



Functional and stylistic features of genitive constructions in Latin

Vasyl Shynkaruk*

Doctor of Philology, Professor

National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine

03041, 15 Heroyiv Oborony Str., Kyiv, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8589-4995>

Oleksandra Shynkaruk

PhD in Law, Associate Professor

National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine

03041, 15 Heroyiv Oborony Str., Kyiv, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5494-1370>

Abstract. The relevance of studying the functional and stylistic features of genitive constructions is determined by their key role in shaping the syntactic organisation of the text, conveying semantic nuances, and revealing the stylistic specificity of Latin linguistic monuments of various genres. The aim of the study was to identify, systematise, and characterise the functional-stylistic features of genitive constructions in the Latin language, taking into account their semantic, syntactic, and text-forming parameters. The research employed a set of comprehensive methods – from sampling to contextual analysis – combining syntactic and functional approaches. A wide range of semantic nuances acquired by the genitive case depending on the context, type of phrase, and stylistic orientation of the text was analysed. The study describes the distinctions between the subjective and objective genitive, the genitive of possession, the genitive of quality, and other varieties that ensure the flexibility and polysemy of Latin expression and allow for a deeper understanding of the formal-grammatical nature of the genitive. It has been determined that the genitive in Latin not only serves as a formal marker of subordination but also functions as a means of conveying semantic precision, logical coherence, and emotional-expressive nuances. It has been substantiated that genitive constructions can emphasise the intellectual, social, or moral characteristics of a subject, creating a specific expressive effect in the text. It has been demonstrated that genitive constructions constitute an important factor in shaping the semantic structure of a Latin sentence

Suggested Citation:

Shynkaruk, V., & Shynkaruk, O. (2026). Functional and stylistic features of genitive constructions in Latin. *International Journal of Philology*, 17(1), 9-27. doi: 10.31548/philolog/1.2026.09.

*Corresponding author



Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

and serve as a universal means of expressing the logical, emotional, and figurative components of the language. The results of the study are significant for further research in the fields of Latin grammar, comparative linguistics, and stylistics. The practical value of the study lies in the fact that its results can be used by specialists in classical philology, translators of Latin texts, instructors of historical linguistics and stylistics, as well as scholars of ancient literature to improve the accuracy of text interpretation and enable a deeper analysis of the linguistic structure of ancient sources. The findings of the research may also be applied in future scholarly works concerning the semantic and syntactic structure of sentences

Keywords: genitive case; sentence; syntax; semantics; stylistics

Introduction

Latin has laid the foundations of modern grammar, syntax, and stylistics for many European languages and is one of the oldest and most influential languages in the Western cultural tradition. Many grammatical structures in modern European languages are direct or indirect descendants of Latin syntax, so understanding the functions of the genitive case (Latin: *genetivus*) can help researchers to trace linguistic changes, particularly the grammaticalisation or reduction of certain structures. The study of the functional and stylistic features of genitive constructions contributes to a deeper understanding of the syntactic patterns of Latin, since the genitive not only conveys a relationship of belonging, but also serves as a tool for expressing abstract concepts, describing qualities, characteristics, etc. Knowledge of the stylistic functions of the genitive allows for a deeper interpretation of classical texts, translating them with consideration for semantic nuances, and avoiding typical mistakes, which is important for the development of not only linguistic competence but also cultural and historical awareness in students. Despite the significant number of studies on Latin grammar, many aspects of the variability and stylistic functions of the genitive remain understudied, which opens up prospects for further linguistic research that enriches both theoretical linguistics and applied aspects of classical language studies.

Problems of syntax theory, in particular genitive constructions, were investigated based on material from different languages and it was the subject of research by well-known linguists. G. Pezzini & A. Chahoud (2023) described the interaction of literary and colloquial in Latin, identified linguistic features of various literary genres, and solved problems such as periodisation boundaries, defined the very concept of “early Latin”, and concluded that “early Latin” is a linguistic construct that evokes the framework of periodisation and postulates the difference between supposedly discrete and integral linguistic diversity (“classical Latin”). P. Crisma *et al.* (2020) described the syntactic diversity and learnability of language and proposed a model of linguistic potential that qualifies as a plausible basis for language learning research, and concluded that the workload of parameter tuning can be significantly reduced by using parameters with positive values and based on a core subset of positive evidence. C. Cabrillana (2024), in the collection of contemporary syntactic studies, described the latest trends in Latin syntax and drew conclusions in Latin linguistics about aspects of “non-finite” constructions, “relative clauses”, and “expressions of definiteness”. P. Cuzzolin (2024) used the language of Cicero’s works to investigate the cognitive and semantic manifestations of definiteness in Latin sentences, considered the ablative case with or without the preposition *cum*

“with”, and concluded that the definite article is conventionally considered the most common means of denoting definiteness or conceptualising definiteness among the languages of the world. R.A. Allbert & M.L. Allbert (2025) presented a cross-language transformational model that measures semantic connections between ancient Greek and Latin lexicons, and concluded that semantic correspondences and contextual vectors allows identifying subtle semantic connections, including the functions of the genitive. H. Pinkster (2021) applied contemporary linguistic theories and conclusions of traditional grammar to the study of Latin syntax and analysed the syntactic functions of the genitive, various types of subordinate clauses. It was generalised that Oxford Latin syntax will become a valuable and relevant resource for both professional Latinists and all linguists interested in the classics. The researchers have made a significant contribution to the study of genitive in Latin, focusing on its syntactic functions, semantic nuances, and evolution at different stages of Latin development. However, many aspects require further study, in particular, the functional and stylistic features of genitive in various genres of Latin literature have not been comprehensively studied, where this form can have additional expressive meanings.

In contemporary Ukrainian science, the study of genitive constructs covers various approaches based on the material of different languages. In particular, constructions with the genitive of the subject and object were studied, as well as differences between classical and late Latin. B. Cherniukh (2022) studied folk Latin and drew conclusions about the specific features of comparing Latin structures with analogues in other Indo-European languages, which helped to better understand the historical origins and semantic and syntactic patterns of this category. L.S. Ostrovska (2023) described the formal and syntactic, and semantic and syntactic status of the genitive case as part of genitive constructions, classified genitive

monosyllabic sentences, and formulated the results that the intonation properties of genitive sentences form the structural and semantic specificity of the genitive case, which acquires the property of asserting or denying the existence of objects with an indication of their quantitative manifestation. Ukrainian linguists have a tendency to systematise the use of genitive in combination with verbs, adjectives, nouns, and its role in the formulation of legal, philosophical, and literary texts. L. Kolibaba (2024) investigated the reasons why speakers rarely use the ending -s in the genitive singular of third declension nouns. An anonymous survey was conducted in the form of a questionnaire, and it was concluded that philologists should set an example in adhering to current norms and preserving the Ukrainian basis of the Ukrainian language, demonstrating the use of the ending -и in their own speech.

However, the analysis of recent publications has shown a lack of research devoted to the study of functional and stylistic features of genitive constructions in Latin, comparative analysis of genitive in Latin, and its transformations in translated texts that reflect the development of cultural and legal traditions in Europe, and a lack of research at the intersection of corpus linguistics and digital humanities, which allows identifying patterns of the use of genitive in large text databases and make broader generalisations about its role in Latin syntax. Therefore, the purpose of the study was to determine and systematise the functional and stylistic features of genitive constructions in the Latin language and to identify the patterns of their functioning in the context of classical Latin literature.

Materials and Methods

The source base of the study was: Latin-Ukrainian dictionary (Kobylianskyi, 1912); Latin-Ukrainian dictionary (Trofymuk & Trofymuk, 2001); Ukrainian-ancient Greek-Latin dictionary (Boyko & Myronova, 2012), and the

sources of factual material were multi-genre Latin literary monuments, from which structures that objectify certain structures were isolated by the method of continuous and representative sampling. The total sample size was more than 100 units and was represented by works of C. Julius Caesar "De bello Gallico" (Caes. B. G.); M. Tullius Cicero "Pro Balbo" (C. Balb.); "De natura deorum" (C. N. D.); "De Officiis" (C. Off.); "Epistulae ad Atticum" (C. Att.); "Philippicae" (C. Phil.); "In Vatinius" (C. Vat.); "Epistulae ad familiares" (C. Fam.); "Brutus" (C. Bt.); "De oratore" (C. De orat.); Cornelius Nepos "Agaesilaus" (Nep. Ag.); "Atticus" (Nep. Att.); "Epaminondas" (Nep. Ep.); "Hannibal" (Nep. Han.); T. Maccius Plautus "Asinaria" (Pl. As. 746); T. Livius "Ab Urbe condita" (Liv.); M. Annaeus Lucanus "Bellum civile" (Luc.); Sex. Propertius → "Elegiae" (Prop.); C. Sallustius Crispus "Conjuratio Catilinae" (Sall. C.); L. Annaeus Seneca "Agamemnon" (Sen. Ag.); L. Junius Moderatus Columella "De re rustica" (Col.).

Methods of studying functional and stylistic features of genitive constructions in Latin were based on a comprehensive analysis of linguistic phenomena. The first stage of the study began with the selection of language material from the above sources and focused on the selection of genitive constructions. The selective method provided for the purposeful selection of texts of various genres and styles, which ensured the representativeness of the language material and allowed tracing the features of the use of genitive in various communicative conditions. The observation method helped to select and analyse genitive constructs and classify them. The descriptive method was one of the leading methods in the study of functional and stylistic features of genitive constructions, which helped to systematise and analyse various manifestations of genitive constructions in different styles of Latin language. Using the descriptive approach, the structural features of genitive constructions were identified, the types of connections between components were

determined, and the morphological forms and syntactic functions of the genitive within the sentence were described. This analysis provided an understanding of how grammatical tools affect the expression of content and stylistic tone of the text. Thus, the descriptive method was a necessary step in a comprehensive analysis of the functional and stylistic features of genitive constructions, combining grammatical, semantic, and stylistic aspects of research. The contextual method of research in the study of functional and stylistic features of genitive constructions in Latin provided for the analysis of their meaning and functions in real language situations, that is, considering the broader syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic environment and determined their role in creating stylistic expressiveness of Latin utterance.

The method of syntactic analysis was aimed at identifying the structural features of genitive constructions, their place in the Latin syntax system, and construction patterns. This method was used to determine the types of genitive connections, the nature of the combination with other members of the sentence, and positional models that form the syntactic organisation of the statement. Syntactic analysis allowed describing the patterns of functioning of the genitive in various syntactic contexts – both in a simple and complex sentences. The method of functional analysis focused on the investigation of the communicative and semantic roles of genitive constructions in texts of different styles of the Latin language, which helped to identify what meanings the genitive implements in different types of texts – artistic, scientific, historical, or religious – and how its use affects the content and stylistic tone of the expression. The combination of syntactic and functional analysis provided a comprehensive study of genitive constructions, since it allowed not only describing their grammatical structure, but also explaining their functional load in speech. This approach helped to find out what stylistic shades are created by

different types of genitive, how they reflect the individual style of the author or the genre specifics of the text. Thus, the syntactic and functional method was an effective tool for in-depth analysis of the functional and stylistic features of genitive constructions in Latin.

The method of pragmatic analysis in the study was aimed at clarifying the communicative intentions of the speaker, the role of context and speech conditions in the formation of the meaning of constructions with the genitive, which allowed tracing how the use of the genitive changes the semantic tone of the expression, in particular, in the expression of belonging, particularity, evaluation, or subjective attitude. The pragmatic approach helped to reveal the functional flexibility of the genitive in Latin, to identify its participation in creating a certain stylistic effect, and to understand how the choice of syntactic construction is related to the author's desire to influence the addressee. All stages, from the initial selection and systematisation of data to the combination of syntactic and functional analysis, enabled a comprehensive investigation of the functional and stylistic features of genitive in Latin.

Results and Discussion

The genitive performs a wide range of functions that vary depending on the stylistic context and occupies an important place in the Latin syntax system, because it is through genitive constructions that language reveals deep patterns of expression of a number of abstract relationships. Among the antique scholars who contributed to the study of genitive constructs in Latin, a special place is occupied by M.T. Varro (1938), who was one of the first to try to explain the functions of cases, in particular the genitive, in the context of syntactic connections. These observations laid the foundation for further understanding of grammatical relationships between words that are transmitted by genitive. The use of

cases in rhetoric and stylistics by Quintilian (2024) was analysed in depth, and attention was drawn to the role of the genitive in expressing logical and semantic connections between concepts. Quintilian considered the genitive as an important tool for accurate expression of thoughts, which gives speech flexibility and expressiveness. The significance of these studies of antiquity lies in the fact that they began a systematic understanding of the syntactic functions of the genitive, which became the foundation for further grammatical treatises in the period of late antiquity and the Middle Ages.

According to L. Zvonska *et al.* (2017), the genitive is one of the indirect cases that combines the functions of two Indo-European cases: the genitive itself, which marked the relationship of an action or feature to a person or object, as well as the relationship between persons and objects, and the ablative, which denotes the separation of an action and an object, the difference of persons or objects by some feature. The opinion of scholars that the genitive, as one of the indirect cases, combines the functions of two Proto-Indo-European cases is reasonable, since its semantic structure combines the meanings of both the former genitive and possessive types of dependence inherited from earlier morphological systems; which is why the genitive today simultaneously expresses belonging, origin, partiality, object and quantitative relations, which in the archaic Indo-European system were distributed among separate case forms, but later condensed within a single grameme, which determined its multifunctionality in the languages of the Indo-European family. The genitive case as a formal exponent of the predicative core was noted by O.E. Bondarenko (2018), which is the most significant identification feature that distinguishes genitive sentences in a system of single-part syntactic units. The researcher distinguished genitive sentences from nominative sentences not only formally, but also semantically – the

meaning of being is complicated by a quantitative assessment or intensity of manifestation of the phenomenon, which is expressed constructively, that is, by the grammatical form of the main member itself, regardless of its lexical content, which is supported and used in this revision to substantiate the independent status of genitive constructions as varieties of syntactic units, considering their formal grammatical, semantic, functional, and communicative features. D.I. Ganych & I.S. Oliynyk (1985) interpreted genitive sentences as monosyllabic sentences, the main member of which is expressed as the genitive case of a noun (or pronoun) that conveys not only the meaning of the presence of an object, but also indicates its quantitative feature, more often – a large number. The researchers' opinion that the genitive case of a noun or pronoun conveys not only the meaning of the presence of an object, but also defines its quantitative characteristics, and in most cases marks a large or indefinitely large quantity, is justified. This interpretation is conditioned by the fact that the genitive case in many syntactic positions functions as a means of generalised quantitative designation, allowing the speaker to emphasise the massiveness, totality or excessiveness of objects that appear not as separate units, but as an often unlimited volume. According to the analysis by L. Rabanyuk (1999), genitive sentences are monosyllabic sentences in which the main term is expressed by a noun in the genitive case. The author of the study identified the key features of genitive sentences – the expression of a genitive relationship and the presence of a reference connection with the subject expressed by a noun in the genitive case, which is a reasonable opinion, because the key characteristics of genitive sentences, according to the author, are monosyllabic (monosyllabic sentences that have only one main member); the expression of a genitive connection (the main member expressed by a noun in the genitive case, which is the most important feature of genitive

sentences); the presence of a reference connection (the sentence indicates the presence or absence of something in a certain location or time interval, which it can be a physical place, or an abstract concept), which is confirmed above in the paper.

From the standpoint of contemporary functional grammar, H. Pinkster (2015; 2021) examined the functions of the genitive in simple and complex sentences, discussed the information structure, which is an inexhaustible source for comparative and synchronic analysis of the genitive in different text genres, and drew attention to changes in the semantics and syntax of individual genitive constructions in different periods. The linguistic material confirmed the researcher's thesis, since it was precisely the diversity of genres that revealed the full range of functional and semantic variations of this case: literary texts represent its emotional and expressive possibilities, scientific texts represent its logical structure and precision, legal texts represent its formalism and clarity of subordinate connections, while journalistic and epistolary texts represent the dynamics of living language practice. Therefore, it is precisely this genre coverage that creates the conditions for tracing stable and variable models of genitive usage, which provides a deep understanding of its grammatical nature and communicative functionality. O. Spevak (2022) considered verbal and nominative derivatives in Latin, described the role of the genitive in marking arguments, and substantiated that the frequency and types of genitive labelling depend on the genre of the text, which was confirmed in this revision. Syntactic and semantic aspects of Latin genitive were analysed by C. Viti (2010) and substantiated the function of word order with the genitive case, which is reasonable, since the order of the genitive case is not random and does not fall under a single "unified" scheme. The researcher relied on the methodology of her predecessors, in particular A. Devine & L. Stephens (2006),

and the role of lexical semantic and pragmatic factors in choosing the position of the genitive was emphasised. A significant contribution to understanding the functional ambiguity of the genitive and its role in the historical grammar of Latin was made by G. Galdi (2002). The researcher considered the specific functions of the Latin genitive, described the constructions “genitive + esse”, and investigated a number of syntactic features of the genitive that go beyond the conventional grammatical description. The researcher focused on non-standard genitive constructions that show the semantic flexibility of the genitive in various syntactic contexts. The researcher analysed the genitive in the function of the dependent member in nouns, adjectives, and verbs, focused on semantic shades, origin, and evaluation, which was substantiated, because the Latin genitive often acts not only as a grammatical indicator of attitude, but also as a means of expressing cognitive and pragmatic nuances in speech. P. Burns (2023) presented a Latin syntactic analysis – a natural language processing model that includes correct recognition of genitive forms, described the model’s training data and parameterisation, and proved that the models are analysed on a large amount of available Latin data, including all five tree-like banks of universal Latin language dependencies, which have been pre-processed for compatibility with each other. The researcher’s point is valid, since correct recognition of genitive forms in sentence structure ensures accurate determination of syntactic relationships between components of an utterance and contributes to adequate interpretation of content. L. Rigobianco (2017) examined the issue of the genitive singular, starting with data from Latin dialects, taking into consideration comparative data in other languages, and presented general reflections on the genitive case, concluding that the Satrician -osio, Ardeatic -oio, and Roman -oeo, including other endings attested in other languages. The study is relevant and timely, since

functional variability in understudied genres of Latin texts, where the genitive can acquire specific semantic and pragmatic meanings, has not yet been sufficiently researched, and the problem of the interaction of the genitive with contextual factors that influence the choice of construction and its stylistic role in the development of the semantic structure of the text remains unexplored, and the question of cognitive mechanisms that determine the interpretation of the genitive by speakers of the language in different historical periods has not been systematically analysed.

In the syntactic system of the Latin language, the qualification of the status of genitive constructions using the genitive case is an urgent theoretical problem. The genitive in Latin is used to refer to belonging, part of something, or circumstances. The linguistic material under study shows that the genitive in a sentence can be either *genetivus objectivus* (genitive of the object) or *genetivus subjectivus* (genitive of the subject). *Genetivus objectivus* is an important means of conveying the semantic relationship between a noun and the action that it represents and performs the function of a direct application for a verbal noun: “*Ca-tonem veteres inimicitiae Caesaris incitant et dolor repulsae*” (Caes. B. G. 1. 4. 2) – “Cato was prompted by Caesar’s long-standing dislike and fear of failure” (*repulsae* – *genetivus objectivus*). The specificity of the functioning of the *genetivus objectivus* in the selected literary texts is its consistent use to denote the object of an action or state expressed by a noun or adjective, which allows statements to be structured according to the principle of a clear semantic hierarchy. The texts show a tendency to combine this type of genitive with lexemes of abstract content – names of emotions, processes, intellectual actions or social phenomena, which forms a compact and logically coordinated model for transmitting the relationship between an action and its object. Such functioning *genetivus objectivus* ensures the economy of utterance,

avoids excessive use of analytical constructions, and creates conditions for greater accuracy and expressiveness of semantic connections.

Genetivus obiectivus is contrasted with *genetivus subjectivus* – the genitive case, which indicates the subject of the action. Definition of *genetivus subjectivus* is always related to the context, because externally it may coincide with *genetivus obiectivus*, where the genitive case denotes the object of the action, not its performer. R. Kühner *et al.* (1912) noted that the boundary between *genetivus subjectivus* and *genetivus obiectivus* is unstable, because in many contexts the same construction can be interpreted differently, and also notes that sometimes only the context or paraphrase of the verb allows defining a function. This thesis is confirmed by the linguistic material under study, since in real linguistic usage, the semantics of a noun in the genitive case often allows for an ambivalent interpretation depending on the context, the pragmatic attitude of the utterance, and the communicative intention of the speaker; as a result, the same genitive construction can be interpreted as expressing both the subject and object semantics of the action, which demonstrates the fluidity of the boundaries between these two

different constructions. Contextual analysis represents genitive constructions with *genetivus obiectivus* (objective genitive) and *genetivus subjectivus* (subjective genitive), which can only be distinguished by their content, since the form of both is the same. For example, in the expression “*timor hostium*” – “fear of enemies”, if it is “fear experienced by enemies”, then it is *genetivus subjectivus*; but if it is “fear before enemies”, then it is *genetivus obiectivus*. Such a genitive construction is often used with nouns to refer to feelings, actions, processes, or states that preserve the verb nature (“*timor hostium*” – “fear of enemies”, that is, “enemies are afraid”). The distinction between *genetivus obiectivus* and *genetivus subjectivus* is based on a semantic and syntactic analysis of the context. The correct interpretation depends on the context and logical relationships between words. Table 1 shows a comparison *Genetivus obiectivus* and *Genetivus subjectivus*, where the meaning differs depending on the content of the sentence – who is the agent and who is the object of the action. Distinguishing between these two types of genitive is important for an accurate understanding of Latin texts, since the interpretation of the meaning of the utterance depends on it.

Table 1. Comparison between *Genetivus obiectivus* and *Genetivus subjectivus*

Genitive type	Meaning/Function	Questions answered	Example Latin	Translation example
<i>Genetivus subjectivus</i> Subjective genitive	Denotes a person or object that performs an action expressed by a noun	Who? What?	“ <i>Acerrima proximorum odia</i> ” (<i>proximorum</i> – <i>genetivus subjectivus</i> : <i>odiunt proximi</i> – the close ones are angry)	The most severe anger of close ones (people)
<i>Genetivus obiectivus</i> Objective genitive	Denotes the person or object that the action expressed by the noun is directed at	Who? What?	“ <i>Bestiae sunt rationis et orationis experts</i> ” (C. Off. 1. 16. 50)	Animals are devoid of intelligence and speech

Source: compiled by the authors based on works of R. Kühner (1912), L. Zvonska *et al.* (2017), O. Bondarenko (2018), H. Pinkster (2015; 2021)

It has been observed that in sentence structure, adjectives governing the *genitive obiectivus* in Latin most often denote feelings, emotional

states, and inner experiences (Table 2). Such adjectives express the subject’s emotional or intellectual reactions to another person or phenomenon.

Table 2. Adjectives that control *genetivus obiectivus*

Latin adjective	Translation	Type of feeling/emotion	Example	Translation example
<i>avidus</i> , -a, -um	greedy for	aspiration, thirst	<i>avidus gloriae</i>	greedy for glory
<i>cupidus</i> , -a, -um	eager for	desire, attraction	<i>cupidus laudis</i>	eager for praise
<i>invidus</i> , -a, -um	envious of	envy	<i>invidus gloriae alterius</i>	envious of another's glory
<i>superbus</i> , -a, -um	proud of	pride	<i>superbus victoriae</i>	proud of victory
<i>ignarus</i> , -a, -um	ignorant of	indifference	<i>ignarus doloris</i>	ignorant of suffering
<i>plenus</i> , -a, -um	full of	strong feeling	<i>plenus irae</i>	full of anger
<i>suspicious</i> , -a, -um	suspicious of	distrust	<i>suspiciosus consilii alieni</i>	suspicious of someone else's advice
<i>satus</i> , -a, -um	happy with	pleasure	<i>satus laboris</i>	happy with work
<i>impatiens</i> , -ntis	intolerant of	irritation	<i>impatiens iniuriae</i>	intolerant of injury
<i>desiderans</i> , -ntis	longing for	longing, desire	<i>desiderans patriae</i>	longing for the homeland

Source: compiled by the authors based on G. Galdi (2002), C. Viti (2010), Fr. Bondarenko (2018), H. Pinkster (2015; 2021)

In constructions where adjectives control *genetivus obiectivus* and denote feelings, emotional states, or internal experiences, the genitive case indicates the object of feeling or emotion, that is, something that is the subject of pride, fear, desire, joy, etc. In such phrases, the genitive case indicates the object of emotion. This type of use of genitive is common in classical Latin, especially in rhetorical and philosophical texts. Often adjectives with *genetivus obiectivus* have appropriate constructions to indicate the attitude or assessment aimed at a particular object. Adjectives with the following meanings are recorded: with the meaning to know, to learn: “*Conscius foederis, ignarus belli*” (C. Balb. 20. 47) – “conscious of the terms of the contract, not familiar with military affairs”; with the meaning of equality, similarity: “*Est vis tanta naturae, ut homo nemo velit nisi hominis similis esse, et quidem formica formicae*” (C. N. D. 1. 28. 78) – “Such is the force of nature that every person wants to be like another, and an ant is like an ant too”; with the meaning of desire, aspiration: “*Populus acer est, suspicax, invidus potentiae*” (Nep. Ag. 13. 3. 5) – “The people are cruel, distrustful, greedy for power”; with meaning guilty, involved: “*Argutus malorum facinorum*” (Pl. As. 746) – “Convicted of crimes”; with the meaning of participation and ownership: “*Bestiae sunt rationis et orationis experts*” (C. Off. 1. 16. 50) – “Animals are devoid of mind

and language”. In the selected texts, the specifics of the functioning of constructions where adjectives control *genetivus obiectivus*, there is their purposeful use to denote the object to which the action, state, or emotional and evaluative attitude is directed, embedded in the meaning of an adjective, so such adjectives are mainly with the semantics of emotional reactions, intellectual perception, or behavioural characteristics that provide an accurate and concise expression of semantic connections, allowing the specification of who or what the assessment or characteristic concerns. *Genetivus obiectivus* performs the function of a structural and semantic means of clarifying the meaning, maintaining a high level of formal organisation of the text, and contributing to its logical integrity, demonstrating the deep connection of the Latin language between the categories of state, action and object, reflecting the high structural organisation and logical consistency of the ancient language system.

In the language material under study, it is recorded that *genetivus subjectivus* and *genetivus possessivus* (genitive case of belonging) can both refer to the relationship between a person and an action, but it is noted that the genitive case refers specifically to actual possession or belonging. Nominal part of the predicate *genetivus possessivus* is used for verbs “*sum*” – “to be”, “*fiō*” – “to arise”, “*facio*” – “to do” and

means belonging to: “*Claves portarum custodi-amque murorum suae potestatis fecit*” (Liv. 34. 21.2) – “He took control of the gate locks and the guarding of the walls”. The pattern of usage of *genetivus possessivus* in the selected Latin texts is that *genetivus possessivus* most often stands for a noun that denotes a thing or object of possession, so its function is similar to a possessive adjective, but differs in that it does not grammatically agree with the signified word, but remains in the genitive case, acting as a syntactic definition that specifies who owns the object of action or property.

In the genitive construction, one of the formal means by which the speaker’s emotional and evaluative tasks are realised is interjections, which play an important role in expressing the emotional or expressive colouring of the utterance. The issue of the place of interjections in the grammatical system of the language has been studied by many linguists. As a result of their study, different views were formed. In particular, L. Zvonska & V.M. Shovkovyi (2003) carried out the classification of interjections in Latin depending on the range of emotions and feelings, which is a good foundation for analysing the functional and stylistic features of genitive constructions, since it helped to clearly determine which emotional states are verbalised in the text and how they correlate with the choice of certain syntactic structures, in particular genitive ones. Emotionally charged exclamations often form the contextual background, enhance the expressiveness of the utterance, and influence the semantic organisation of the sentence, which, in turn, determines the specific functional load of the genitive – from denoting the intensity of experience to expressing subjective assessments or shades of emotional modality. Therefore, this approach allowed for a deeper understanding of the interaction between lexical and emotional, and syntactic means, providing a comprehensive understanding of the stylistic potential of genitive constructions in Latin speech. The genitive

case is used in exclamations and is called *genetivus exclamationis* (genitive of exclamation). The material under study revealed a clear pattern in the use of *genetivus exclamationis*, which consists in its ability to clarify the emotional content of a statement and enhance its expressive effect. Such constructions, combining an interjection with the form of the genitive case, create additional semantic tension, since the genitive case acts as a means of concretising the object to which the emotion is directed, or marking the situation that causes a response. Based to this, interjections cease to be isolated elements of emotional speech and turn into structurally inscribed components of the text, providing a more accurate transmission of feelings, shades of assessment, and intensity of the expressed state. In particular, many speech implementations of emotional and semantic variants of the exclamation “Oh!”: “*O miserae sortis!*” (Luc. 2. 45); “Oh, poor fate!”; “*Foederis heu taciti!*” (Prop. 4. 7. 21) – “Oh, a conspiracy!”; “*O operam tuam multam!*” (C. Att. 13. 6. 4) – “Oh, your many labours!” Genitive constructions designed with the help of interjections are characterised by high emotional expressiveness. With the help of constructions that include interjections, the speaker can realise expressive, commission, and directive and angular goals. A distinctive feature of such genitive constructions is that they do not reflect logical possession or partiality, but convey emotional and semantic dependence. The genitive case performs a psychological function and denotes what causes or accompanies an emotion. In Latin texts, especially poetic and rhetorical, such structures are used to create high emotional tension, and their presence indicates the flexibility of Latin syntax, where even interjections can enter into grammatical relations with cases, in particular with the genitive, while maintaining the expressiveness of speech.

The specificity of the functioning of genitive structures is their ability to characterise an object not qualitatively, but quantitatively.

Such constructions (*genetivus quantitatis*) form an additional semantic layer in the selected texts, allowing the author to vary the degrees of manifestation of certain characteristics – from minimal to maximum. In the analysed materials, *genetivus quantitatis* is often combined with qualitative adjectives and adverbs, enhancing their gradation function and providing more accurate structuring of the author's assessment, which determines its role as a tool for clarifying, intensifying, and creating stylistically labelled meanings: "*Conon pecuniae quinquaginta talenta civibus suis donavit*" (Nep. 9. 4. 5) – "Conon gifted his citizens fifty talents". In the construction, the genitive case of quantity gives the Latin utterance greater accuracy, logical clarity, and allows avoiding repetitions and deepens the meaning of the utterance, revealing the internal connection between the quantitative indicator and its subject content. It has been noted that *genetivus quantitatis* is widely used in classical Latin literature, where it serves as a means of both logical and artistic expression of proportion and measure: "*Veneti navium quod ubique fuerat in unum locum coegerant*" (Caes. B.G. 3. 16. 2) – "The Venetis drove the ships that were everywhere to one place". The genitive case of quantity is used to express a part of an integer or quantitative characteristic of a particular object or phenomenon and most often accompanies nouns with quantitative meaning denoting measure, volume, quantity, or part, for example: "*Maximus vini numerus fuit, permagnum pondus argenti*" (C. Phil. 2. 27. 66). "There was an immense amount of wine, a huge mass of silver". In such constructions, the genitive case acts as a dependent component that specifies the volume or measure of what is expressed by the noun quantity. According to C. Viti (2010), the genitive case gives the statement accuracy and allows specifying the quantitative aspect of an action or state. This thesis is confirmed in the study, because the genitive in the structure of the utterance performs the function of clarifying the semantic parameters

of the action or state, in particular, its quantitative aspect, because it is through the genitive case that the speaker can specify the measure, degree or volume of manifestation of a certain process, highlighting it from other possible interpretations, so this ability of the genitive ensures the accuracy of the utterance, because it not only names the associated object or phenomenon, but also determines their quantitative characteristic, forming clear boundaries of meaning and strengthening the logical and semantic organisation of the sentence. The genitive case of quantity is often used after pronouns and adverbs with quantitative meaning, such as "*plus*" – "more", "*minus*" – "less", "*satis*" – "enough", "*nimum*" – "quite a lot", "*tantum*" – "few" (Kobyliansky, 1912), denoting a measure or degree: "*plus sapientiae*" – "more wisdom", "*satis temporis*" – "enough time", where the genitive quantity expresses not just a part, but a relative quantity or measure of quality. Thus, the genitive case of quantity is an important syntactic tool that ensures the accuracy and flexibility of the Latin expression, combining the semantics of particularity and quantitative certainty.

In the studied material, it is recorded that *genetivus quantitatis* is used in adverbs (Table 3) when it comes to expressing a measure, degree, or quantitative characteristic of an action or condition: "*Unde gentium?*" (Pl. As. 90) – "Where is he from?". In constructions, the genitive indicates the limit or degree of manifestation that the adverb denotes, for example: "*multum laboris*" – "a lot of work", "*nihil spei*" – "no hope". When an adverb appears in combination with the genitive number, it clarifies the measure of action: "*multum*" – "a lot of", "*parum*" – "little", "*nihil*" – "nothing", "*satis*" – "enough", "*plus*" – "more", etc. (Trofymuk & Trofymuk, 2001) and form figures of speech like "*multum temporis*" – "a lot of time", "*parum sapientiae*" – "little wisdom"; "*Satis eloquentiae, sapientiae parum*" (Sall. C. 5. 4) "Eloquence is enough, wisdom is not enough".

Table 3. Use of Latin adverbs combined with the genitive number (*genetivus quantitatis*)

Latin adverb	Translation	Combination type	Example Latin	Translation example
<i>multum</i>	many	adverb + Gen	<i>multum temporis</i>	a lot of time
<i>parum</i>	little	adverb + Gen	<i>parum aquae</i>	little water
<i>nihil</i>	nothing	adverb + Gen	<i>nihil spei</i>	no hope
<i>satis</i>	enough	adverb + Gen	<i>satis laboris</i>	enough work
<i>plus</i>	more	adverb + Gen	<i>plus honoris</i>	more honor
<i>minus</i>	less	adverb + Gen	<i>minus pecuniae</i>	less money
<i>tantum</i>	so much	adverb + Gen	<i>tantum auxilii</i>	so much help

Source: compiled by the authors based on L. Zvonska & V.M. Shovkovyi (2003), C. Viti (2010), H. Pinkster (2015; 2021)

Genetivus quantitatis in adverbs emphasises the relativity and gradation of the feature, allowing to more accurately convey the intensity, comparison, or constraint. Thus, the genitive case of quantity in adverbs is an important means of expressing the semantics of measure and intensity in the Latin syntactic system. A clear pattern of use of the dividing genitive case was revealed (*genetivus partitivus*), which manifests itself in the sequential designation of a part of the whole, when the authors seek to specify the quantitative or qualitative parameters of objects and phenomena. Such a genitive is widely used in constructions with words to denote quantity, weight, measure, or part, and in combination with negation, which enhances the shade of incompleteness or particularity. The use of such a construction in texts is conditioned by the need for a more accurate nomination of fragmented objects or abstract concepts, which contributes to greater expressiveness and structural organisation of the utterance. According to the analysis by L. Zvonska *et al.* (2017), *genetivus partitivus* denotes the integrity, mass, or group from which a part is allocated; always put in a predicative position. The language material certifies that *genetivus partitivus* is used for adjectives in the higher and highest degrees of comparison: “*Prior horum apud Massagetos in proelio cecidit*” (Nep. Ep. 21. 1. 2) – “The first of them died in the battle with the massagets”; “*Ex his, qui dominatum imperio tenuerunt, excellentissimi fuerunt Persarum Cyrus et Darius Hystaspis filius*”

(Nep. Han. 21. 1.2) – “Of those who were in power, the most famous among the Persians were Cyrus and Darius, son of Hystaspus”. By analysis, *genetivus partitivus* is also often used after pronouns and adverbs that express a number or indefinite part, and can replace other constructions by conveying the particle in an expressive, concise form: “*aliquid temporis*” – “a little time”, “*quid novi?*” – “what’s new?”, “*multi hominum*” – “a lot of people”. Thus, the partitive genitive case is an important means of clarifying quantitative and partial relationships in Latin, contributing to the accuracy and flexibility of Latin syntax.

A recent syntactic analysis of Latin cases was carried out by H. Pinkster (2021), where the genitive case of price (*genetivus pretii*) is considered in connection with the pragmatic function of indicating valuation and value in an expression. Review of *genetivus pretii* in connection with its pragmatic function, the designation of valuation and value is appropriate, since it is this construction that allows the Latin expression to convey not only the quantitative or economic characteristics of the subject, but also broader socio-communicative meanings related to the assessment, significance and hierarchy of values in a particular discourse. It is noted that due to *genetivus pretii*, the speaker actualises their own attitude to the object or action, emphasises their expediency, desirability, or vice versa – depreciation, which serves as an important means of forming a pragmatic effect of expression, therefore, *genetivus pretii*

acts not only as a grammatical model, but also as a tool for stylistic organisation of the text and a marker of communicative intent, which reveals the hidden meanings and cultural codes of Latin speech. In the analysed texts, *genetivus pretii* regularly accompanies nouns and verb forms that express purchase, exchange, value ratio, or metaphorical definition of value, forming a stable model for describing quantitative characteristics within the contexts under study. It was noted that the use of *genetivus pretii* is characteristic of expressing both literal and figurative meaning, that is, it can mean not only a monetary price, but also a price in a broad sense – effort, loss, honour, or glory: “*Tanti quodque malum est, quanti illud taxavimu*” (Sen. Ag. 19) – “Evil is as great as we have assessed it to be”. The genitive case indicates how highly something is valued and reveals not only a material, but also a moral or symbolic price. The genitive case of price is also used with some adverbs of the measure of value, such as “*magni*” – “high”, “*parvi*” – “cheap”, “*tanti*” – “for so much”, “*nihili*” – “worthless”, “*pluris*” – “more expensive”, etc (Kobylianskyi, 1912). For example: “*Cujus auctoritas in iis regionibus magni habebatur*” (Caes. B. G. 4. 21.7) – “Whose authority in these parts was high”.

Sources of factual material represent genitive constructions with a variant of the genitive of quality (Latin: *genetivus qualitatis*), which is used to denote the quality, property or feature of a person or object and characterises the object by internal or external features. A clear pattern of usage of *genetivus qualitatis* was revealed, which certified the authors’ desire for a concise but expressive description, when qualitative characteristics are presented not through an adjective, but through a noun in the genitive case, which gives the expression more formality or stylistic expressiveness. The use of *genetivus qualitatis* in texts often performs a clarifying function, allowing the specification of the degree, measure, or intensity of a certain property, which ensures

semantic accuracy and structural compactness of syntactic constructions: “*Cato in omnibus rebus singular and fuit prudentia et industria*” (C. Fam. 7. 1.2) – “Cato was distinguished in all matters by exceptional prudence and diligence”. This method of expression emphasises the constancy of the property, which makes the description more imaginative and expressive. The meaning of *genetivus qualitatis* is similar to that of an adjectival modifier, but it gives the statement a more solemn or literary tone, allowing a particular quality to be conveyed more accurately as a permanent or inherent feature rather than a temporary state. A functional and stylistic feature of genitive constructions with a variant of the genitive case of the property is that it is used with the verb “*esse, fuit*” – “to be”: “*M. Messalla in causis cognoscendis componen-disque diligens, magni laboris, multae operae multarumque causarum fuit*” (C. Bt. 70. 246) – “M. Messala was adept at understanding and resolving matters, (overcoming) great labours, difficulties, and numerous obstacles”. *Genetivus qualitatis* plays an important role in the stylistic diversity of the Latin language.

In the artistic and moral and philosophical style, where it is important to emphasise character traits, abilities or moral qualities, genitive constructions are used with the characterising genitive (*genetivus characteristicus*) to express a permanent or typical feature of a person or object. The specificity of the functioning of *genetivus characteristicus* constructions in the selected texts is their ability to denote a constant feature inherent in an object or person, which distinguishes it from others and gives the statement additional semantic expressiveness. Such genitive constructions serve as a means of clarifying a characteristic feature, enhancing the descriptive nature of the message, and helping to more accurately distinguish semantic tones. In the analysed texts, *genetivus characteristicus* was used to characterise internal qualities, behavioural traits, or stable properties of objects, ensuring logical coherence and

stylistic completeness of texts, but it was most often combined with nouns. According to C. Lehmann (1991), a noun plays an important role in the language system. The researcher's argument is convincing, because it is the noun that serves as the central carrier of subject semantics and determines the structural organisation of the phrase, in particular, the genitive construction, where it forms logical and semantic relations between the components. Within the genitive case, the noun sets the direction of interpretation of dependent words, concretises belonging, qualitative characteristics, volume, particularity or other types of semantic connections, which allows accurately and economically conveying a variety of semantic shades. Due to its ability to combine grammatical and lexical meanings, the noun provides stability and flexibility of genitive constructions, making them a universal tool for modelling complex semantic relationships in speech. In the genitive construction, nouns denote a person, gender, condition, age, or other lasting qualities that are integral or essential to the named person, i.e., have a characteristic nature: "*Et sapientis est consilium explicare suum de maximis rebus, et honesti et disertis, ut mente providere, auctoritate probare, oratione persuadere possit*" (C. De orat. 2. 81. 333) – "And reasonable people tend to express their opinion about the most important things, and serious and experienced people have the ability to predict through reason, through authority to prove, through eloquence to convince". In genitive constructions, *genetivus characteristicus* conveys deeper shades of meaning, which allows not only to naming an object or person, but also to indicate their defining feature, emphasising their individuality and value characteristic.

In the selected texts, a clear pattern of use of the genitive of crime (*genetivus criminis*), used mainly after verbs or verbal nouns with the meaning of accusation, suspicion, condemnation, which provides an accurate definition of what exactly the person is accused of. Regularity

of the use of *genetivus criminis* in the materials under study indicate its important role in the development of legally and semantically correct statements, and the stability of this grammatical model in the contexts of official business and journalistic styles. It has been recorded that in the genitive constructions of *genetivus criminis* are used with verbs: "*accuso*" – "I accuse", "*arguo*" – "I expose", "*condemn*" – "I condemn", "*absolve*" – "I absolve" (Boyko & Myronova, 2012). In such constructions, the genitive case indicates the crime or guilt itself, and not the person who committed it: "*accuso eum furti*" – "I accuse him of theft", where the word "*furti*" stands in the genitive case and expresses the content of the accusation, i.e., *genetivus criminis* specifies exactly what the charge is or what action is considered a crime. According to the analysis by L. Zvonska *et al.* (2017), *genetivus criminis* names the reason for the punishment or absolvement. The genitive case of guilt is often combined not only with verbs, but also with nouns meaning accusation, trial, sentence, or punishment: "*reus furti*" – "guilty of theft", "*absolutus culpa*" – "acquitted of guilt", giving the genitive construction an official or legal connotation that reflects the importance of this case in the rhetoric and judicial practice of Ancient Rome.

The specificity of the functioning of genitive constructions is their ability to clarify or concretise the content of a reference noun through the representation of the genitive member as an explanatory name that reveals the essence, type or category of the designated object. Such constructions (*genetivus appositivus*) serve as a means of semantic concretisation in the selected texts, allowing the author to structure information more accurately and avoid ambiguity. Within the analysed texts, *genetivus appositivus* was most often used to define abstract concepts, terms, and generalised categories, forming clear nominative connections and ensuring a high level of lexical and semantic organisation of the presentation. An

internal mechanism that combines elements of the paradigm in Latin was revealed. This idea is valid, since the internal mechanism that unites the elements of the paradigm manifests itself as a systematic interaction of morphological and semantic factors that ensure the integrity and functional consistency of case forms. This mechanism is especially clearly confirmed in the study of genitive constructions, because it is in them that a natural combination of structural models and semantic roles is traced, which demonstrates not randomness, but the internal regularity of their organisation and use in Latin syntax. *Genetivus appositivus* is used to explain, clarify, or reveal the content of the noun to which it belongs, without expressing belonging or dependence, but specifies who or what

exactly the object designated by the main word is and identifies two concepts where one is a concretisation or interpretation of the other. In the material under study, it is recorded that *genetivus appositivus* is used after nouns to denote generalisations, categories, parts, or concepts that generalise: “...*scopuli herbis algae vestiuntus*” (Col. 8. 17. 6) “...rocks entangled in seaweed grass”. In genitive construction, the control word is a general name, and the application expressed by the genitive is a specific one. In such constructions, the genitive case clarifies or reveals the meaning of the main word, acting as a kind of “prefix”. The selected texts show a clear pattern in the use of *genetivus copiae* (genitive of abundance) and *genetivus inopiae* (genitive of scarcity) constructions (Table 4).

Table 4. Comparison of *genetivus copiae* and *genetivus inopiae*

Genitive type	Meaning	Example Latin	Translation example	Explanation
<i>Genetivus copiae</i> Genitive case of abundance	Expresses the presence, abundance, or excess of something	<i>plenus sapientiae</i>	full of wisdom	Indicates an item that someone or something owns in large quantities
<i>Genetivus inopiae</i> Genitive case of lack	Expresses the absence, lack, or deprivation of something	<i>inops consilii</i>	deprived of advice	Indicates an item that is missing or missing

Source: compiled by the authors based on L. Zvonska et al. (2017); C. Lehmann (2020); H. Pinkster (2015; 2021)

Attention is drawn to the systematic use of these genitive forms in contexts where it is important to describe resources, material goods, or abstract concepts, which allows the authors to effectively emphasise the presence or absence of essential elements in the phenomena under study. According to the analysis, *genetivus copiae* is typically used to denote fullness, excess, generosity, or a large quantity of something and is combined with the adjectives “*plenus*” – “full”, “*dives*” – “rich”, “*refertus*” – “filled”, “*abundans*” – “generous” (Trofymuk & Trofymuk, 2001). In the construction “*terra plena fructuum*” – “land full of fruits” the genitive case expresses the source or content of abundance, indicating what exactly the object is rich or saturated in. However, *genetivus inopiae* is used to refer to the absence or lack of a certain

quality or object, so this genitive accompanies adjectives and nouns that express lack, need, or emptiness. For example, in the construction “*inops consilii*” – the genitive case “devoid of prudence” acts as an indicator of what exactly is missing or missing in the subject. According to L. Zvonska et al. (2017), *genetivus copiae* may depend on the semantics of adjectives. The researchers suggest that *genetivus copiae* may depend on the semantics of adjectives, since it is the qualitative characteristics expressed by adjective forms that can set parameters for the measurement, volume, or quantitative fullness of a feature that needs to be clarified with the genitive case. Adjectives semantically contain the idea of fullness, abundance or lack, so they naturally require a genitive definition to specify “what” or “how much” the object is filled with or

marked by. Therefore, it is the semantics of the adjective that forms the need for *genetivus copiae* as a clarifying component that ensures the accuracy and completeness of the statement. The use of *genetivus copiae* and *genetivus inopiae* gives the Latin utterance more expressiveness and accuracy, because it allows conveying not only the fact of the presence or absence, but also the degree of this feature. In the context of Latin stylistics, these constructions often emphasise the internal state or characteristic of the subject, revealing deep semantic shades of the text.

Thus, genitive constructions in Latin form a complex system of syntactic connections, in which the genitive case (*genetivus*) expresses various relationships between a noun (or other governing word) and a dependent component. The general model of genitive constructions is based on the principle of subordinate definition, where the genitive clarifies, restricts or explains the meaning of the main word. Structurally, the model of a genitive construction can be represented as: [noun/adjective/adverb/verb] + [noun in the genitive case], which is a universal scheme for expressing dependent relationships and covers both grammatical and semantic types of connections and demonstrates the flexibility of Latin syntax, where the genitive case serves as one of the main means of developing content and forming semantic nuances in a sentence.

Conclusions

Genitive constructions occupy an important place in the system of case forms, since it is through them that a wide range of logical and semantic, and syntactic relations are realised. Genitive constructions allow expressing belonging, origin, characteristic, part of the whole, measure, cause, cost, etc., so this multifunctionality makes the genitive one of the most flexible and expressive cases in Latin. The functional specificity of genitive constructions is that they can clarify the meaning of the main word, creating close semantic connections within the phrase, and can also serve

as an attribute, object or subject of action, which indicates their ability to replace other syntactic structures, thus, the Latin language achieves a high level of compactness and logical accuracy of the expression. In the stylistic aspect, genitive constructions give speech expressiveness, solemnity and a certain abstraction, which are especially characteristic of classical Latin of literary and scientific styles, where they emphasise the complexity of logical connections between concepts. The use of genitives instead of analytical turns makes the text more concise and richer in content. In the text, the genitive case performs not only a grammatical, but also an expressive function and plays the role of a means of accurate definition of concepts, which makes the genitive an indispensable tool for constructing abstract statements, ensuring clarity of wording and accuracy of relations of ownership or responsibility, and demonstrates logical subordination of concepts and avoids ambiguity, so such genitive constructions emphasise the standardisation and structure of the text. Functional and stylistic features of genitive constructions in Latin indicate their universality and expressive potential, which are an important means of syntactic organisation of the text, combining the accuracy of grammatical connections with the flexibility of stylistic use, where the genitive has become an integral element of the Latin language style, combining logic, harmony, and expressiveness. The paper does not claim to be an exhaustive description of the functional and stylistic features of genitive constructions in Latin, but it is relevant for further study of the syntactic system of Latin in the context of the historical development of Indo-European languages and its influence on the development of grammatical categories in contemporary European languages. In addition, the study opens up prospects for comparing Latin genitive constructions with similar structures in other languages, which will contribute to a deeper understanding of

universal and national linguistic trends in the expression of case relations.

such resources for research, and the right to link and cite them as authors when using the materials.

Acknowledgements

The authors express their gratitude to the researchers who uploaded their studies to scientific platforms, as well as to all scientists who provided open access to scientific information, free use of

None.

Funding

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

- [1] Allbert, R.A., & Allbert, M.L. (2025). PhiloBERTA: A transformer-based cross-lingual analysis of Greek and Latin lexicons. *ArXiv*. doi: [10.48550/arXiv.2503.05265](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2503.05265).
- [2] Bondarenko, O.E. (2018). [Linguistic status of genitive sentences: Semantic, structural, functional-communicative aspects](#). *World Science*, 1(29(6)), 70-76.
- [3] Boyko, N., & Myronova, V. (2012). [Ukrainian-Ancient Greek-Latin dictionary](#). Kyiv: Publishing and Printing Center "Kyiv University".
- [4] Burns, P.J. (2023). LatinCy: Synthetic trained pipelines for Latin NLP. *ArXiv*. doi: [10.48550/arXiv.2305.04365](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.04365).
- [5] Cabrilla, C. (2024). *Recent trends and findings in Latin linguistics: Volume I: Syntax, semantics and pragmatics. Volume II: Semantics and lexicography. Discourse and dialogue*. Berlin: De Gruyter. doi: [10.1515/9783110722116](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110722116).
- [6] Cherniukh, B. (2022). [Folk Latin](#). Lviv: Ivan Franko National University of Lviv.
- [7] Crisma, P., Guardiano, C., & Longobardi, G. (2020). [Syntactic diversity and language learnability](#). *Studi e Saggi Linguistici*, 58(2), 99-130.
- [8] Cuzzolin, P. (2024). Aspects of the expression of definiteness in classical Latin. In C. Cabrilla (Ed.), *Recent trends and findings in Latin linguistics: Volume I: Syntax, semantics and pragmatics. Volume II: Semantics and lexicography. Discourse and dialogue* (pp. 19-44). Berlin: De Gruyter. doi: [10.1515/9783110722116-002](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110722116-002).
- [9] Devine, A.M., & Stephens, L.D. (2006). [Latin word order: Structured meaning and information](#). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [10] Galdi, G. (2002). On the Latin genitive: Some special usages. *Journal of Latin Linguistics*, 8(1), 101-117. doi: [10.1515/joll.2002.8.1.101](https://doi.org/10.1515/joll.2002.8.1.101)
- [11] Ganych, D.I., & Oliynyk, I.S. (1985). [Dictionary of linguistic terms](#). Kyiv: Vyshcha Shkola.
- [12] Kobylanskyi, Y. (1912). [Latin-Ukrainian dictionary for secondary school](#). Vienna: Imperial-Royal School Book Publishing House.
- [13] Kolibaba, L. (2024). [End of the gender singular case of nouns of the 3rd declension in the modern language practice of the Ukrainian linguistic community](#). In *Grammatical portrait of the Ukrainian language in the 21st century: Collection of abstracts of scientific reports by participants of the international scientific conference in honor of doctor of philology, Professor Kateryna Hryhorivna Horodenska* (pp. 35-38). Kyiv: Publishing House Dmytro Burago.
- [14] Kühner, R., Holzweissig, F.W., & Stegmann, C.F.L.A. (1912). [Comprehensive grammar of the Latin language](#). Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung.
- [15] Lehmann, C. (1991). [The Latin nominal group in typological perspective](#). In R. Coleman (Ed.), *New studies in Latin linguistics: Selected papers from the 4th international colloquium on Latin linguistics* (pp. 203-232). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- [16] Ostrovska, L.S. (2023). The problem of qualification of genitive one-member sentences. *Southern Archive (Philological Sciences)*, 95, 31-38. [doi: 10.32999/ksu2663-2691/2023-95-4](https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2663-2691/2023-95-4).
- [17] Pezzini, G., & Chahoud, A. (2023). Introduction: What is “Early Latin”? In J.N. Adams, A. Chahoud & G. Pezzini (Eds.), *Early Latin: Constructs, diversity, reception* (pp. 1-12). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [doi: 10.1017/9781108671132.001](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108671132.001).
- [18] Pinkster, H. (2015). *The Oxford Latin syntax: Volume 1: The simple clause*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199283613.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199283613.001.0001).
- [19] Pinkster, H. (2021). *The Oxford Latin syntax. Volume II: The complex sentence and discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [doi: 10.1093/oso/9780199230563.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199230563.001.0001).
- [20] Quintilian. (2024). *Institutio oratoria*. New York: Lyceum Institute.
- [21] Rabanyuk, L.S. (1999). *Syntactic nature of genitive monosyllabic sentences*. Chernivtsi: Chernivtsi State University named after Yuri Fedkovych.
- [22] Rigobianco, L. (2017). The o-stem genitive singular: Considerations from the perspective of the Latin dialects. *Pallas: Revue d'études antiques*, 103. [doi: 10.4000/pallas.4275](https://doi.org/10.4000/pallas.4275).
- [23] Spevak, O. (2022). *Nominalization in Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [doi: 10.1093/oso/9780192866011.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192866011.001.0001).
- [24] Trofymuk, M., & Trofymuk, O. (2001). *Latin-Ukrainian dictionary*. Lviv: Publishing House of the Lviv Theological Academy.
- [25] Varro, M.T. (1938). *De lingua Latina*. Harvard: Loeb Classical Library.
- [26] Viti, C. (2010). Observations on genitive word order in Latin. In O. Spevak (Ed.), *The noun phrase in Latin: New contributions* (pp. 77-96). Paris: L'Harmattan.
- [27] Zvonska, L.L., & Shovkovyi, V.M. (2003). *Latin language: Textbook for students of classical philology*. Kyiv: Kniga.
- [28] Zvonska, L.L., et al. (2017). *Encyclopedic dictionary of classical languages*. Kyiv: Kyiv University Publishing and Printing Centre.

Функційно-стилістичні особливості генетивних конструкцій у латинській мові

Василь Шинкарук

Доктор філологічних наук, професор
Національний університет біоресурсів і природокористування України
03041, вул. Героїв Оборони, 15, м. Київ, Україна
<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8589-4995>

Олександра Шинкарук

Кандидат юридичних наук, доцент
Національний університет біоресурсів і природокористування України
03041, Героїв Оборони, 15, м. Київ, Україна
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5494-1370>

Анотація. Актуальність дослідження функційно-стилістичних особливостей генетивних конструкцій зумовлена їх ключовою роллю у формуванні синтаксичної організації тексту, передачі семантичних відтінків та розкритті стилістичної специфіки латинських мовних пам'яток різних жанрів. Метою дослідження було виявлення, систематизація та характеристика функційно-стилістичних особливостей генетивних конструкцій у латинській мові з урахуванням їх семантичних, синтаксичних та текстотворчих параметрів. У дослідженні застосовано комплексні методи дослідження – від вибіркового до контекстуального, поєднання синтаксичного та функційного аналізу. Проаналізовано широке коло семантичних відтінків, яких набуває родовий відмінок залежно від контексту, типу словосполучення та стилістичної настанови тексту. Описано розмежування між родовим суб'єкта і родовим об'єкта, родовим приналежності, родовим властивості та іншими різновидами, що забезпечують гнучкість і багатозначність латинського висловлення та дозволяють глибше зрозуміти формально-граматичну природу генетиву. Визначено, що генетив у латинській мові не лише виконує роль формального показника підрядності, а виступає засобом передавання смислової точності, логічної послідовності та емоційно-експресивних відтінків. Обґрунтовано, що генетивні конструкції можуть підкреслювати інтелектуальну, соціальну або моральну характеристику суб'єкта, формуючи особливу експресію тексту. Доведено, що генетивні конструкції є важливим чинником формування смислової структури латинського речення і виступають універсальним засобом вираження логічних, емоційних та образних компонентів мови. Результати мають значення для подальших досліджень у галузі латинської граматики, порівняльного мовознавства та стилістики. Практична цінність дослідження полягає в тому, що його результати можуть бути використані фахівцями з класичної філології, перекладачами латиномовних текстів, викладачами історії мови та стилістики, а також дослідниками античної літератури для підвищення точності інтерпретації текстів та поглибленого аналізу мовної структури античних джерел. Результати дослідження можуть бути використані у наступних наукових працях щодо семантико-синтаксичної реченнєвої структури

Ключові слова: родовий відмінок; речення; синтаксис; семантика; стилістика