental and are subject to certain strategies of speech behavior, the author’s self-presentation, etc. The definition and description of such strategies requires further research at the textual level.

V. CONCLUSION

With a certain assumption (taking into account the artificial conditions of appearance, arbitrariness of motivation, etc.), the innovations created in New Latin text have the right to exist, albeit not as a fact of language, but as a fact of speech activity, as an element of the word, because they are created in accordance with all the norms and inherent conditions of the linguistic system development: they utilize once productive standard word-formation models together with roots, stems and derivational morphemes actual in modern European languages, they are constructed on the basis of systemic syntactic relations – and most importantly – they are the result of an actual, although simulated, communicative need for a word to name a

thing.

Summarizing the observations of the peculiarities of such modern Latin innovations contrasted with the processes taking part in development of Latin borrowing in English it is possible to identify a number of trends. In developing the newly borrowed elements the English language took the path of both semantic derivation and morphemic formations (using the numerous adopted derivational elements of Latin origin sometimes combined with originally Germanic ones), whereas in the new Latin authors less often resort to word formation as a method of coining new nominations, preferring contextual neologisms, and also to multiword terms (phrases), showing a certain trend for analytism in the naming of realities, thus following similar patterns in the Neo-Romanesque and Germanic languages.

At the same time, creators of new Latin text tend to abstain from serious innovations in the already established structure of the Latin word, probably, due to the fact that Latin in this respect offers an extremely rich potential of its advanced repertory for derivational elements and the flexibility of a synthetic language. This resistance to considerable derivational innovations is presumably caused by the rich vocabulary of the classical Latin language with developed derivational nests, and a huge number of already existing derivatives which are at hand for anyone willing to produce a text in Latin.

However, such generalizations can be made with certain limitations, connected with (a) an objectively scanty sample (a small amount of the New Latin 'corpus' material itself), and (b) the "idiolectic" nature of this material, as it is a product of a very narrow circle of individuals who have their own individual preferences (cf. variations in referring to Russian Saint-Petersburg and the Russian President's office - Petropolis / Petrogradum, praeses Russi / Sarmaticus), and who, on the other hand, are rather homogeneous in their sociolinguistic parameters unlike users of a living language.

REFERENCE LIST

Arnold, I.V., (1986) Lexicology of Modern English [Leksikologiya sovremennogo angliyskogo yazika]. Moscow: Visshaya shkola. (in English).

Bazylev, V.N., (2001) Redistribution of translations in semiotic sphere [Bazylev, V.N. Pereraspredelenie perevodov v semiosfere. Pp. 95-99. (in Russ).

Dvoretzky, I.Kh., (2002) Latin-Russian Dictionary [Latinsko-russkiy slovar]. Moscow: Russkiy yazik. (in Russ).

Ephemeris = News texts in Latin [Web resource] / free access at: <http://ephemeris.alquinus.net> [in Latin].

Filipieva, E. F., Yurieva L. I., (2005) Internet-news in Latin [Internet-novosti na latinskom yazike] – Kemerovo: Kemerovo State Univ. (in Russ).

Ivanova, I.P., Chakhoyan L.P., Belyaeva, T.M., (1999) The History of the English Language [Istoriya angliyskogo yazika]. Saint-Petersburg: Lan. (in Russ).

Jackson, H. and Ze Amvela E., (2002) Words, Meaning and Vocabulary: An Introduction to Modern English Lexicology. London, Continuum International Publishing Group. (in English).

Katamba, F., (2004) English Words: Structure, History, Usage. Abingdon, Routledge. (in English).

Kuthe, D., (2008) Latin Loanwords in English, Munich, GRIN Verlag. (in English).

Loewenthal, M., (2008) The Latin Heart of English: English Vocabulary Practice Volume 1, Lulu.com.

Logunov, T.A., (2009) Derivational development of Latin borrowing in English [Derivatsionnoe razvitiye latinskikh zaimstvovaniy v angliyskom yazыke Aktualnye problema sovremennogo slovoobrazovaniya] in Urgent Issues of Modern Studies in Word-Formation. Proceedings of International Scientific Conference. Pp.

83-89. (in Russ).

Nuntii Latini = News texts in Latin [Web resource] / free access at:<http://areena.yle.fi/1-1931339> [in Latin, Finnish]. (in English).

OLDo – The Oxford Latin Dictionary Online – Oxford Scholarly Editions Online. <http://www.oxfordscholarlyeditions.com/page/the-oxford-latin-dictionary>(in English).

Rastorgueva, T. A., (2003) History of the English Language [Istoriya angliyskogo yazika]. Moscow: Nauka. (in Russ).

SOED The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles. (1970). Oxford.

Stockwell, R. P. and Minkova, D., (2001) English words: history and structure, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. (in English).

Webster's (1993) Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language. Chicago (in English).

Yartseva, V. N., (1985) History of the Standard English Language of 9th-15th Centuries [Istoriya angliyskogo literaturnogo yazika IX – XV vv.]. Moscow: Nauka. (in Russ).